

PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE AND PERSPECTIVES
IN THE TEACHING OF HISTORICAL EMPATHY

A Dissertation Submitted to the University of Oxford
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

by
Deborah Lynn Cunningham

St. Edmund Hall
Michaelmas Term 2003 [i.e. 2004]



Professional Practice and Perspectives in the Teaching of Historical Empathy

Deborah Lynn Cunningham
St. Edmund Hall, University of Oxford
For the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy
Michaelmas Term 2003 [ie 2004]

To empathise, in a historical sense, generally means to entertain the perspectives and values of people in the past through consideration of the circumstances they faced. Widely acknowledged as a fundamental part of the historian's craft, empathy has had a more tenuous place in school history due to the conceptual confusion of the term, its association with the promotion of a leftist political agenda, and its difficulty for pupils. Scholarship on empathy has focused upon its philosophical meaning and students' thought processes, but has largely neglected to explore teachers' knowledge and practice about how to cultivate it. Instead, it has tended to offer norms for good practice that take little account of differing contexts or the sometimes competing goals that teachers seek to achieve. It has been guided as well by a particular image of empathy teaching as dedicated exercises, often involving immersion in many historical sources.

My study begins to address the lack of attention to teachers' actual ideas and practices for fostering empathy by presenting a case study of four experienced history educators in England. Through extensive analysis of lesson and interview transcripts, I derive a new framework for thinking about empathy teaching that takes into account both the major activities and small-scale discourse strategies – heretofore largely unexamined – that the teachers use to promote understanding. It attends to their ways of conceptualising empathy, their means of establishing the conditions they view as essential, their negotiations of myriad factors helping or hindering their efforts, and their complex deployments of various types of relevant knowledge. The framework shows how, in making decisions about empathy teaching, they consider student factors such as capacities, preconceptions and motivation, structural factors such as time, resources, and examination priorities, and factors

concerning their own knowledge, beliefs and state – then utilise a broad and flexible repertoire of strategies to address the shifting variables they encounter. Finally, the study explores curriculum as an *interaction* between teachers, pupils and educational context, recognising the influence of each on understanding in particular classrooms.

Significant divergences between how teachers think and practice and how empathy teaching is discussed in the educational literature emerge for a spectrum of issues. These include how empathy is conceptualised, what sorts of strategies are enacted, who the historical subjects of empathetic efforts are, how students' achievements are assessed, and how empathy-related dilemmas are construed and managed. All of these discrepancies suggest that research stands to benefit by attending more closely to teachers' ideas. For their part, the teachers appear to be oriented toward self-improvement – learning and changing through experience, collegial contact, and focused reflection of the sort prompted by this research. Implications for teachers' professional development and for future research approaches are explored.

For my parents and Christine

Empathisers extraordinaire

Acknowledgements

Whatever merits this research may possess, they would surely be fewer without the dedicated support of many people on both sides of the Atlantic.

Above all I thank my supervisor, Anna Pendry, whose deep knowledge of history education and scholarship has informed this project from the design to the details, and whose vision of teachers and researchers strengthening each others' work through mutual respect and desire for understanding has inspired me. For her thoughtfulness and rigour in intellectual matters, her responsiveness and flexibility in practical ones, and her warm and generous spirit, I am profoundly grateful. Anna represents the very best of Oxford.

To the teachers who participated in this study, I owe tremendous thanks, for each of them carved out many hours to talk to me from demanding sets of responsibilities. Their candour and commitment to self-scrutiny made this research possible in the first place, and their personal qualities made it a joy to carry out.

From the moment of its inception, this project has benefited from the wisdom and superb critical skills of my sister, Christine Cunningham, who is also an educational researcher. Giving with her time, prompt with feedback on every draft and query, and unfailingly encouraging and kind, I could not have found a better or more steadfast ally in this enterprise.

My parents, Janice and Brian Cunningham, have offered me great doses of support and love through the duration of this project, in addition to sparking my interest in history at a young age through books, travel, and conversation. I am especially grateful for the retreat they provided for me in starry Vermont during October of 2003 while I wrote the final chapters of this thesis.

For financial grants to conduct this research, I thank Oxford University and the Department of Educational Studies for a University Graduate Studentship, and CVCP for an ORS Award. And for extensive computer support, technical tips and reassurance, I am indebted to Andrew Ross and Dan Laba.

The content of this dissertation has been significantly improved through the suggestions of a cohort of readers. I thank Geoffrey Walford, Geoff Hayward, Ann Childs, Susan James, Andrew Ross and David Green for their careful and constructive readings of various chapters.

Many fellow graduate students and close friends in Oxford have showered good fortune on this project and on me for the past few years, through countless discussions and selfless sharing of their knowledge and ideas. In particular, I am thankful for the company of Andrew, Susan, Maria and Matthew Kott, and Rachel Wilson – convivial comrades, consultants, and co-quaffers. Their friendship has been inexpressibly precious, a source of sustenance and delight time and again.

Finally, I thank my siblings Kathryn and Dan and all of my friends in Europe and America for their care, attentiveness and belief in me, which enabled me to devote myself to this research and made the process a pleasure.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PRELIMINARY MATERIALS

Dedication.....	i
Acknowledgements.....	ii
Table of Contents.....	iv
List of Tables.....	viii

CHAPTER 1: LITERATURE REVIEW.....	1
Introduction.....	1
Conceptualising Empathy and its Role in History.....	2
Philosophers' and Historians' Thinking.....	2
Empathy's Introduction in History Education.....	6
Challenges to Empathy in School History.....	10
Conceptual Clarification.....	14
Students' Empathetic Thinking.....	27
Teaching for Empathetic Understanding.....	33

CHAPTER 2: METHODOLOGY I –

RESEARCH DESIGN AND DATA COLLECTION.....	42
Research Rationale and Questions.....	42
The Research Design.....	45
Strategy.....	45
The Participating Teachers.....	46
Sampling the Lessons.....	48
Data Collection.....	52
Principles.....	52
Accessing Teachers' Thinking.....	54
Methods of Data Collection.....	56
Initial Interview.....	57
Classroom Observations.....	58
Post-Lesson Interviews.....	59
Coursework Interview.....	60
Curricular Documents.....	61
Final Interview.....	61
My Role and Influence.....	62

CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY II –

DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION.....	63
Analysis.....	63
The Constant Comparative Method for Grounded Theory... ..	64
Principles for Coding.....	65
Procedures of Analysis.....	67
Preliminaries.....	67
Stage One.....	69
Stage Two.....	74

Teacher Cognition Research.....	78
Stage Three.....	85
Stage Four.....	86
Fine-Grained Analysis.....	87
Quantification.....	89
Interpretation of the Data.....	90
Purposes.....	90
Principles.....	90
Procedures.....	92
CHAPTER 4: PORTRAITS OF THE TEACHERS IN THEIR SCHOOL CONTEXTS.....	97
Mr. Dow.....	99
Mr. Ingram.....	102
Ms. Joslin.....	105
Ms. Hayes.....	108
CHAPTER 5 (FINDINGS I): CONCEPTUALISING EMPATHY AND ITS ROLE IN THE HISTORY CLASSROOM.....	111
Introduction.....	111
Conceptualising Empathy.....	111
Definitions.....	111
What is Empathy?	113
Identifying Lessons: Empathy as Integral or Discrete.....	114
What Does It Mean to Empathise?	119
Expressing Ideas of Empathy through Classroom Practices..	121
Setting Boundaries.....	123
Dimensions of Difference in Teachers' Thinking and Practice.....	127
The Role of Imagination.....	128
The Nature of Understanding Sought: Personal or Historical?	131
The Role of Identification and Emotional Connection.....	135
The Relationship between Empathy and Moral Judgment...	138
The Issue of Scale.....	141
Conditions Required for Empathy.....	142
Recognising and Assessing Empathy.....	143
Parameters of Empathetic Sophistication.....	144
Formal and Informal Systems of Assessment.....	146
CHAPTER 6 (FINDINGS II): TEACHERS' THINKING ABOUT FACTORS INFLUENCING THE EMPATHY CURRICULUM.....	155
Introduction.....	155
Student Factors.....	156
Students' Capacities for Empathy.....	156
Students' Preconceptions and Prior Knowledge.....	162
Knowledge of How Students React to Historical Topics.....	168
Knowledge of General Student Factors.....	171

Structural Factors.....	173
Curricular Time.....	173
Resource Quality and Availability.....	177
Curricular and Examination Specifications.....	183
Other Structural Constraining or Facilitating Factors.....	185
Teacher Factors.....	185
Sources of Teachers' Knowledge and Skill.....	186
Experience and Reflection.....	186
The Department and Wider Profession.....	188
Life Experiences.....	189
Dominant Influences.....	190
Teacher Control of Classroom Discourse.....	191
Teacher Content Knowledge.....	195
Teacher Approaches to Controversial Topics.....	201
Teacher State.....	203
“Packaging” the Factors for Pedagogical Reasoning.....	203
CHAPTER 7 (FINDINGS III): CONSTRUCTING THE EMPATHY CURRICULUM.....	207
Introduction.....	207
Preparing to Empathise.....	208
Building the Requisite Knowledge-Base for Empathy.....	208
Promoting Empathy.....	214
Classroom Activities.....	214
Classifying Empathy Strategies: Updating the Shemilt Typology.....	214
Influences on Strategy Choice.....	219
Historical Integrity and Verisimilitude.....	224
Sequence and Variety.....	228
Discourse Strategies.....	231
Cultivating an Empathetic Thought Process.....	232
Establishing Relevance.....	241
Dramatising or Enlivening History.....	250
CHAPTER 8: CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS.....	254
Introduction.....	254
Findings and the Literature.....	255
Ongoing Empathetic Dilemmas.....	260
Limitations of the Study.....	263
Future Research.....	268
Implications for Teacher Education and Policy.....	269
Initial Teacher Education.....	270
Experienced Teachers' Development.....	272
Policy Implications.....	274

APPENDICES.....	276
Appendix A: Research Ethics.....	277
Appendix B: Interview Protocols.....	279
Appendix C: Definitions of Codes.....	284
Appendix D: Transcripts Used for Fine-Grained Analysis.....	290
Appendix E: Lessons Observed for Each Teacher.....	291
Appendix F: Card-Sort Data from the Initial Interview.....	293
Appendix G: Sample Full-Text Transcripts.....	298
Ms. Joslin.....	298
Mr. Ingram.....	307
Ms. Hayes.....	317
Mr. Dow.....	329
 BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	 337
 SECONDARY CITATIONS.....	 351

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE A: Research Questions.....	42
TABLE B: Methods in Relation to Research Questions.....	57
TABLE C: Code Families and Hierarchies.....	76
TABLE D: What Empathy Is.....	114
TABLE E: Teachers' Concepts of What It Means to Empathise.....	120
TABLE F: Signs of the Presence or Absence of Empathy.....	150
TABLE G: Influences on the Difficulty or Ease of Empathising.....	165
TABLE H: Examples of Students' Reactions to Topics.....	170
TABLE I: Number of Student Comments of Various Lengths in 3 Lessons..	193
TABLE J: Characteristics of the Empathetic Subjects.....	197
TABLE K: Instances of Use of Particular Empathy Activities.....	218
TABLE L: Discourse Strategies Used to Foster Empathy.....	232

Chapter 1

Literature Review

Introduction

Any study wishing to make sense of the ideas and practice of teachers with regard to historical empathy needs to acknowledge from the beginning the contested nature of the concept, both in terms of its definition and value. Recognising the spectrum of views and controversies swirling around it, this chapter opens by tracing the “historiography of empathy,” the ways that philosophers, historians, and educators have conceptualised it and its role in history. The fact that pinning down empathy has proven difficult does not lessen the importance of trying to explore its meanings – especially in the minds of teachers, whose conceptions may have decisive classroom implications. Empathy is apparently too vital for the cultivation of historical understanding to be sidelined in practice, and writers who dispute its place are exceptions. Yet while this study sets out to map *teachers’ own* understandings of the concept, and show how these relate to the literature, some initial guidance as to the basic conceptual space empathy occupies may be helpful in approaching the topic. Broadly, then, empathy is usually regarded as the process of using cues in historical evidence to reconstruct the perspectives of people in the past.

To lay the groundwork for the case study of empathy teaching presented in this thesis, I outline what is known about students’ empathetic thinking and examine both the academic and professional literature about teachers’ work to promote it (an area of scholarship notable mainly for its neglect). Relevant research on teacher knowledge is then reviewed in the following two chapters as and when it illuminates methodological choices made in this project.

Conceptualising Empathy and its Role in History

“Empathy is central to history,” writes Peter Lee, “ – one might say structural, in that without it (as something achieved) history cannot begin” (1983: 40). Indeed, historians today rarely deny the secure place of the concept in historical epistemology¹; it is an important mechanism for understanding and connecting the broken and incomplete records of the past. The school subject of history, of course, need not model itself on academic history in every respect, but to merit the name it must share the discipline’s most characteristic features. Empathy qualifies as one.

Ideas about historical empathy have generally arisen from four sources: philosophers of history, historians, history education researchers, and teachers. These groups are distinguished less by the fundamental questions about history that they address than by their means of answering them; at the philosophical level, the concerns of academics and schoolteachers possess a high degree of overlap because the answers have practical implications for both. Central themes of common interest involve the relationship of present inquirers to bygone times: is the past knowable? If so, how do we know or understand the past? If empathy is one of our tools of understanding, what exactly is it, and how important is it relative to other modes of apprehension? What does achieving empathy require, and how do we know when we or our students have arrived? What is the purpose of trying to understand history anyway? How does it serve the present? Nobody practicing in a historical field today escapes these questions.

Philosophers’ and Historians’ Thinking

In the past, issues were not problematised in this way. For most of human history, people viewed the past as a ghost-like version of their current reality – fundamentally similar, just lost to view. Even through the end of the nineteenth century, “history remained for many a seamless whole scarcely

¹ This claim relates to Western views of history as they have developed since the eighteenth century; neither the purposes nor methods of history are universally accepted.

distinguishable from the present, human nature the same in all epochs” (Lowenthal, 1985: 232).

The German Romantic J.G. Herder (1744-1803) pioneered a break with the notion of human nature as a constant by developing the idea that history resulted from the interaction between external, environmental forces and the internal spirit of various peoples – different civilisations or races possessed their own unique characteristics which required separate examination. “Become with shepherds a shepherd, with a people of the sod a man of the land, with the ancients of the Orient an Easterner, if you wish to relish these writings in the atmosphere of their origin,” he wrote (Burnett, 2001: 145). The idea of *historical difference* gradually caught on, with Leopold von Ranke (1795-1886) embracing a similar view. He too wanted to accurately reconstruct the unique periods of the past and the mentalities that shaped them, and insisted in particular that this be done without injecting the spirit or values of the present (an approach now known as historicism). Herder was less cautious about the use of his own mind as a vehicle of understanding; to him, capturing the zeitgeist of an age or people was a straightforward endeavour because of the shared sense of self that is intrinsic to all humanity. “The harmony of every creature is one with me, yes, I am they!” Herder proclaimed (*Ibid*: 148). Without denying the necessity of careful attention to texts, he advocated intuitive projection as the mechanism of understanding.

Contemporary scholars of art and psychology shared this emphasis on intuitive perception; Rudolph Lotz and Wilhelm Wundt coined the term *Einfühlung*, meaning “in-feeling” or “feeling into,” as an aesthetic doctrine, and in 1883, Theodore Lipps developed their idea to mean a mode of inner imitation of an artwork wherein a viewer imaginatively projected into the object. It was this term that historians borrowed and translated into English in 1903 as “empathy.” Working in the philosophy of history, the German idealist² Wilhelm Dilthey (1833-1911), like Herder and many late nineteenth century

² ‘Idealists’ hold that the proper subject of history is the thoughts and experiences of *minds*, and that we can grasp these through the imaginative process of re-thinking or re-living them, thus accessing them from within.

thinkers,³ placed faith in the interpreter's ability to directly grasp, rather than infer, the mental state of a past figure by using the "foundation of a general human nature" (*Ibid*: 164) and advances in psychology itself (note that Dilthey had moved beyond Herder's civilisational stereotypes to the level of the individual). He felt that aesthetic and psychological experience engaged one's affective capacities and involved identification in a way that transcended the simply rational or what could be expressed in words. Confidently, he wrote that

Individual differences are not in the last analysis determined by qualitative differences between people, but rather through a difference in the degree of development of their spiritual processes. Now inasmuch as the exegete tentatively projects his own sense of life into another historical milieu, he is able within that perspective to strengthen and emphasize certain spiritual processes in himself and to minimize others, thus making possible within himself a re-experiencing of an alien form of life (*Ibid*).

Notable here are the ideas that the interpreter possessed the necessary *Einfühlungsvermögen* – empathetic capacity – to re-capture the *experience* and *feeling* of a time rather than just knowing its traits; this was not simply a detached cognitive exercise. The purpose of "glimps[ing] alien beauty in the world and areas of life beyond his reach" was ultimately expanding the self, developing new feelings and sensibilities through vicarious experience of them (*Ibid*: 163).

In the English context, the most important philosopher and historiographer was Robin G. Collingwood (1889-1943), who summarised his idealist position by famously writing that "All history is the history of thought" – all causality begins in the minds of agents (1946: 215). Without using the word empathy, Collingwood mused extensively about the role of imagination in reconstructing history. Diverging from Dilthey, he restricted the application of imagination to *thoughts*; he rejected the possibility of re-capturing feelings and sensations – which he saw as too tied to the immediately felt background

³ For example, Edmund Husserl believed all phenomena within human experience were open to all others because of the shared objective world of abstractions. Benedetto Croce advised that the method for understanding the history of a Neolithic Ligurian or Sicilian involved trying to become one in your own mind.

in which they were experienced – whereas “no tenable theory of personal identity” prevented thoughts and reasoning from being revived later in time (Walsh, 1958: 51).

With this limit in mind, the work of historians was to investigate *actions*, which had both “inside” and “outside” dimensions, the former discernible only through the disciplined use of imagination on evidence. He explained,

The historian’s picture of his subject, whether that subject be a sequence of events or a past state of things, thus appears as a web of imaginative construction stretched between certain fixed points provided by the statements of his authorities; and if these points are frequent enough and the threads spun from each to the next are constructed with due care, always by the *a priori* [factually-grounded] imagination and never by merely arbitrary fancy, the whole picture is constantly verified by appeal to these data, and runs little risk of losing touch with the reality which it represents (Collingwood, 1946: 242).

This description of the process of historical sense-making resonates with more recent accounts. For example, in his writings on history education, Martin Booth has promoted historian David Hackett Fischer’s description of such thinking as *adductive*; the historian arranges selected facts so that a “satisfactory ‘fit’ ” is obtained between a specific question and an answer (Fischer, 1971, cited in Booth, 1994: 63).⁴ Or in the view of Peter Rogers (1984), historical thinking involves inferential reasoning to construct a contextual frame out of particulars.⁵ Imagination – and indeed empathy – must be employed because of gaps in the evidential record; no narrative explanation can be created without inferring thoughts or feelings from what is known.

Amongst historians today, historical empathy is broadly accepted as an indispensable tool of the trade. However, their comments about the past tend to emphasise its remoteness from the present and lack the easy conviction of earlier thinkers about the transparency of past minds – they commonly recognise the *constructed* and tentative nature of all historical accounts. “The past was not only weirder than we realize; it was weirder than we can

⁴ Sources originally cited in other writings are listed in a separate bibliography, called “Secondary Citations,” at the end of this dissertation.

⁵ This adductive mode of thinking contrasts with the deductive thinking examined by Piaget.

imagine,” warns David Lowenthal (2000: 74). In the nineteenth century, T.B. Macaulay wrote, “If we would study with profit the history of our ancestors, we must be constantly on our guard against that delusion which the well-known names of families, places, and offices naturally produce, and must never forget that the country of which we read was a very different country from that in which we live” (1937: 7). Carlo Ginzburg echoes this sense of caution, saying,

The historian’s task is just the opposite of what most of us were taught to believe. He must destroy our false sense of proximity to people of the past because they come from societies very different from our own. The more we discover about these people’s mental universes, the more we should be shocked by the cultural distance that separates us from them (cited in Wineburg, 2001: 10).

But far from recommending that empathetic efforts be abandoned because complete understanding is elusive, these historians strive to exhibit empathy in their own work and commend its achievement in others’ writings (see Lowenthal, 2000). Indeed, debates among historians centre on how to know this irretrievable past (which presumes some measure of knowability), and how to convey it without losing its flavour in the translation.⁶ In questions of both accessing and representing the past, the concerns of historians overlap with those of history educators.

Empathy’s Introduction in History Education

Empathy has not held as secure a place in history education as in the historical discipline at large. During the 1910s and 1920s, a handful of scholars pioneered empathetic work in education. In the interwar period in Britain, M.W. Keatinge emphasised the importance of grasping a “sense of period” and developed source-based exercises to promote this goal, and F.C. Happold designed exam papers requiring pupils to display understanding of perspectives (McAleavy, 1998). These early efforts reflected post-WWI fears of jingoism, with the League of Nations promoting “cooperation rather than

⁶ One panel at the annual convention of the American Historical Association in 2001 agreed that “orthodox historiography simply cannot communicate certain experiences, like the awfulness of life on the Western front during World War I” (Morris, June 21, 2001).

antagonism, culture rather than destruction, international rather than national ideals” in history classrooms – in short, a measure of “sympathetic understanding” of others (Marsden, 1989: 521). In the United States, C.H. Judd noted the dominance of presentism⁷ in students’ historical thinking, and began to evaluate the merits and dangers of certain strategies such as dramatic re-enactments (Wineburg, 1996). However, these forays into empathy-teaching research made little headway. Patriotic versions of history designed to celebrate British achievements prevailed in school curricula over attempts at deeper understanding of bygone mindsets at home or especially abroad. Researchers in education increasingly focused upon process-product studies that tended to ignore the particularities of subject matter right through the 1960s. Scholarship in history education stagnated.

In Britain, insights into history teaching were also deeply affected from the 1950s through 1970s by the influence of Piaget and his acolytes such as E.A. Peel, M.F. Jurd, and R.N. Hallam. Applying Piagetian categories to thinking about history, their psychological studies arrived at the view that schoolchildren could handle only very limited abstract or complex thinking, and promoted the idea that history was devilishly difficult, accessible to few before the age of fourteen. Many teachers took the message to heart, adjusting their expectations accordingly (Macintosh, 1987).

However, more optimistic notions of student potential began to take hold with the cognitive revolution of the 1960s and 1970s. Jerome Bruner, for example, argued that advanced ideas could be made comprehensible even to young children through a “spiral curriculum” in which they were presented in “intellectually honest” terms that were meaningful to them (1960: 33). J.J. Schwab drew attention to the “structure of the disciplines” (1964), Paul Hirst described “forms of knowledge” (1974), and Bruner encouraged the teaching of the “central ideas” and “concepts” of a subject (1960). Though they were not the first to make these arguments, their combined impact was a heightened focus on the skills and processes involved in learning history. Scholars identified empathy as one of the constructs basic to the discipline,

⁷ The attribution of current characteristics to past events or situations

and the idea arose that students should be made explicitly aware of it. So, for instance, one exercise designed for pupils in Britain included the text, “Before a historian can begin to understand why people in the past did this or that, they have to try and discover why they behaved in the way that they did. Trying to understand other people’s behaviour and feelings is called **empathy**” (Simkin, 1989, cited in Hughes, 1995: 80).

Within British schools, significant changes in history education accompanied these philosophical shifts. As teachers tried to apply new educational and psychological theories, they gained a sense of school history as a field distinct from professional history. This may appear slightly ironic in light of the concurrent emphasis on bringing historical *disciplinary* concepts to schoolchildren, but the act of scrutinising their work while adjusting to new theories naturally led teachers to ask whether these models were appropriate, and how they could be “spiralled” to work with students. As Dennis Gunning commented,

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. If we are teaching fourteen-year-olds, we should subject everything we want to teach them, whether a fact, a concept or a skill to this question: ‘Of what use, or potential use, is this knowledge to them?’ We should not ask, ‘Is this piece of knowledge, or this skill, part of the equipment of an academic historian?’ because the vast majority of our pupils will never be academic historians (1978: 13-14).

The 1970s likewise brought the introduction of the “New History,” a conception of the discipline that introduced progressive methods of inquiry, work in sources, and a measure of social history to the curriculum, which had traditionally been dominated by the transmission of facts about great figures of the (mainly Southern English) past.⁸ Chief among the curricular reform efforts were three projects funded by the Schools Council from 1972 to 1978, and empathy was part of them all. However, it was not conceptualised in consistent or clear ways, and muddled thinking resulted in questionable practices and

⁸ These methods were actually a *return* to the sort of work Keatinge and Happold had instigated decades earlier.

damage to its own standing.⁹ In *History, Geography and Social Science 8-13*, empathy was equated with imagination and with the social skill of “appreciating and understanding of the behaviour of others on the basis of one’s own experience and behaviour” – an incitement to the projection of current assumptions known as presentism (Hughes, 1995: 61). The next project, *Place, Time and Society 8-13*, defined empathy as the capacity to “imagine accurately what it would be like to be someone else,” and recognised the difference between historically grounded and everyday empathy even while persisting in the description of empathy as a social skill (*Ibid*: 62). It also distinguished between “pseudo” and “genuine” empathy without indicating how one might tell the difference. These undeveloped conceptualisations resulted in teachers’ confusion about whether they were evaluating pupils’ socialisation or historical skills, and in contradictory reports about the nature of success.

In the final project, *History 13-16* (or more commonly, SHP), empathy emerged as a concept underpinning every unit of instruction. Delving into the philosophy of history, the authors drew on Collingwood’s notion of understanding people’s attitudes and circumstances from the inside, and made empathy the focus of the Enquiry in Depth. They wrote,

The depth study is designed to increase pupils’ self-knowledge and awareness of what it means to be human by concentrating attention upon the ideas and beliefs, values and attitudes of people of a different time and place – by standing, as it were, for a moment in the boots of General Custer or the footsteps of Sitting Bull (Schools Council, 1980, cited in Hughes, 1995: 66).

Empathy was described as a *desire* to stand in another’s boots, and elsewhere as an *ability*, and finally was implied to be a *skill* transferable from its development in history to other contexts (*Ibid*: 66-67). Without working through the various issues involved, these statements prefigured major issues in the empathy-teaching debates soon to erupt: what *is* empathy? How does

⁹ For a full treatment of the topic of clouded definitions of empathy and the sometimes baffling practices and conclusions that stemmed from them, see Hughes (1995). Her findings are summarised only briefly here.

historical empathy relate to present-day empathetic interactions? And to what degree is it possible, or necessary, to inhabit the shade of another person?

Despite these lingering questions, for almost fifteen years SHP was widely lauded for changing the character of British history education. Moreover, the project and its follow-up *Evaluation Study* by Denis Shemilt (1980) demonstrated empirically that pupils could empathise, if often in a limited way. While the SHP syllabus was only adopted by just over a quarter of British schools, studies indicated that its philosophy and methods were having ripple effects in others, and it is still followed by about a third of GCSE students today. Most significantly, when the GCSE was introduced in 1985, empathy was enshrined as an explicit goal for History and some Geography teaching, and students began to be formally assessed on it. The historical aspect of the empathy goal was clarified – empathy meant an “ability to look at events and issues from the perspective of people in the past” – but as efforts to promote empathetic thinking became more widespread, dilemmas of evaluation became correspondingly more apparent.

Challenges to Empathy in School History

In the 1980s, controversy broke out about several aspects of empathy in the school context, including what the concept meant and how difficult it was to achieve – debates that will be discussed separately below. Disagreements also centred on issues of assessment, of the proper subject matter of history, of the knowability of the past, and of the purpose of studying it.

With the introduction of the GCSE, examination boards now required that students demonstrate empathetic skills in the form of “empathy essays” wherein they imaginatively assumed the role of a particular or representative figure in history. Accordingly, supporting materials such as textbooks and revision materials adopted this approach – in some cases retaining it right into the 1990s. Some teachers rather naïvely encouraged empathy without prior build-up of secure contextual knowledge by asking pupils, “How would you react if...?,” or telling them to “Imagine you’re a (fill in the blank).” Witnessing these early efforts, critics argued that empathy had more to do with creative

writing than with responsible history. At best, it was ahistorical, and at worst fraudulent (Jenkins & Brickley, 1989; Shemilt, 1984). These claims were true in some cases, as even empathy's proponents realised; students were not required to look at actual historical figures, but could project their own stereotypes onto whole groups in a vacuum of evidence. Moreover, they could demonstrate the "differentiated empathy" needed for top-level understanding in the GCSE mark scheme by formulaically reporting that one person thought one way, while another thought another way (minus the specifics of real individuals' thinking).

Teachers themselves were quick to note the difficulties of evaluating empathy in an examination context; they reacted against the generalised and often mechanistic nature of pupil responses it engendered, and raised questions about standards of authenticity and validity in assessing the emotional reactions of people in the past. While one 1988 study found that three-quarters of teachers approved of the GCSE's aims to foster historical empathy and other skills (Patrick, 1988), examiners' reports showed that some teachers viewed it with "hesitancy" (Phillips, 1998; Truman, 1990). Clearly the means of assessing empathy were under review from within the profession, and more subtle ways of evaluation sought.

This trend was given added impetus as neoconservative critics of empathy brought assessment difficulties to the attention of the public as part of a broader attack on the skills-based approach to history. Deploring empathy as "generalised sentimentality" without any base, and an aim that gave students too great a role in interpreting the past, they sought a return to a facts-centred approach extolling Britain's heritage and historic role¹⁰ (Deuchar, 1987: 15). In tandem with writers from the right-wing Centre for Policy Studies, Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher asserted that "New History...with its emphasis on concepts rather than chronology and empathy rather than facts, was at the root of much that was going wrong" (Foster, 2001: 168). In her retrospective book, she added,

¹⁰ As Nash et al. point out, in the mid-1980s, anxiety ran high because of economic recession, technological deficiencies, an influx of immigrants, strained relations with the EEC, and especially diminishing British influence on the world stage (2000).

Though not a historian myself, I had a very clear – and I had naïvely imagined uncontroversial – idea of what history was. History is an account of what happened in the past...No amount of imaginative sympathy for historical characters or situations can be a substitute for the initially tedious but ultimately rewarding business of memorizing what actually happened (1993: 595).

Regular press-releases vamped up the rhetoric of crisis in the history curriculum, as the public was told that “good” and “bad” empathy could not be distinguished in pupils’ work and that empathy was, in fact, a leftist curricular ploy to encourage students to see the perspectives of Russian peasants or of Castro supporters. Critics spoke out against the new and “unwarranted” concern for relevance and utility in curricular documents, attesting to how their study of monarchs had served them well and suggesting a return to rigour (Beattie, 1987). Some academics also weighed in on the debate, calling such practices not simply indulgent and emotive, but also “indoctrinatory” (Skidelsky, 1988).

Politics aside, an important epistemological argument underlay two of the criticisms, which constituted the latest chapter in the ongoing historical discussion about the accessibility of other minds. First, because the past is always seen through the lens of some historical person, access to unbiased worldviews is impossible – and history thus politically manipulable. At the same time, gaining access to other minds is logically impossible due to their fundamental privacy and difference from our own (arguments summarised by Husbands, 1996). Even as these charges were levelled, however, counter-arguments were taking shape – or indeed, had already been articulated. Peter Lee and Rosalyn Ashby (2001) responded by examining the logical inconsistency and disciplinary paralysis which followed from such views, and P.J. Rogers, amongst others, showed that good history resulted from the equipoise, not artificial polarisation, of knowledge and skills (1987) – a position which the new Working Group for the National Curriculum was prepared to accept. Teachers as well as students wrote letters to newspapers defending their empathetic endeavours, and the Southern Regions Examinations Board published *Empathy in History: From Definition to Assessment* (1986), an attempt to refine assessment practices by introducing

the notion of four stages of empathetic understanding: information gathering (knowledge), everyday empathy (wherein modern value systems were back-projected onto the past), stereotype historical empathy (where pupils assumed the same ideas were held in the same way by everyone), and differentiated historical empathy (where students recognised variety in behaviour and responses within past societies). Plentiful examples of teaching strategies accompanied the elaboration of these stages, which were picked up by examination boards and recycled and sometimes retitled in influential books for practitioners (such as Booth, Culpin, & Macintosh, 1987).

Despite such developments, however, empathy was popularly discredited, and by the time the History Working Group came up with its Final Report on the new History National Curriculum in 1989, the report dared not speak its name. However, evidence of its philosophical foothold in the discipline appeared through the inclusion of empathy's purposes diffusely under the guise of the "Knowledge and Understanding" Attainment Target, which required students to understand history in its setting. Similarly, although empathy disappeared from official GCSE assessments in 1997, revised GCSE specifications in the "Knowledge, Skills and Understanding" section called for study of "the key features and characteristics of the periods, societies or situations specified...and the experiences of men and women in these societies" (Edexcel, 2000). In the updated National Curriculum 2000, the same purposes were upheld: Key Stage 3 pupils should be taught to "describe and analyse the relationships between the characteristic features of the period and societies studied including the experiences and range of ideas, beliefs and attitudes of men, women and children in the past," "to analyse and explain the reasons for, and results of, the historical events, situations and changes in the periods studied," and to "consider the significance of the main events, people and changes studied." The term "empathy" continued to be shunned¹¹ (DfEE,

¹¹ By contrast, in the United States, where the word had not become common parlance among teachers, the 1989 Bradley Commission on History in the Schools and some state frameworks for history now explicitly embraced the cultivation of empathy as a "habit of mind" and part of "historical literacy" (Seixas, 1993b). In their *Guidelines for Teaching History in Schools*, the Commission also broadened responsibility for teaching empathy to geography and government courses.

2000). However, the 1999 National Curriculum Programme of Study for Citizenship, for which history teachers assumed key responsibility in many schools, moved closer to a call for empathy: pupils had to “Use their imagination to consider other people’s experiences and be able to think about, express and explain views that are not their own” (DfEE, 1999). And while many individual British history teachers had never actually stopped using the term, the recent upsurge of articles involving empathy in *Teaching History* may suggest a broader renaissance of professional interest (Dawson & Banham, 2002; Luff, 2000; Martin & Brooke, 2002; Mastin, 2002; McCully, Pilgrim, Sutherland, & McMinn, 2002).

Conceptual Clarification

Scholars soon recognised that debates over the place of empathy owed much to the way that early history education literature was uncritically deploying a host of definitions of it. For example, it was equated with “imagination” (Coltham & Fines, 1971), “identification” (Sutherland, 1986; Thompson, 1983), and “intuition” (Portal, 1987). Lee noted, “There can be few notions so commonly employed in talk about what children need to be able to do in history, and so little examined” (1983: 34-35). Terminology had indeed proliferated, with empathy described as a “skill” (Cairns, 1989; Portal, 1987), a “power” (Coltham & Fines, 1971), a “mode of inquiry” (*Ibid*), a “heuristic process” (Portal, 1987), an “ability” (DES, 1985a), an “achievement” and a “disposition” (Lee, 1983). Writers on history education began working to clarify the concept, and soon acknowledged that while certain boundaries could be drawn, it did not possess the conceptual sharpness of other historical ideas like “evidence.” With its several related definitions, it qualified as a “fuzzy” concept.

Part of the problem was that empathy had different meanings outside of history. Its etymological similarity to “sympathy” often led to the interchangeable use of the words in speech,¹² and Dilthey as well as more

¹² Indeed, as Barnes and Thagard note, *Einfühlung* was often confusingly translated as “feeling with,” which is the usual meaning of *Mitgefühl*, or sympathy. But whereas sympathy involves

recent scholars (Wedgwood, cited in Little, 1983) did not clearly distinguish the two. As Peter Knight points out, its use in psychology also associated it with a multitude of other meanings – seventeen, according to one book (Goldstein & Michaels, in Knight, 1989b). Indeed, psychologists highlighted the affective aspects of “empathy” that were present in the very term “*empathia*,” the Greek word meaning “to suffer with.” When history commentators referenced psychological definitions, they came away calling empathy a “feeling” (Low-Beer, 1989) or an “emotion” (Sutherland, 1986), and then failing to credit it with cognitive aspects.

Acknowledging early on that “empathy” had become an umbrella term, Tony Boddington (1980) called for its range of meanings to be examined and pared down, so that it was educationally useful and in principle assessable.¹³ His concern with the educational implications of philosophical confusion was not misplaced. One study alluded to the way in which a teacher’s view of empathy as an *intuition* affected her classroom practice – she believed her students would *intuitively* and spontaneously make an empathetic connection to historical figures without much assistance or structuring of work on her part (Stockley, 1983). Another earlier review (Baranowski, 1974, cited in Hughes, 1995: 62) showed how a teacher’s conflicting notions of empathy led her to evaluate a unit on the Reformation by saying, “Yes – empathy most definitely achieved. I have been amazed at the profound and critical questions and assumptions,” right after she had noted that

They didn’t link the Reformation in Europe too easily with the Reformation in England (they seem to be a lot of little Englanders who liked doing the English Reformation but saw little purpose in learning about ‘foreigners’) – an interesting side-light that came out almost by accident (*Ibid*: 61).

Research asking how history teachers defined empathy was thin, but two studies suggested that any firm consensus about what it entailed was also

sharing another’s experience, communing with a person, the more extensive idea of empathy applies to the effort to know and comprehend another’s mental state. M.F. Basch explains that the German synonyms of empathy “imply an understanding of another person that includes, but is not limited to an affective experience, and there is nothing of the irrational or primitive implied by these terms” (1983, cited in Barnes & Thagard, 1997: online).

¹³ Historians, after all, regularly assessed the *products* of one another’s empathy.

elusive. Knight's survey of primary teachers, who notably were not history specialists, indicated that they held a wide variety of definitions (1989b). The conceptual fog also infiltrated materials for history teachers, with HMI, the Southern Regions Examination Board, the Schools History Project, and the main professional journal, *Teaching History*, all circulating different views (Hughes, 1995). Another study whose focus was neither history teaching nor empathy shed incidental light on the process of Australian middle and secondary school history teachers' working out their definitions of it in conversation:

Sarah: To establish an emotional connection, a feeling for reality outside their own experience –

Lesley: And a feeling for ideas and attitudes outside their own...

Cathy: To walk in their shoes, that's what I hope for – to be in the trenches, to feel the mud...

Kamoya: Perhaps I don't aim so high...I just want them to get out of their own...

Cathy: And to understand the notions of Empire – king and country...

Anon: Or more than that, maybe. Someone asked in my class, in a tone of frustration, "Why did they stay there? Why did they fight? Why didn't they just say – 'No, I'm not doing that!' "

Kamoya: Perhaps that's a different kind of empathy – a higher one... – the capacity both to feel what it was like – the horror and the dirt of it – and also to understand why they were there, and why they stayed...

[And Kamoya's notes record:] At a higher level that emotional connection needs to have a more analytical base, an awareness of different values and attitudes, some sort of questioning of what underlies the reactions of other people in other times (Landvogt, 2001: 194).

Their comments are instructive for both what they do and do not say. None of the teachers construed empathy as sympathy, as a mysterious power, nor as an exercise involving the creative or fantastical imagination. They considered that empathy involved a cognitive understanding *that* certain attitudes were held and why; students needed an "analytical base" from which to reason. But for at least some of the teachers, there was an affective dimension as well: empathy involved an "emotional connection," a "feeling for" attitudes not their own (thus a "getting outside" of oneself), and in the case of Cathy, a certain experiential quality, a vicarious sensing of conditions. Such discourse is also typical of the goals expressed by teachers when they are

not discussing empathy outright: for example, Sean, an American teacher, said about teaching the Great Depression, “I want them to connect in some way to the material and not just read it and digest it and spit it back. I want them to *become* the material, if only for a moment” (Wilson, 1991: 103; see also Ms. Kelsey's aims in Wilson & Wineburg, 1993).

Their identification of these elements of empathy showed that the teachers were focusing on many of the same aspects of empathy deliberated upon by scholars. And despite differences within the research community, which were compounded by new authors' often not seeming to review the work on empathy done by others, clarification in some areas actually was accomplished. As early as 1975, Charles Bailey highlighted the difference between empathy as “imagining myself in the place of others,” which involves envisioning *oneself* in other circumstances, and empathy as “evoking the other within myself,” which involves imagining actually *being* the other (89). Shemilt echoed and popularised the distinction (1984); empathy meant understanding how *others* would have perceived a situation, not how *you* would feel about it. Lee's writings, as well as those of HMI (1985), distinguished empathy from sympathy in the sense of fellow-feeling, arguing that this could actually inhibit intellectually respectable empathy, and demonstrated how empathy might be viewed as a *process* and an *achievement*, even a *disposition*, but not a special power of the sort sometimes relied upon in exhortations to “feel” and “imagine” (1983; 1984b). Unconstrained creative imagination is rarely considered part of empathy today; the proper sort of imagination involves not “transcendental flights into the unknown,” as historian Bernard Bailyn has stated, but ‘imagination in a straitjacket’ ” (1997: online). These distinctions have dominated much subsequent educational scholarship.

Less consensus has emerged in terms of the balance of cognitive and affective elements of empathy, and the issues of whether empathy involves identification and use of hindsight. To take the first matter, several cognitive tasks are now understood to be part of empathising. Knight inaugurated the approach of breaking empathy down to its constituent components; he felt that

only by abandoning the notion of a unitary construct could a better understanding of children's capacities for each aspect be achieved. For him, the cognitive competencies involved were recall of salient data, ability to distinguish their own and another's perspectives, skill in re-telling a story from others' perspectives, estimations of actions, predictions of the way historical situations would develop, and judgments (mainly of historical characters) and the reasoning behind them (1989b). Overlapping with his system somewhat, Keith Barton and Linda Levstik (in press: Chapter 11) mapped out five elements of "historical empathy as perspective recognition" that teachers needed to develop in the classroom: a sense of "otherness" (or recognition of the differentness of the past), shared "normalcy" (grasping that people had outlooks that were sensible to them), historical contextualisation, multiplicity of historical perspectives (not everyone thought or felt the same), and contextualisation of the present (discussed below).¹⁴ As the strictly cognitive word "recognition" implies, this type of empathy – which they label "historical" in their chapter title – did not encompass affective components.

Rather than denying empathy's emotional side, however, Barton and Levstik designated an analytically separate tool of "empathy as caring," which was not historical but was critical for history – thus they effectively detached affective components from *historical* empathy as such (in press: Ch. 12). In their view, the "skill" of care involved caring *about* people and events and finding them meaningful, caring *that* they happened and reacting morally, caring *for* people in history by wanting to respond concretely to their suffering, and caring *to* adapt behaviors and beliefs in the present in light of new learning. They felt that these types of care – which added new and civically purposeful ideas to the more usual views of the affective sides of empathy – mattered as much for students' intellectual and moral development, or more, than the cognitive ones.

¹⁴ These promising ways of looking at empathy – which is as much a shorthand term for a cluster of components working together as, say, "source interpretation" – coincide with the factors that teachers in this study took into account in their practice. They will therefore be examined in greater detail in Chapter 3, which deals with analysis of the components of empathy, and Chapter 5, which relates conditions that the teachers believed were required for empathy.

Their intent in suggesting this two-pronged formulation was to *connect* past with present, historical judgments with moral ones, historical empathy with larger curricular purposes. These are indeed vital to ponder. However, while I agree with the authors' placement of three varieties of care in a distinct category of empathy regarding *present* mores and actions, their total analytical separation of the cognitive and affective in historical empathy concerns me. In particular, I believe *caring about* events and their meaning relates integrally to historical empathy, forming its precondition in a way the other varieties do not. Also, I think caution should be exercised in handling a variety of meanings for empathy so different in nature. Though the authors do not preface their term "empathy as caring" with "historical," they refer to it as a "tool for making sense of the past," a fairly subtle distinction that might easily be missed or misinterpreted (in press: Ch. 12).¹⁵ Readers need to be as clear as the authors are that while *historical* empathy does link to social values today, it cannot absorb the other meanings (or three of them, I would argue) and retain coherence.

Few people would deny that both cognitive and affective dimensions play a role in understanding, the question is usually to what extent. The language chosen to describe empathy shows different shadings of position on the cognitive/affective spectrum. On one hand, the SREB claimed that empathy was not just knowing *that* someone felt a certain way, it was *trying out* the feeling in one's own mind. Indeed, *projection* of one's own feelings and values was a necessary foundation for more sophisticated empathy (1986). On the other hand – and perhaps as a reaction to claims that empathy was a "touchy-feely" skill – some scholars accentuated its grounded, intellectual side. They noted that it was primarily a cognitive achievement, but linked with the affective domain in a fairly restricted way, through the initial *impulse* to empathise (Lee, 1983; Lee, Dickinson, & Ashby, 1997; Little, 1983).

Researchers proposed terms to replace empathy that valorised its intellectual elements. In a sociocultural analysis of empathy, Bruce

¹⁵ While "skill" and "tool" are used here to mean cultural tools, following Wertsch (1998), describing care as a "skill" seems likely to create fresh confusion. "Disposition" might be a more fitting choice since "skill" and "tool" will not always be read in sociocultural terms.

VanSledright (2001) argued that “contextualized thinking” gave a more precise picture of what historians do. Claiming that empathy referred to a “mysterious accomplishment,” a kind of sorcery involving construction of tropes to make the past accessible to learners today, he recommended that discourse on empathy focus instead on contextualisation. This “turns on readily definable cognition performances” such as “strategic competence in dealing with and adjudicating among historical artifacts and the positionalities that frame them, the capacity to develop and then draw on prior knowledge of events and agents in question, and a recurring self-examination of one’s own positionality” (65). This rather arid and strictly cognitive description of what historians do begged the question of *how* one adjudicated and filled in gaps when evidence was sparser than might be desired. It contrasted with Sam Wineburg’s study of historians’ expertise, which drew attention to the fact that far from being a merely intellectual process, the empathy of historians at work “engages the heart” (2001: 22). It also ignored a facet shown by Tom Holt’s portrayal of a student at work on sources, who automatically slipped into dramatic mode as he read, spontaneously taking on roles, gesturing, and speaking in excited tones as he tried out interpretations (1990).

In a similar vein, Terrie Epstein discussed how a purely cognitive approach to an artistic source such as a spiritual sung by slaves or Picasso’s *Guernica* missed much of the point; to understand these works at all, one had to feel some of the passion that spawned them – to grasp them “*viscerally* as well as visually” (1994: 175-176). The same might be argued for any emotion-laden text. Teachers’ writings in professional journals tended to stress affective as well as cognitive aspects of empathy; they attended to the vividness and power of sources, the importance of “sight, sound, and smell” approaches to setting a scene, the need for emotional engagement so that history was not an anodyne exercise. In and out of school, talks, reconstructions and re-enactments ranging from the historically rigorous to the historically inspired

theme park attested to the popularity of such tactics, and historical sites increasingly strove to convey the “experience” of past life to visitors.¹⁶

The search for more apt terminology for empathy sparked other linguistic contenders. Lee and Ashby offered the phrase “rational understanding” – which laid emphasis on the cognitive – but later acknowledged that the awkward term created new muddles, particularly concerning whether “rational” referred to standard liberal notions of the rational, calculating individual, and whether current or past standards of rationality were implied. They ultimately concluded that “empathy,” for reasons of familiarity and conciseness, was here to stay (2001).¹⁷ O.L. Davis (2001) as well as Elizabeth Yeager and Stuart Foster (2001) concurred, choosing to supplement it when possible with “perspective taking,” a term used by Matthew Downey (1995) to mean trying to understand a historical figure’s frame of reference, but not identifying or sympathising with the feelings involved.¹⁸ However, the verb “taking” does seem to connote the possibility of identification and emotional engagement every bit as much as older descriptors such as “*appreciating* predicaments” (HMI, 1985), “*entertaining* beliefs” (Lee, 1983) or “*considering the impact* of emotions” (*Ibid*) (emphasis added to each).¹⁹

Most recently, Barton and Levstik traded in “perspective taking” for the dual concepts of historical empathy as “perspective recognition” – because “‘perspective’ accords well with intuitive notions about the complex elements of individual viewpoints, and because the phrase avoids the implication that

¹⁶ For example, a pamphlet advertising Pompeii’s “Excavations by Night” show – complete with on-site tour and effects from more than 500 halogen lamps, surround sound, and image projection – invites visitors to “A voyage into the life of Pompeians just before the tragic eruption.” It promises to “plunge visitors into the world of 2000 years ago,” and allow them “to experience the dramatic moments of the eruption and of the escape with a rapid sequence of highly exciting images.” (Promotional leaflet from the Pompeii Archaeological Superintendency)

¹⁷ Empathy as a term may be more entrenched among teachers in Britain than in the U.S. and elsewhere, given the attention it received in curricular documents and in the press.

¹⁸ Foster and Yeager do not seem willing to dispense with the possibility of identification entirely, however; they object to empathy as “overidentification” (1998: 1) and elsewhere claim it is not *primarily* about identification (Foster, 2001: 169). But then the example they give of “overidentification” – asking students to identify with Adolf Hitler – elides the meanings of the two words.

¹⁹ Lee notes that this does not necessarily mean *sharing* beliefs or *feeling* emotions.

we can ‘take on’ the perspectives of others” (in press: Ch. 11) – and empathy as “caring,” as explained above, because “Empathy without care sounds like an oxymoron...care is the motivating force behind nearly all historical research” (*Ibid*, Ch. 12). Joan Skolnick, Nancy Dulberg and Thea Maestra also viewed empathy as both a matter of affective engagement and the primarily cognitive task of perspective-taking, with imaginative emotional and intellectual participation as distinct elements but working together (1999). In justification of their equal weighting of feelings with more broadly accepted rational dimensions in history, Barton and Levstik cited the research of Nancye McCrary (2002), whose work suggested that affective engagement led to cognitive payoffs. In her study, offering accurate information without attention to affect rarely led learners to change their stereotypical preconceptions and consider new perspectives. However, the opposite was true when they felt personally connected to those they were learning about; caring about the characters led to a re-evaluation of issues.

Given the ink that has been spilled trying to clarify the meaning of empathy – and the progress in terms of both limited consensus and mapping of the terms of debate – it is disturbing that several 1998 journal articles, later developed into the volume *Historical Empathy and Perspective Taking in the Social Studies* (2001), introduce some novel elements to the definition of empathy without adequately justifying their inclusion. Chief among these is the notion that sophisticated empathy involves the use of hindsight (Foster, 2001; Riley, 2001; Yeager & Foster, 2001). For example, in their “Conclusions for Historical Empathy,” Yeager et al write that students “should use the benefit of hindsight in understanding actions” (Yeager, Foster, Maley, Anderson, & Morris, 1998: 21). This advice might make sense for understanding the *outcomes* of actions, or interpreting their significance, but hindsight only obscures the matter of causality.²⁰ While it is clearly impossible to banish one’s awareness of subsequent events – though pupils’ knowledge of developments can never be assumed – empathy scholarship has typically

²⁰ Except in cases where there is reason to believe that historical actors were influenced by factors of which they were unconscious and about which we know better

emphasised that such understandings need to be somehow mentally quarantined to try to view happenings as actors did at the time.²¹

The new idea of including hindsight as *part* of empathy appears possible because the authors define empathy as an “organizing framework,” and as tantamount to the whole process of historical craftsmanship and its results (Riley, 2001: 145). It involves four interrelated (and by implication linear) phases: introducing an event in need of explanation, understanding context and chronology, analysing a variety of evidence and interpretations, and constructing a narrative framework through which to reach conclusions (Yeager & Foster, 2001). Since these are all recognised types of historical knowledge or skills, it is not clear what empathy adds to the process. This identification of empathy with the process of creating historical understanding, instead of one tool in its generation that interacts with the aforementioned concepts and skills in particular ways, is in my view confusing and flawed. And the deliberate injection of hindsight stretches empathy past its bounds of meaningfulness as a concept by denying that it focuses on a particular moment in time. Lowenthal suggests a similar interpretation when he notes the importance of empathy but says that alone, “it imparts limited light” (2000: 77). Empathy and hindsight are two separate contributors to historical sense-making.

Whether or not empathy is enhanced by use of hindsight is separate from the question of the actual *possibility* of bracketing one’s thinking out completely, which conventional phenomenology requires. Recent scholarship has leaned toward the view that we cannot view history except through our own lenses and in light of our own questions – we cannot recapture what Allan Megill terms “hermeneutic naiveté” (cited in Wineburg, 2001: 10).²² VanSledright goes so far as to conclude that authentic empathy may be

²¹ A process of bracketing (or *epoché*) prescribed by Edmund Husserl in 1931 for understanding others’ experiences, whereby without changing our own convictions, we disconnect them and set them ‘out of action’ (cited in Fancourt, 2003).

²² Elsewhere, Wineburg has related the story of the attempt made by Robert E. Lee’s biographer, Douglas Freeman, to reconstruct Lee’s thinking by limiting himself only to what Lee knew and writing within those boundaries. Regarding this approach, the historian H.S. Commager commented, “There are many things to be said for accepting our limitations and looking at the past through the eyes of the present, but this is the most persuasive: no matter how hard we try, this is what we do anyway” (Wineburg, 1991).

impossible due to our inescapable need to impose our own “positionality” onto the past. He explains,

By this notion of positionality, I mean the current, socioculturally permeated deportment or stance any historical thinker brings to the task of making sense of the past. An often implicit theory functions as a set of sometimes immovable, other times resilient, temporal bearings that hinge on pivotal ontological (what’s my world view), existential (who am I), and epistemological (how do I know) questions. Because the theory is thoroughly saturated with ontological, existential, and epistemological assumptions, it cannot help but also be deeply imbued with sociocultural, racial, ethnic, class, and gendered components (2001: 57).

In a similar vein, Christopher Blake argues – rightly, I think – that “The reason we need to sensitize ourselves to our relative contemporaneity in any empathic activity is that our understanding of the past is distorted and compromised without a recognition of the perspectives we bring constructively from our present lives” (1998: 29). Advancing the view that empathy in history has more in common epistemologically with empathy in other domains than history educators have generally admitted, and that teaching would benefit if historians conversed with those of other disciplines, he points to the awareness of religious studies educators of the centrality of empathy for self-reflexivity, for sustaining the dialectic of intersubjectivity between self and other (29). In this spirit, Barton and Levstik include “contextualization of the present” as one of their five components of empathy-as-perspective-recognition, noting that it is “both the trickiest and, arguably, the most crucial for deliberation in a pluralist society” (in press: Ch. 11). The challenge it poses is one of grasping – and being willing to admit – that our own perspectives are contextually situated just like those of people in the past; we no more possess “eternal verities” than they did (*Ibid*). It may be precisely this recognition that allows us to make links between empathy in history and empathy in the present – a transfer that, recent studies show, cannot be assumed will happen (Levstik, 2001).

A final point concerning the nature of empathy, this one a matter of considerable consensus among scholars, concerns its difficulty: negotiating between the familiarity and strangeness of the past involves heavy cognitive

demands that need to be borne in mind in any research on what teachers do with empathy in the classroom. Empathy has been shown to require that a thinker tolerate ambiguity and puzzlement while at work on sources (Wineburg, 2001). It involves open and complex situations where “right” and “wrong” answers are frustratingly unavailable. Even when the evidence is rich, it can be hard to specify an actor’s intentions. Historical sources often use words with current meanings in obsolete, thus misleading, ways. Issues of moral judgment become mixed up in empathetic understanding, especially when “unsavoury” historical figures are the topic; it is notoriously difficult to entertain a worldview for which one has no sympathy (Lee, 1978). Likewise, recent psychological studies reveal a large “empathy gap” between people’s thinking and behaviour – a poor capacity to predict how they personally will react in a “hot” state (as of anxiety, courage, fear, excitement or craving) when they are in a “cold” state of rational calm. Researcher George Loewenstein says, “These kinds of states have the ability to change us so profoundly that we’re more different from ourselves in different states than we are from another person” (Gertner, 2003: online). If we have difficulty understanding *ourselves*, in the present, how are students in the normally “cold” state of classroom life to comprehend the many “hot” actions in history? This is only the more difficult if, as Wineburg claims, present-mindedness is our “psychological state at rest,” our natural means of coping with the world (2001: 19).

For pupils, such challenges are compounded by their youth. At the most basic level, students (with their relatively brief pasts) may strain to appreciate the very *reality* of the past, to grasp the idea that it happened.²³ To make meaning in history, J.H. Hexter has argued, people draw upon their “second record” – their assumptions about the world and experiences in it. But students’ bank of knowledge and experience is relatively poor, their sense of human motivations and the complexities of institutions often quite ingenuous and structured around the personal, family, and emotional worlds they know

²³ A twist on this idea is provided by an Oxford history student’s comment that until age sixteen, he did not realise that the past happened in colour, not black and white! (Anna Pendry, personal communication)

(Husbands & Pendry, 2000). Empathy asks them to examine agency in history when they may feel little of it in their own lives; Peter Seixas points out that “without this tool, students cannot see themselves as operating in the same realm as the historical figures whom they are studying, and thus cannot make meaning of history” (1993b: 303). Additionally, empathising demands intellectual and emotional maturity, requiring *children* with little or no experience of power to try to grasp the logic of action of important and sometimes heroic *adults* (Husbands & Pendry, 2000; Lowenthal, 2000). Furthermore, students (acclimatised as they are to schoolhouse ways) may ask for answers they can parrot back about thoughts or feelings, not realising that empathy requires them to *think*, to invest earnestly in their own understanding. Nor is the classroom an evocative place for historical reconstruction; as Chris Husbands has pointed out, “it lacks the colour of the theatre, the dusty atmosphere of the archive or the architectural brilliance of the castle” (1996: 88). Finally, empathy requires a high degree of self-awareness, for without recognising one’s own assumptions, it is difficult to know what to try to avoid imposing upon the past. Such reflexivity is often challenging for adults, let alone young people, to muster.

Fortunately, there is evidence too of facilitating factors, such as a human instinct for empathy, and the motivation and fascination pupils feel when they realise that their own consciousness and mentality is one among many in the historical scheme of things (see, for example, Hvolbek, 1993). Furthermore, progress in empathetic understanding is a relative achievement, not all or nothing. More sensitive empathy can be cultivated, and studies suggest that the capacity for it exists at quite a young age and becomes marginally easier over time. In fact, many gradations of empathetic understanding exist – a fact amply documented by the literature on pupils’ thinking, to which this review now turns.

Students' Empathetic Thinking

Most scholarly work on empathy in the classroom focuses on students and the development of their thinking. What teachers do to promote such progression has typically been left out of the equation; indeed, teachers receive little mention in the literature, except insofar as researchers gamely (and quite commonly) deduce “tips for teachers” from the thinking of students. While such prescriptions generally take little account of the context of teaching or teachers' perspectives, their claims about *students* are still relevant in a study about teachers' thinking and actions. In fact, knowledge of students' thinking helps to contextualise the teacher's task – both the opportunities and constraints that cultivating empathy involves. Such findings also suggest potential types of teacher knowledge about pupils that may be implicit, and thus not something teachers might articulate unless asked. Finally, the studies offer insights useful to the design of a research project on teachers, which will be discussed in Chapter 2.

The central question guiding much of the student thinking research is “What can pupils achieve, and when?” Due to the aforementioned influence of Piaget and his notion of cognitive stages, British educational theorists have tended to view empathy as the province of the very able (though ironically, its association with imagination has led many teachers to see it as most appropriate for the very young!). Shemilt's evaluation study of *History 13-16*, for example, concluded that “It is...clear that the thinking of most *examination stream children* occasionally exhibits formal characteristics, and equally clear that hardly any pupils (even those with mental ages in excess of 16+) consistently reason at a formal level” (1980: 42, emphasis added). He found that C.S.E. pupils typically viewed past peoples as “*similar* to themselves in precisely those respects in which they differ (the way they thought and felt), and *different* or inferior to themselves in respect of the humanity common to all (their capacity for thought and feeling)” (77-78). But he also urged that a version of Piagetian theory tailored to history be devised, a view endorsed by D. Thompson (1984), and noted that “student attainment appears so closely tied to teacher performance that, given the current state of pedagogic and

research technologies, it is meaningless to set limits or norms for adolescent conceptualisation” (1983: 3). The same might be said today, since research has largely focused on younger children and adults. In the former case, this was motivated in part by a desire to refute charges that empathy was too difficult and complex for children to attempt, and should be postponed until later adolescence – a view advanced by scholars such as R.N. Hallam, who regarded historical thinking as deductive.²⁴ It was also hoped that the findings would inform effective teaching.

During the late 1970s and 1980s, several researchers based at the Institute of Education in London set themselves the task of mapping students’ construction of historical explanations. The group posited a model of unified cognitive progression with five levels where

- (1) people in the past were seen as stupid or morally inferior
 - (2) past actions were explained in terms of conventional stereotypes or roles
 - (3) pupils’ own values were projected onto people of the past
 - (4) pupils recognised that a past agent’s values differed from their own
 - (5) pupils could set action in a wider context of beliefs and values
- (Ashby & Lee, 1987; Dickinson, Gard, & Lee, 1978; Dickinson & Lee, 1978).

They differentiated their model from a lockstep age-stage framework by cautioning that the categories represented a *logical* hierarchy, not a *developmental* one. Progress was uneven and unstable; students bounced between levels, so teachers should not use the model deterministically. This conclusion was later corroborated by comments by practitioners; for example, one headteacher observed that students’ empathetic advance and regression was dictated by many factors, including the topic, the characters, and the period in history (Cairns, 1989). However, neither this London research programme nor the follow-up project, *Concepts of History and Teaching Approaches* (CHATA), which also looked at children’s explanations and inquiry in history, appear to have generated any empirical findings specifically relating to teaching approaches to date (Lee et al., 1997). The notion of stages has also

²⁴ Recall both Collingwood’s and Booth’s description earlier of the adductive nature of thinking in history, which has little in common with the deductive operations tested by the Piagetian school.

come under fire for being analytically unhelpful; one study showed that a prospective primary school teacher engaged in reading historical texts was at Levels 3 and 4 simultaneously: her moral indignance was accompanied by her recognition that past people thought differently (VanSledright, 2001).²⁵

Early work by Martin Booth (1980; 1983) gave credence to the view that children's abilities had been seriously underestimated: a high proportion of middle-adolescents could attain the open-ended, inductive thought required for empathy. Hilary Cooper (1994) summarised research showing that some elements needed for empathy were extant even earlier, often as young as seven. According to Barton and Levstik (in press: Ch. 11), recent research suggests there is even greater cause for optimism concerning students' capacities, since children from preschool age spontaneously role-play and recognise others' mental states and perspectives. By age four, it appears, the fundamentals for the everyday variety of empathy are in place. This is heartening, though *historical* empathy demands in addition the consideration of context and self-awareness. Nonetheless, these findings indicate it is possible to cultivate aspects of historical empathy in school from the primary years.

Looking at empathy in history, researchers examining what students could achieve at given points in their schooling²⁶ asserted that 80% of pupils could retell a story from another point of view by age 10.3, explain a "strange" attitude as reasonable by 12.8 (Knight, 1989a), and overcome presentism to empathise and see other points of view by age ten, but without taking contextual information into account (Brophy, 1996). They were especially inclined to do so for heroes or victims of oppression; apparently students enjoy identifying with both groups and pondering how they would act in matters of justice. They preferred narratives to textbooks because it was easier to "imagine yourself there" (Levstik, 1993); with the help of narratives, even young children who had not grasped the concepts of time and chronology were

²⁵ Barton and Levstik's parallel finding with nine- and ten-year-olds gives added credence to the view that either the idea of levels or these particular levels may be flawed, or perhaps just not mutually exclusive.

²⁶ Note that some of these concern what pupils could be taught to do, not what they were doing untutored, which was the basis for the London researchers' claims.

able to view the past with historical empathy (Downey & Levstik, 1988). Based on their own feelings, eight- and nine-year-olds could make inferences about Richard III's emotions while fighting the rebels in the Peasants' Revolt – with the older students suggesting a greater number of possible interpretations (Blakeway, 1983, cited in Cooper, 1994). They could also recognise that people in the past did not view themselves as old-fashioned, but many only did so after teachers (or peers) modelled this awareness (Barton & Levstik, in press: Ch. 11). Nine- and ten-year-olds began to associate background knowledge about historical periods with particular dates, which made contextualisation easier (Levstik & Barton, 1996). CHATA research and the small-scale work that preceded it revealed that by eleven, a considerable number of students could offer a mechanistic explanation for the medieval belief in the efficacy of the ordeal, and that at eleven and thirteen, a small number of pupils considered elements of the situation to explain the ordeal; the older the class, the more numerous the students who took account of the beliefs and values of the time (Lee & Ashby, 2001).

In a review of literature on adolescents' social, cognitive, and moral development, James Mackey (1991) summarised Connell's 1971 findings that age eleven marked a major advance in children's ability to conceptualise political order and think abstractly, Berti and Bombi's (1988) and Furth's (1988) conclusions that adolescent economic thinking became more adult-like after age eleven when pupils ceased to assume actions were simplistically determined by personal desire, and Turiel's (1988) observation that most adolescents began to develop systematic notions of social systems and social conventions at about age fourteen. A rich picture of academically able sixteen-year-old pupils engaged in a highly contextualised debate based on empathetic reconstruction emerged from Sam Wineburg and Suzanne Wilson's (1991) study of an expert history teacher, suggesting that teachers' knowledge about how to cultivate empathy in students was fundamental. The same conclusion was reached by British researchers who showed that when teachers provided opportunities for pupils to engage in peer interaction, and refrained from

giving out “right” answers, even many less able students could make sense of the “paradoxes” of the past (Ashby & Lee, 1987; Dickinson & Lee, 1984).

This is not to say that students’ empathy was often at the same level, or even of the same nature, as that of historians. Students differed in the type of content they encountered (Knight, 1989a) and in the historical knowledge and theories they brought with them, which derived from a broad mix of personal and media sources. They frequently failed to use available evidence even when it was put before them, relying instead on their own ideas or imaginings about past happenings (Dickinson & Lee, 1984). When encountering evidence of past practices, they often initially reacted as if people in the past were behaving absurdly or shockingly. However, in a short time they began to try to make sense of these choices and develop their empathy, particularly given sources to consult and questions prompting them to look deeper (*Ibid*; Barton & Levstik, in press, Ch. 11).

Pupils also tended to explain historical data in personalised terms and to overrate the importance of personal intentions vis à vis structural factors like economics or politics. In a study of nine- and ten-year-olds, Barton found that even when teachers pointedly and repeatedly emphasised broader contextual factors such as the system of representative government or meaning of taxation, students persisted in conceptualising the American Revolution in terms of individual intentions, and interpreting conflicts as battles of will (1997). What is more, pupils often continued to account for happenings in terms of human purposivity well beyond primary school (Carretero, Jacott, Limon, Lopez-Manjon, & Leon, 1994; Hallden, 1994, 1997). Lee, Dickinson, and Ashby found that from age seven to fourteen, students attributed the *success* of the Roman invasion of Britain directly to the determination of Claudius or the Roman troops (1997). This emphasis on individual desire or motives is consistent across cultures, possibly because “human behaviour schemata” are among the most fully developed and readily available modes of understanding that young children may bring to bear on an issue (Barton, 1990, cited in Levstik, 1993). Barton suggests that instead of waiting for pupils’ societal thinking to develop (as noted above, significant changes appear

to happen around age eleven), primary teachers should embed history lessons in the context of an integrated social studies programme focusing on social institutions and systems.

If students are not junior Annales or Marxist historians, they *are* moralists: they show strong inclinations to impose ethical frames on events, to judge quickly and from the standpoint of modern mores (von Borries, 1994; Wineburg, 1999).²⁷ There are subtleties to this trend: when presented with information that does not harmonise with their prior understanding of history and their moral stance on it, they seek to explain or excuse the new information by filling in the historical context. They swiftly identify lessons of the past for the present (Seixas, 1994).

When students' convictions and views of themselves become involved in ways that make them uncomfortable, however, they often react rather differently. The value of research on student thinking is especially apparent here, for it can call into question assumptions that educators hold dear. For example, one reason that history teachers value empathy highly – the editor of *Teaching History* calls it “history teacher heartland” (Counsell, 2000: 2) – is for its perceived merits in terms of the intellectual and emotional growth of students. Such arguments are framed not merely in terms of its benefits in understanding the past for its own sake, but in having an impact on pupils' thinking today. Empathy is supposed to create a habit of mind that prevents students from casually dismissing others' behaviour as stupid or absurd (Lee, 1983; Ashby & Lee, 1987; SREB, 1986), that promotes self-knowledge (von Borries, 1994; VanSledright, 2001), and encourages “humility before the narrowness of our experience and openness before the expanse of history of the species” (Wineburg, 1998: 2). However, work by Linda Levstik has shown that the analogy of transfer from past to present empathy sometimes fails; students prefer perspective taking at a safe distance in place and time (2001).²⁸ While students she studied in New Zealand willingly condemned the Nazis as

²⁷ The implications of these tendencies for empathy are discussed in Chapters 5 and 8.

²⁸ This challenge is echoed by Religious Education teachers, whose work regularly evokes powerful issues of student identity in trying to cultivate understanding across religions (Fancourt, 2003).

racist, many had trouble seeing Maori perspectives on the loss of their land to Europeans, and one even suggested the problem could be solved by having all Maoris move to Auckland. Similarly, Northern Irish students primarily noted injustices against their own religious communities but not others', and while over half the girls in one study regarded women's suffrage as one of the most important topics in history, none of the boys did (Barton and Levstik, in press, Ch. 5). Clearly, transferring one's empathy from the past to the present is complicated by matters of identity and personal interest; it appears to have more to do with a disposition than with skills per se. Cultivating historical empathy – while commonly believed to be preferable to allowing pupils' gross misconceptions about others to stand unchallenged – is often insufficient to ensure the transfer, and teachers may need to devise other interventions if they wish to see this goal realised.

Many of the studies mentioned above tout the centrality of the teacher in affecting what pupils may accomplish (Sansom, 1987; Thompson, 1984; Wineburg, 1996). Shemilt, for instance, commented that “in determining the level of a child's conceptual attainment, the character and quality of the teaching he receives is, if anything, more important than his measured intelligence” (1980: 85). Yet, despite the fact that projects like the SCHP *Evaluation Study* and CHATA collected reams of data on classroom events, few studies have emerged that attend to teachers' actions or understandings at all.

Teaching for Empathetic Understanding

In the mid 1980s, several British academics noted that in terms of understanding what teachers actually do in classrooms to bring about progression in empathy, scholarship was just at the beginning of the learning curve (Shemilt, 1984; Ashby & Lee, 1987). A decade later, an American scholar commenting on the detailed portrait of adolescent reasoning in *History 13-16* wrote that,

Given the complexity of this portrait, one might expect similar attention to be devoted to the other half of the equation – the knowledge, understanding and practices of the teachers who participated in the project. Here the evaluation study offered fewer insights...The question

of what teachers needed to know in order to enact this curriculum was not addressed (Wineburg, 1996: 429).

With rare exceptions, such as *Understanding History Teaching*, a recent book examining the knowledge, practice and concerns of eight British history department heads (Husbands, Kitson, & Pendry, 2003), subsequent years have not brought appreciable gains.²⁹ Writings fall into three categories: research articles, academic writings, sometimes more fittingly characterised as position papers, and accounts of practice by teachers or teacher educators, sharing ideas in their professional journals.

In terms of research, three case studies – none of them from Britain – have touched upon teachers' cultivation of empathy. As part of the Knowledge Growth in Teaching project at Stanford, Wineburg and Wilson (1988) observed expert history teachers at work, and gave a fairly detailed description of the skill of one teacher engaged in a unit about whether the British colonies in America should secede. "Ms. Jensen" displayed multiple types of knowledge: she understood and was prepared for student resistance to taking the British point of view; provided pupils with primary documents she judged to be vivid, memorable, and accessible; knew when to intervene and when to pass responsibility for learning to the students; clarified matters using analogies and metaphors; and structured the subsequent discussion and assignment such that pupils had to entertain more than one perspective on events. Additionally, Jensen had a voice in the research: in her own "Notes" at the end of the article, she credited more than twenty years of experience and collaborations with dedicated colleagues for helping her to develop her expertise. This endorsement of experience was echoed by veteran teachers interviewed by Carole Hahn (1994: 212), who stressed the persistence, patience, and hard work involved in getting students to reflect on the reasons people took alternative positions in controversies. Not only did it take them years to build a

²⁹ This is not to deny the growing body of literature that has developed in the past decade about various aspects of historical thinking, but the knowledge base relative to that of other school subjects is slim, and often slanted toward prescribing practices to teachers on the basis of little actual study of their work. Empathy is no exception.

“reservoir of materials” useful in this regard, but also to develop the confidence to manage conflict in the classroom positively.

David Stockley’s case study of an Australian novice trying to engage pupils in the horrors of the Black Death had a different sort of purpose. Subtitling it “The history lesson that went wrong,” he painted a colourful but rather humiliating picture of the teacher’s “failure” to interest the pupils (1983: 50-51). He then offered advice for improving the lesson, some of which drew on empathy research. The teacher’s thinking about what happened was referred to only glancingly; the focus was on discussing the nature of empathetic reconstruction and “fixing” the lesson. While the study aptly made the case that cultivating empathy in the classroom required pedagogical skill and knowledge and clear thinking about what success would look like, it was difficult to learn much about the actual teacher’s thinking from this approach.

The most comprehensive description of pedagogical practice relating to empathy (though not at the secondary level) came from G. Williamson McDiarmid’s two studies of Professor Vinten-Johansen’s historiography seminar at an American university (1994; 1996). While the reports dealt with older students who were part of a teacher-preparation programme, their strength was that they related the professor’s beliefs about history and pedagogy to classroom actions. They outlined his “idealist” ideas about the necessity of grasping people’s “inside” motives and feelings to make sense of an event, and described his work in building contextual knowledge, in using historical fiction, and in alerting students to their anachronistic thinking.

Another approach involved a researcher’s evaluating curriculum materials in terms of their potential contribution to empathetic understanding. Karen Riley examined three popular curriculum packages on the Holocaust, critiquing their “moral education” slant and teachers’ “social criticism” approach to history (2001: 140). Apart from abjuring teachers’ civic responsibilities entirely, the author seemed both unaware of research showing the strength of student responses to morally charged topics – one might say their *need* to react morally – and out of touch with the realities of classroom life. She used the work of academic historians to set a standard for classroom

practice, even referring to students as “individual researchers” (*Ibid*: 162). Her article concluded with a startlingly idealistic³⁰ vision of the desired outcome of the empathetic process with regard to the Holocaust:

The end result...should demonstrate that the individual researcher has considered context, evidence, and the nature of her position in weaving together an explanation of the past. It should also show how the framework of empathy has guided her investigation and enabled her to view the actions of multiple historical actors without endorsement or condemnation and allowed her to render a reasonable interpretation, keeping in mind that sources of evidence not consulted might affect her current interpretation (*Ibid*).

A study taking less of an editorial approach to reviewing publications was one by Knight and Green. With the help of sixty eleven-year-olds, they examined materials by nine U.K. publishers for the attention they gave to distinctive worldviews and mindsets. They found that scant information was provided on these matters, “leaving the ‘Flintstones syndrome’ as children’s default mode of understanding” (1993, cited in Knight, 1996: 37).

Other studies involved researchers’ using a teacher’s classroom to test out particular theories about teaching for empathy. Recent examples included a document-based exercise with sixteen-year-olds investigating why Truman decided to drop the atomic bombs on Japan (Yeager & Doppin, 2001). Although the teacher apparently taught the unit, it was not clear how much of a role he or she had in designing it or selecting the sources, since the questions used were provided by the researchers, and the pedagogical logic of the unit was justified in terms of other studies, not the teacher’s thinking. Indeed, the study promoted a normative view of teaching for empathy based on heavy immersion in a large number and variety of sources, and a view that empathy was taught in terms of “exercises” where it was the main or sole focus. They concluded that because empathy exercises were so time-consuming to prepare, teachers would have to select just a few topics for such exercises.

These views should be questioned for several reasons. First, it is not clear that teachers actually do construe the teaching of empathy in terms of extensive exercises requiring a class period or more; to suggest so may put

³⁰ Idealistic, that is, if historical objectivity, not moral response, is taken to be the goal

people off the attempt when many approaches involve less labour. Secondly, the assertion (repeated elsewhere) that a considerable quantity of authentic sources is *de rigueur* for good empathy demands much more testing. While in one study the authors match this source-immersion experience against that of a group reading a 1979 textbook with limited information and negligible offerings of non-American perspectives, and find the former more effective (Yeager et al., 1998), there are multitudes of other options that might work as well as multiple sources. Many teachers, for example, remark on the power of a single (inauthentic?) film clip to evoke empathetic reactions and thoughts. One popular British book for GCSE teachers gives examples of questions about a nineteenth-century political cartoon, saying,

This sequence of questions – which could be considerably extended – is interesting for the range of empathetic ideas which can be explored from a quite small information base. It is the big, wide-ranging ‘imaginative writing’ question which requires a wide background knowledge in order to be done effectively (Booth et al., 1987).

Finally, the language and tone in several of these articles outlining lesson plans and detailing necessities for proper empathy teaching presumes deficits in teachers without evidence that they are warranted. Riley, for example, writes, “Rarely will teachers ask themselves why they wish to teach a particular topic or what they want their students to know about it when finished,” a haughty statement to apply to a whole profession (1998: 37). Foster spells out exact steps teachers should take in a self-described “model empathy lesson” for teaching about Neville Chamberlain’s position prior to WWII – right down to how many students *should* be in a group and how much text each *should* write at various points in the lesson (1999). This approach assumes that from a distance, the author has a clearer sense of what will work in a teacher’s classroom than the teacher herself, a suspicious premise. The logic seems to be that teachers need this sort of help; as one scholar noted, “National standards...generally recognize empathy as an important goal of teaching history. History teachers and textbooks, however, are not ready for this kind of emphasis” (Davis, 2001). How does he know? Given the dearth of research on teachers’ perspectives and practices, particularly in the volume

from which this quotation comes (Davis, Yeager, & Foster, 2001), such pessimism appears alarmist.

VanSledright appears poised to offer a corrective to this trend. For a start, he asks an empirical question about the act of teaching: “In what ways do savvy history teachers work from their students’ temporal positions to engage them in ambitious acts of historical thinking that promote deep historical understanding?” (1998: 2). He then discusses the pivotal role of teachers, arguing that because they are closest to the source (i.e. students and their positionalities), they are uniquely able to take account of situational factors like personal or local context, memory, and experience. They know details about their particular students such as what prior images and ideas they bring, so the bulk of the work falls to them in planning progression from that point. But from this promising start, VanSledright shifts into elaborating what “adventurous” and “intrepid” teachers do in the classroom, and while some of the practices he describes may be grounded in empirical observations (though no studies are cited), others are clearly a sketch of what might ideally happen. It is not the substance of his vision that is at issue here so much as the unspoken basis of its claims.

Another example of researchers using classrooms as laboratories for their own ideas comes from Veronica Boix-Mansilla’s (2000) study of a unit comparing the Holocaust to the Rwandan genocide of 1994. A team of scholars devised a task intended to help pupils contextualise these events and avoid anachronistic thinking. Teachers “delivered” the curriculum to 35 pupils aged 13-15, and the team analysed students’ thinking, concluding with suggestions for teachers. The study revealed important findings about pupils’ ability to historicise events, but also proposed ideals for teacher behaviour not even tested in the study. The voice of teachers seems to have been bypassed throughout the process.

It is not often that enough literature exists on a particular strategy for cultivating empathy that it can be systematically reviewed, but this was the case for games and simulations. Ambrose Clegg (1991) reported that role-playing games seemed to be highly motivating to pupils, but did not promote a

statistically significant amount of learning of facts or principles. Studies of simulation-style role plays showed students becoming more realistic about the topics concerned, but indicated real problems with lower ability pupils' learning from the games. Another synthesis of studies showed a small degree of recall, retention, and knowledge application from a game-treatment group compared to a control group. All in all, the effectiveness of these techniques seemed to be modest. It may be noteworthy that most of the studies on which Clegg's review drew were from the 1960s and 1970s when role-playing was in its heyday, a time when computer simulations also did not exist.

Finally, the seminal and in fact only study I found documenting actual teacher practices based on a large amount of empirical data was Shemilt's 1984 article deriving from the SCHP evaluation of *History 13-16*. In it, he recorded and categorised twelve different types of practices used to teach historical empathy, such as on-site re-enactments, biographies, and empathetic dilemmas, and noted some of their merits and limitations in terms of effectiveness, adding his own comments. In general, he concluded that methods demanding *explanation* of a past event had more to recommend them than methods involving *description*. While the strategies specified seemed to be rooted in actual classroom data and curricular materials – he referred frequently to particular teaching episodes or exam questions – the argumentation from examples sometimes gave an impressionistic character to the evaluation. Also, the article presupposed a definition of what counted as work on empathy. All the techniques mentioned were self-contained *exercises* in which empathy was the focus; notable for their absence were the sort of techniques so commonly mentioned in articles by teachers, such as use of music and vivid visual aids. However, Shemilt's summary offered more detail and matter for thought than most studies, and expanded the range of ideas in circulation on what teachers were doing to promote empathy.³¹

Teachers' writings about their own practices also constitute a rich source of ideas about and for fostering empathy. Though anecdotal, these narratives combine with the research literature to suggest some areas of

³¹ For a more extensive evaluation of Shemilt's study in light of my findings, see Chapter 7.

consensus in tone and substance. Regarding the former, they resemble one another in accentuating positive *possibilities* for empathy; they note challenges mainly to discuss ways of surmounting or minimising them. They seem energised by evidence that students can markedly deepen their understanding of historical perspectives, and are excited to share how this came to pass in their classrooms. Moreover, teachers' articles are generally sprinkled with comments about empathy's value for making history interesting and meaningful to students, and helping to develop their prosocial thinking. It is important to remember that those closest to the performance of students do not typically write as though particularly daunted by all of the warnings elsewhere in the literature.

However, their optimism is not born of blithe unawareness of the pitfalls associated with empathy; the strategies they promote or discourage show their knowledge of missteps. Many reports by both teachers and researchers concur about the dangers of encouraging empathy through use of a single source, and demonstrate the importance of making accessible multiple points of view (Field, 2001; Roth, 1996; Spoehr & Spoehr, 1994; VanSledright, 2001). Both groups seem especially alert to troubles inherent in overusing written sources, as opposed to those that appeal to other senses (Barker, 1978; Bryant, 1970; Field, 2001; Luff, 2000; Roth, 1996; Spoehr & Spoehr, 1994; Thompson, 1983; VanSledright, 2001). Peer group interaction is frequently seen as helpful both in revealing students' preconceptions and allowing pupils to work out the implications of their ideas gradually (Ashby & Lee, 1987; Bain, 2000; Husbands, 1996; McCully et al., 2002; Seixas, 1993a; Wilen & White, 1991). And exercises asking students to use empathy to resolve a dilemma or puzzle are suggested as particularly effective (Barker, 1978; Dickinson & Lee, 1984; Shawyer, Booth, & Brown, 1988).

Naturally, the literature also contains many contradictory ideas. Notable disagreements include, to what degree should knowledge be simplified in laying the groundwork for empathy? To what extent can empathy work be mixed with work on other historical skills (such as assessing source reliability), before confusion brings diminishing returns? Is didactic teaching necessarily at

odds with cultivating empathy? And to what degree do teachers have moral, as well as subject-matter-based, responsibilities to fulfil? These pedagogical and philosophical questions take us into issues of teacher knowledge and beliefs, and the sorts of expertise that particular teachers use to answer them in particular classrooms. Because ideas about teacher cognitions and their applications directly affect the research design and analytical methods of a study aiming to examine them, I review the educational literature on these topics in the next two chapters.

Chapter 2 (Methodology I) Research Design and Data Collection

Research Rationale and Questions

“[A]ny serious attempts to improve the quality and effectiveness of teaching and learning in schools must start from an understanding of what people in classrooms do at present.” So wrote Paul Cooper and Donald McIntyre (1995: 1), promoting a research agenda that would derive relevance and use from its grounding in reality. Indeed, so little is empirically known about history teachers’ ideas and practice – regarding *many* concepts and modes of their work – that description and explanation make a logical starting point for a study. No doubt teachers possess a great deal of knowledge that is unrecorded and ultimately lost to the profession. For this project, I undertook to help codify it in one area, the cultivation of historical empathy, and thus to help lay the groundwork for informed theorising about issues of importance in their ongoing development. Five research questions were the focus of the project.

TABLE A: RESEARCH QUESTIONS

RESEARCH QUESTIONS
1. How do experienced teachers conceptualise empathy and its role in historical understanding?
2. What do teachers think and know about effective means of teaching historical empathy (to their own students and more broadly)?
3. What do teachers do in practice to bring about the empathetic understanding they view as desirable?
4. How have teachers learned what they know about the pedagogy of historical empathy?
5. What factors facilitate or constrain teachers’ work in helping students to develop empathetic understanding?

At an early stage it became apparent that investigating empathy practices in the work of four teachers would not be straightforward because the definition of empathy itself was contested and multifaceted. I struggled

with how to respond to the idea, gleaned from the literature, that neither the definition, nor value, nor role of empathy in school history could be taken for granted; teachers might conceive of it in quite different ways. How could I capture the authentic conceptions of the teachers, in all their variability, but also ensure that we were talking about the same basic aspect of historical understanding?

I was unsure how much teachers' conceptualisations of empathy would actually differ, so in May of 2001 I tested one approach when I went into two schools to trial some data collection methods. To establish a starting point for discussion about empathy in the Initial Interview, I pulled together a definition on the basis of several sources and asked the teachers for their reactions:

To achieve empathy is to enter into some informed appreciation of the circumstances of people in the past, and to entertain their perspectives on issues and events. Empathy depends on the ability to interpret sources, to identify the gaps in our understanding, to be aware of anachronism, and to forget what we know about the outcomes of past events. It presumes that some logic of action guided people's choices, and helps us to stop patronising the past (DES, 1985b; HMI, 1985; Lee, 1983; Slater, 1989).

Though the teachers both agreed with this definition, one seemed startled by the second and third sentences, which suggested that these elements were absent in his own natural conception of the term. His ways of thinking about empathy were in fact very closely tied to what he believed students could accomplish at a particular age. How he talked about empathy diverged enough from that of the other teacher that I decided the teachers' meanings of the term needed to be researched in their own right – thus I added what is now Research Question 1 to my original list. I also felt that for the sake of the study proper I could pare the definition down to the first sentence only. This would suffice, I felt, to ensure that the teachers and I were addressing the same general phenomenon – or it would probably soon become clear from their actions if we were not – so I would work with their terms of empathy's meaning³² and avoid planting normative ideas. This approach also had the

³² Shifts in the teachers' own concepts of empathy also had the potential to complicate the data collection; this matter is commented upon later under "Sampling the Lessons."

advantage of limiting reactivity; while I wanted teachers to know that empathy teaching was the focus of the research, I did not think it would be helpful for them to know all the sub-questions in my mind.

Teachers' ideas about ways of cultivating empathy, both those that they employed and those that they had opinions about using, were the focus of the second question. I also wanted to look at their knowledge as it emerged through their *practice*, the topic of question three and the theoretical heart of the study. Question four attempted to get at the tricky issue of the development of their expertise. Since this was not really a longitudinal study – data collection took place sporadically over the course of one school year – I had to mainly rely on self-report data about a process that teachers were not necessarily in the habit of thinking about consciously; this made the findings more tentative in some instances. Lastly, question five acknowledged the fact that teachers' work was situated in a particular context; their decisions could not be read as pure expressions of their will. Noting the congeries of factors that directly helped and hindered their empathetic efforts grounded the research, and the propositions resulting from it, in classroom reality. Since it was not clear at the outset which factors would have significant bearings on teachers' empathetic practice (the literature offered few clues), I intentionally kept the question broad.

This chapter discusses the design of the research and the principles and methods used in collecting data, including ways that these were influenced by the literature and by my trialling experiences. In light of the strategies chosen, researcher effects were a major concern, and the ways that I strove to minimise them are presented throughout the chapter. Their actual influence, insofar as I could discern it, is assessed in Chapter 8.

The Research Design

Strategy

Because I wanted to portray the contours of teachers' work in their natural settings, case study seemed the most fitting approach. Yin defines this as

an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context, especially when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident (1994: 13).

Case studies come in several shapes and sizes, and the most useful distinction for me in choosing a design involved the variable of purpose. Stake (1995) refers to cases studied for their own sake as *intrinsic*, and those geared toward understanding a question beyond the single case as *instrumental*. Mine was of the latter variety; the primary focus of interest was the teaching of historical empathy, explored across the work of four teachers – making it, in Stake's terms, one *collective* case study. Naturally, there were facets of individual teachers' practices worthy of detailed description in their own right for the theoretical issues they raised. But fundamentally the goal of the study was to generate propositions about the teaching of empathy that rested upon analysis across the four sub-cases.

Because the study had a dual nature – both exploratory and theory-generating – I needed to abide by certain strictures. Its status as the former meant that I observed how teachers chose to teach empathy without offering any guidelines, materials, or notions of what was “good”; it had a phenomenological slant in the sense of trying to get “inside” the teachers' views and learn what events meant to them. In terms of the theories generated, these served to make sense of the empathy teaching examined in this study. While they may prove helpful in other instances, they cannot be claimed to represent teachers' work on empathy at large. The label of “propositions” indicates that they require further testing and can only be viewed as generalisable in a theoretical sense. Nonetheless, the teachers and lessons from which the data were drawn were not sampled at random; rules

were followed to increase the chances that they would resonate more widely with British teachers.

Conducting research on such a small scale involves obvious sacrifices in terms of the nature and power of claims that can be made. A broader survey of teachers' practices regarding empathy would have ratcheted up the policy significance of these findings. However, the depth of the case study approach provides alternate advantages in showing where the practices came from, and in capturing the nuances of their execution. Without the initial identification of concepts related to empathy teaching that this sort of study offers, it would be difficult to even know how to construct questions on a survey instrument.

Downey and Levstik note further tradeoffs in their statement,

Survey research also tends to mask the great diversity of methods and approaches that characterize the teaching of history in the schools (Fancett & Hawke, 1982). It focuses attention on central tendencies, on what most teachers do most frequently. The great diversity of teaching styles and methods emerges more clearly in ethnographic studies based on sustained classroom observation. Such studies also provide a much clearer picture of the dynamics of teacher-student interaction in history classrooms (1991: 405).

The Participating Teachers

Two factors influenced the number of teachers I invited to take part in the study: the possibility of comparison and practicality. I wanted to have as many teachers as I could manage, in order that points of commonality and difference might emerge, but knew from my trial run of an initial interview and classroom observation that the data would be rich and plentiful and thus require considerable time to analyse and digest. I also felt that to understand the strategies and styles of teaching used by the participants, I needed to observe them working with more than one year group, and teaching different types of lessons. What seemed feasible given these priorities was to join four teachers as they taught three different year groups four or five times each in the course of the year – a total of 12-15 lessons per teacher.

I asked teachers to participate who fulfilled certain criteria:

1. **At least three years' experience:** Because novice teachers are struggling to master many classroom issues, and have not always had time to settle into preferred ways of approaching topics, I wanted teachers with at least three years' experience – especially since empathy is not an easy or straightforward dimension of history to teach. More practiced teachers would offer richer and deeper stores of experience for me to explore.
2. **An undergraduate history degree and PGCE qualification:** I opted for teachers with these qualifications because I was aware that teachers coming to history from other disciplinary backgrounds faced added obstacles in conveying the nature of the discipline accurately (Wilson & Wineburg, 1988).
3. **Willingness:** I looked for teachers who were willing and interested in participating, despite the considerable time commitment.
4. **Alignment of goals:** I sought teachers who viewed historical empathy as important and consistent with their own goals and those of the curriculum structures in which they functioned, not wanting to work against the tide of what they would naturally choose to do in their classrooms.
5. **Typical of the area in their professionalism:** I wanted teachers who were fairly typical of schools in the region, where the standard in History is for competent, conscientious, and thoughtful practitioners. Teachers were not chosen as “experts” at the empathy dimension of teaching – not least because it was not clear what expertise would look like – though I knew they would demonstrate much in the way of skill and understanding.
6. **Teachers of at least two Key Stage 3 year-groups and one GCSE group:** Trialling indicated that age differences played an important role in teachers' thinking and practice, and observing along a spectrum of ages allowed me to see how this worked (see further rationales below).
7. **Accessible:** I needed to be able to visit the teachers' schools using public transportation from the town where I lived.

My supervisor, who had worked with teachers from many schools in the south of England, suggested approaching three of the teachers, one of whom took part in my trialling of methods, and one who I knew from participation in a university professional development course. Thus I used an opportunity sample of teachers, but they were identified for particular purposes.

Having met these basic criteria, I discovered it was also possible to select teachers who differed along several other potentially important angles. For example, with the help and input of my supervisor, I chose two teachers who were more experienced, in their tenth year of teaching or more, and two who had taught between three and five years. Two of those involved were women, and two men. Two of them taught in single sex schools, and two in coeducational settings. While I considered that the more experienced teachers might have somewhat more refined methods or more abundant resources for empathy work – and was cognisant of research indicating that few teachers adequately mastered the standard pedagogical problems besetting first-year teachers in fewer than five years (Huberman, 1985, cited in Berliner, 1986) – I had no theoretical reasons for the other ways the sample was divided. All of the teachers approached – Ms. Hayes, Ms. Joslin, Mr. Ingram, and Mr. Dow – graciously agreed to participate, and I wrote them letters introducing the project during the summer of 2001 in preparation for autumn visits to their classrooms.³³

Sampling the Lessons

Lesson observations and follow-up interviews generated the bulk of data gathered in this study, so identifying which lessons would be the best to observe for empathy was a central concern. This proved complicated at times; teachers occasionally felt in retrospect that a lesson had not delved as deeply into the issue as anticipated, often for timing reasons, or mentioned that an unidentified lesson had turned out to be particularly pertinent. With empathy involved *to some degree* in many lessons, picking the most fruitful could be hit and miss.

³³ More detail on the teachers as individuals is provided in Chapter 4.

Placing parameters on the year-groups to involve in the study also posed challenges, chiefly because the teachers had to be selected before they knew what their responsibilities would be for the coming school year. My initial aspirations for a firm comparative design with the same year-groups and some of the same historical topics yielded to broader and more realistic guidelines. Key Stage 3 lessons seemed ideal to observe because the lack of exam pressures created greater freedom for the teachers, and because much of the Year 7 and 8 curricula focused upon the non-twentieth century world – I theorised that empathetic techniques might stand out in sharper focus when the historical era was more distant. (I knew I would be observing some lessons on modern history in any case, as the Year 9 curriculum focused on it.) I decided to observe whichever two Key Stage 3 classes the teachers happened to be teaching in 2001-2002, or whichever they identified as preferable to observe, as well as one of their GCSE classes. With the older Year 10 and 11 pupils, teachers were negotiating the major added pressure of exams, and I thought it would be important to see how that affected their thinking and practice regarding empathy. In schools that used banding or setting, I also saw a mix of attainment groupings, though this related to the lessons teachers invited me to attend, not deliberate structuring on my part.³⁴

In terms of actual lessons, I asked teachers to select which ones I should observe, both because they knew their plans best and because their choices revealed their conceptions of what empathy was. However, I knew from the trialling of methods that if I said nothing about identification, they might try to pick lessons matching what they thought *I* considered empathy to be. So part of the rationale for having them talk about *their* definition of empathy at the Initial Interview was to focus the identification discussion upon their views. I also explicitly stated at the start of the research, and dropped reminders during the year, that I wanted to see lessons *they* considered relevant to empathy, taught in their normal fashion – that this would be of most value for the study. As it turned out, lesson selection worked a bit differently with each teacher. Hayes emailed me her complete schemes of work

³⁴ Further reflections on the study design and its implications are included in Chapter 8.

for the term, and picked candidate lessons that we sat down and briefly discussed; sometimes I asked probing questions about the topics and sorts of activities involved until she settled on choices. Joslin identified units of work that seemed most promising, and in discussions via telephone and email we narrowed it down to particular lessons. I assured her that it was *her* idea of empathy that should guide the choice, and she took this on board and chose accordingly.

Ingram typically glanced through his plans at the end of one lesson and then and there named the next time he would use empathetic methods. During the spring of 2002, his ideas about what constituted an empathy lesson were changing slightly due to external professional development and ongoing reflection during the research process. While his basic means of identification continued to focus on methods, his conception of empathy-related methods broadened. For his final three lessons, all in May, he chose lessons where his standard strategies, such as role-play, formed a significantly smaller component of the total lesson, and knowledge accretion, sourcework, and discussion played a more prominent role. That these shifts in action were beginning to form a trend indicative of new underlying thinking became fully visible to me only during subsequent analysis, through the subtle comparisons afforded by slower examination of tapes and transcripts. But Ingram also made a few direct comments in May interviews about his changing conceptions and plans, the nature of which are explored at greater length in Chapter 5. It was these late-breaking statements that tipped me off that in the Final Interview I needed to compile all of the conceptions of empathy expressed by teachers over the year and ask explicitly about any changes and inconsistencies. If when Ingram *first* broached new ideas I had more aggressively pursued the question of how they might be specifically affecting his lesson identifications, I may have gained a clearer picture of the scope of his thoughts a few weeks earlier. However, even in retrospect such a methodological principle is not simple: for one, doing this would have required extraordinary sensitivity to – perhaps overinterpretation of – the few comments he made prior to the Final Interview. Also, a clearer picture was not necessarily available at the time; it may have

been *just taking shape* in his mind as he adjusted his strategies, and my requesting too concrete a rationale for what were small experimental steps may have produced distortions or research effects. On the other hand, a rationale may have been ready to access if I had simply shone a light on it – a possibility endorsed by the fact that Ingram’s most developed articulation of the shifts came in the last interview when I most directly probed the matter of change. Ultimately, I am not sure. What *is* clear is that pinpointing the earliest stages of change can be laden with complications.

Dow identified particular units of work at the beginning of the year, as well as a specific early Year 10 lesson in which empathy was one of several goals, but he later appeared to feel that few GCSE lessons fit the bill; after I observed a series of Year 9 World War I lessons in the autumn, there was a lull. In the course of discussion in late January, I inquired into observation possibilities beyond the originally chosen year-groups, and we established that a forthcoming Year 12 lesson had potential in terms of its subject matter. Subsequent to this lesson Dow slightly altered how he was thinking about empathy in terms of the Upper School (see Chapter 5 for details) – which most likely would have affected his identifications had the successive subject matter been more relevant, and exam revision not encroached. It emerged that his thinking about empathy was actually broader than the lessons he identified during the middle part of the year, when he defaulted to a more traditional notion of almost “pure empathy” lessons, a notion he thought interested me. My limitations as a researcher in not reminding him to follow the line of his own thinking to its natural if “untraditional” end-point in lessons were apparent here; also, in trying to be sensitive about GCSE and A-Level pressure, I probably began to ask about what exactly was happening in Upper School lessons too late. For all the affordances of teacher-identification tactics in terms of seeing conceptions embodied in choices, there were costs as well, most notably in the quantity of lesson data ultimately available for Dow.

Unforeseen circumstances also mitigated against a neat and complete roster of four to five lessons for three consistent year-groups per teacher. The original plan worked with minor exceptions for Ingram and Joslin, and also for

Hayes except that she was never assigned a Year 10 class so I observed Year 11 in her case rather than be rigid. More significantly, due to major reorganisation stemming from the arrival of student teachers who took over Dow's Year 10 class in the winter term, as well as the switching of his Year 7 from History to Religious Education, two of the year-groups I was observing suddenly vanished from possibility. I considered the options, and entertained the idea of adding another teacher to the study, but because I already had six rich and fascinating transcripts of Dow teaching, and would gain several more (four in the end), I felt it was unnecessary. I did try to compensate for the smaller number of lessons, and the fact that seven were from Year 9, by extending the follow-up interviews in Dow's case. After reviewing the lesson, I added questions about other strategies he used in unseen lessons. I also observed one Religious Education lesson that he taught to Year 7 because he felt it showed the same empathetic method that he would have used with this group for History (dramatic re-enactment of a narrative).³⁵ By the end, I felt I had holistic sense of his empathetic repertoire (eyewitness or hearsay) and a reasonably strong sense of his style despite the skew in the data.

Data Collection

Principles

Because much of the validity of the interview data in this study relied on teachers' level of comfort in speaking their thoughts openly, I attempted to build rapport and to create motivating circumstances that would facilitate their doing so. I was also eager that, having welcomed me into their classrooms, they would feel during and after the research process that their trust had been merited. Three principles guided my approach: respect, clarity about the process, and provision of assistance in accessing their thinking.

Respect for teachers and their knowledge was a fundamental to my approach, and indeed to my reasons for even undertaking the study. I

³⁵ I did not treat the content of this lesson as historical during the analysis process; I noted only the methods.

expressed this in a few ways. Following the methodology of Brown and McIntyre (1993), I tried to show positive regard for them and their work (hardly a matter of effort); I refrained from negative judgments, took an interest in all that they said, and when a teacher appeared disappointed with a lesson, encouraged a balanced approach by asking about what had gone *well*. Maintaining a stance of openness about their rationales was also my aim; I tried not to impose my assumptions onto their work or to lead them in questioning – though my inexperience as a researcher meant that I sometimes struggled to frame questions ideally. I made it clear that I was not there to evaluate them, but to *learn* from them. This generally approving orientation seemed to have the effect of allowing them to speak honestly, and they were not hesitant to critique their own performances, or how things went over with pupils, when they were displeased. I did not have to raise the issue. Occasionally teachers sought my reaction to a classroom event or opinion about an approach anyway, which as much as possible I tried to deflect by commenting on reactions of the pupils that I had witnessed or making a brief note of how things seemed to go and then changing the topic.

Another facet of respect involved trying to give teachers as much control as possible over the research process. So for example, I gave them the choice of whether they or I approach their headteacher for formal permission for the research, of when they invited me into the classroom, and of what they told pupils about my project.

A second principle I followed was to be clear with teachers about the research process and what it entailed. I explained the obligations and time commitment involved at the outset, and also made them aware of when I was gathering data as opposed to just chatting. To ensure clarity about our roles, I drew up a Research Ethics statement (see Appendix A) involving issues of data collection, confidentiality, and our mutual rights, and made sure at the beginning of the research that they had no concerns about it.

Thirdly, I tried to support teachers in accessing ideas about their teaching choices and decisions. This was done not out of a conviction that they did not know their own minds, but from an awareness that fleeting classroom

events could be difficult to recollect and that teachers might not even be conscious of aspects of their performance, especially as they had become automatised with experience (Berliner, 1986). In two of the three independent interviews (described below), where questions were more abstract, I sent teachers the interview protocols in advance so that they had a chance to reflect; I felt some of the questions were demanding and unfair to confront them with on the spot. In the course of the interview, I used probes and prompts to uncover the range of their thoughts and add focus. For the third lengthy interview, teachers and I were looking at marked coursework together, and these documents served as helpful reminders to teachers of what they had been thinking while reading them. Michael Eraut has linked such “mediating objects” to an increased capability for people to talk explicitly about their knowledge (2000: 119-120).

During post-lesson interviews, I prompted teachers’ erstwhile thoughts about proceedings by citing their statements or those of students, preserving when possible the language actually used. To make this possible, I made notes as lessons progressed on comments of particular interest, as the tape recording offered no immediate access to them. I also tried to conduct interviews directly upon the conclusion of a lesson, when this worked with a teacher’s schedule, or otherwise at the next earliest hour. Sometimes I stayed after school to ensure I could ask questions on the same day. In three cases, no time on the day was available at all, so I used stimulated recall methods – in the form of transcript provision – to prompt teachers’ memories. This had the effect of eliciting metacognitive interpretations, for example about the amount of talking the teacher had done, mixed in with the more typical sort of explanations like why a particular empathy strategy had been chosen.

Accessing Teachers’ Thinking

While I feel confident in saying that these methods helped teachers to ground their reflections in the lessons themselves, and increased the authenticity of their post-hoc reflections, I am equally aware that these methods necessarily missed some sorts of data such as their implicit cognitions.

Michael Polanyi (1967) drew attention to “tacit knowing,” and Guy Claxton glossed the argument about the inaccessibility of knowledge behind fluent performance in this way:

Polanyi’s point is that virtuosity cannot *in principle* be fully explicated, for it embodies observations, distinctions, feelings, perceptual patterns and nuances that are too fine-grain to be caught accurately in a web of words (2000: 36).

A similar point, oft-cited in educational literature, was made by Donald Schön, who drew attention to “knowing-in-action,” which he defined as “knowing that is ordinarily tacit, implicit in our patterns of action and in our feel for the stuff with which we are dealing” (1983: 49). This knowing, he suggested, is generated through “reflection-in-action.” However, Eraut (1995) points out that this mode of reflection is hard for teachers to achieve when circumstances involve rapid-response, and argues that their thinking is often more aptly characterised as “reflection *on* action,” which happens during slower, “cooler” moments in the classroom. Was much of the reflective and knowledge-creating process undergone by teachers in this study taking place during active teaching in moments hard to capture or articulate after the fact? If so, a study examining teachers’ thinking would be woefully incomplete.

Though surely teachers possess tacit knowledge that may be difficult to bring to the surface, it seems likely that its extensiveness and especially its ineffability has been overestimated in some cases.³⁶ Investigating the importance of *time* in teachers’ analysis and learning, Eraut concluded, “I am not convinced that this [knowledge creation] results mainly from reflection-in-action rather than more deliberative reflection out of the action” (1995: 21) – thus in circumstances where it might be collected or shared. Indeed, even during the “action” in this study, teachers occasionally took time to make an

³⁶ While acknowledging and exploring the difficulties of detecting tacit knowledge, Eraut (1995) argues that Schön’s analysis of “knowing-in-action” is deficient in coherence and rests on a self-serving subset of available evidence. With reference to professional work generally and teaching in particular, Eraut (2000) refines and complexifies the depiction of knowledge beyond the basic categories of procedural/propositional or tacit. He shows the wide range of phenomena to which the latter category refers, demonstrates how it interacts with the propositional, and illustrates how contextual variables matter: different *processes* of understanding a situation and different *modes* of cognition are brought to bear depending partly on the time available and “crowdedness” of the situation (the number of issues competing for a practitioner’s attention).

observation in passing to me, something they would not have done had they been relentlessly busy and unable to deliberate. As far as being able to express the substance of their thoughts in general, another study investigating the relationships between teachers' theories, thoughts, and actions concluded that teachers' ideas were detailed and comprehensive to a degree that threw doubt on other researchers' claims "that teachers have difficulty in 'objectifying' and explaining what they do" (Mitchell & Marland, 1989: 124). And retrospective interviews of history teachers in a series of studies showed experienced teachers to be quite capable of articulating their thoughts (Cooper & McIntyre, 1996; Husbands et al., 2003; Pendry, 1994).

The teachers in this study rarely seemed to suffer from difficulties in expressing their logic and ideas. Naturally, their explanations were happening slightly out of the immediate lesson context and as such must be considered constructions, but except when a teacher stumbled or seemed at a loss, there was little reason to suspect that they could not recall some of their interactive thinking, and aptly articulate it. What accounted for their fluency? Some research (Eraut, 2000) indicates that training or mentoring relationships as well as continuing education (such as serious reading) endow people with greater ability to think and talk about their work. These seemed likely possibilities, given that the teachers were all mentors or actively worked with student teachers, as well as keeping abreast of their own professional development. Ultimately, too, it was not only interactive teaching cognitions that interested me in this study, but their conclusions and how they viewed their own work during less harried reflection – what has been called the substance and logic, not psychology, of their thinking (Brown & McIntyre, 1993).

Methods of Data Collection

Seeking to maximise the validity of the study initially through the processes for collecting data, I utilised triangulation of data sources as well as question types to build an understanding of the teachers' thinking and practice.

The ways that these corresponded to the research questions are expressed in Table B.

TABLE B: METHODS IN RELATION TO RESEARCH QUESTIONS

RESEARCH QUESTIONS	METHODS
1. How do experienced teachers conceptualise empathy and its role in historical understanding?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initial Interview • Observations + Post-Lesson Interviews • Final Interview
2. What do teachers think and know about effective means of teaching historical empathy (to their own students and more broadly)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initial Interview • Observations + Post-Lesson Interviews • Final Interview
3. What do teachers do in practice to bring about the empathetic understanding they view as desirable?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Observations + Post-Lesson Interviews • Coursework Interview
4. How have teachers learned what they know about the pedagogy of historical empathy?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initial Interview • Observations + Post-Lesson Interviews • Coursework Interview • Final Interview
5. What factors facilitate or constrain teachers' work in helping students to develop empathetic understanding?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initial Interview • Observations + Post-Lesson Interviews • Coursework Interview • Final Interview • Curricular Documents

The individual methods offered different sorts of data, which in each case (apart from written documents) I converted from tape-recordings into transcripts. How each contributed to the study is explicated below.

Initial Interview

In September of the data collection school year (2001-2002), I conducted an Initial Interview with each of the four teachers. The interview was semi-structured, and the stem questions, though not associated probes, were sent to teachers a few days in advance (see Appendix B for the protocol). Exceptions to this were the contents of a card-sort exercise, of a standard definition of empathy that I introduced, and of a final multiple choice question to which I wanted them to react without prior reflection. This Initial Interview, which lasted from one to two hours, gave me an opportunity to learn about the

teachers' educational backgrounds and philosophies. I arranged the questions with a gradually narrowing focus, from broad-based queries about the teachers, to their beliefs and values about history, to their ideas about empathy and the strategies it involved. This approach aligned with the advice that

Getting the individual questions right is vital but they also have to be ordered appropriately. A good interview schedule has a rhythm to it which takes the respondents through what appears to be a set of issues which are sensibly related. Interviews cannot jump, without explanation, from one topic to another (Breakwell, 2000: 241).

Indeed, the ordering was also strategically important; to avoid prejudicing their responses through the questions, I first inquired what they felt the purposes of school history were, then asked them to complete a standardised card-sort exercise, grouping or ranking different purposes that I had culled from the history teaching literature.³⁷ I likewise asked them for their definition of empathy before checking that they agreed with the rudimentary one I had drawn up.

Classroom Observations

In order to gather data that was as ecologically valid as possible, I observed teachers on multiple occasions, teaching different topics to several year-groups and bands, at a variety of times of day and of the school year. This gave me the opportunity to see a broad range of ways that they both used and nurtured empathy. I asked teachers to identify lessons in which promoting empathetic understanding was one of the goals or a main goal, and encouraged them not to contrive lessons for my benefit nor alter their usual modes of teaching. They were to pick sessions, or sequences of lessons, where empathy was part of their established scheme of work or natural planning. Because innovation is actually a normal part of a teacher's work, some was captured in the study; Joslin for example developed several new WWI lessons and was teaching a brand new GCSE curriculum, but these decisions pre-dated my study (and outlasted it).

³⁷ Card-sort results are shown in Appendix F.

Ultimately I joined each teacher for between 9 and 15 lessons, recording them with a sensitive but unobtrusive radio-microphone device that usually picked up students' comments as well as teachers' words except in louder group work situations. I supplemented this information with my own field notes to highlight nonverbal communications, special circumstances, and students' comments that I judged too soft in volume to be decipherable on tape.

The role I adopted during these lessons was "observer as participant" (Robson, 1993: 198), meaning that I presented myself as a researcher, not a teacher, but sought to help out in small ways as requested, passing out materials, helping with equipment or running a quick errand on rare occasions. I attempted not to interfere, and positioned myself on the margins of the action when possible – though all parties were aware of my presence and occasional roving around the classroom during group work.

Post-Lesson Interviews

As soon as possible after a lesson, I sat down with the teacher and conducted a follow-up interview ranging from ten minutes to half an hour (usually 15-20 minutes) that focused upon their thinking about events in the lesson. Discussing shared experience in this way allowed questions to target not *what* happened, but their explanations and logic. It also reduced the odds that, in the lingo of Argyris and Schön (1974), their "espoused theories" would diverge from their "theories-in-use" – a possibility since lesson and interview contexts were quite different. While I crafted the questions during the lessons – or on the spot – three core questions were the staple: "Why did you choose these particular strategies?," "How did they contribute to empathetic understanding?," and "Did they work as you had hoped, in terms of pupils' responses?." Often I reported teachers' words to them and asked them to elaborate on what they were doing.

For the first couple of months I took special care to keep questions very grounded in the specifics of events, not building any ideas into the questions for them to respond to. In February, I reviewed all questions asked by every

teacher to check for biases and gaps in my own questioning, and also to note important issues and themes mentioned by a particular teacher so that I could be alert for chances to raise the issue with the others – as I ultimately did in the Final Interview, if not before. Thus while post-lesson interviews remained focused upon lesson events, they also became testing grounds for emerging ideas and theories. This review also enabled me, as a starting point in analysis, to evaluate whether trends were emerging in teachers' responses. I was concerned that patterns noted in the literature might be influencing the data, for instance Bromme's (1987) assertion that teachers remembered "peak phases" of introducing new material better than other parts of a lesson, or Berliner's (1988) claim that experienced teachers tended to focus their attention on what was *atypical*, commenting on problems or outstanding events more than those they took for granted. Perhaps because I was asking teachers about so many parts of a lesson, and citing or paraphrasing statements back to them, these distortions were not arising except for a particular attentiveness to matters they wanted to change in the future.

Coursework Interview

In September 2001, I asked teachers to identify a piece of coursework assigned at some point in the year that focused upon historical empathy, and around which we could discuss how they assessed students' empathetic performance. I specifically requested that they select two examples each of work they considered excellent, middle-range, and poor. After they had marked these and added such comments as they chose, I sat down with the teachers for about 45 minutes and asked them to talk me through the students' writing, explaining what they looked for and how they knew a student had or had not empathised, why they had made particular comments, and how they had marked them. I gathered background information on the assignment – which in three cases was a soldier's letter from the WWI trenches and in one case an account of fighting in the Battle of Hastings – such as how it was worded, what resources were available to students in completing it, why it was valuable, and how the assignment had developed over time, if it had. I also

asked whether there were empathetic matters teachers had considered addressing, but had not, to get at their broader pedagogical *or* specific empathetical philosophies.

Curricular Documents

Throughout the year I collected documents relating to the lessons taught and to teachers' ways of thinking about the curriculum. These included schemes of work (as available), lesson handouts, syllabi, examination questions, National Curriculum guidelines, photocopies of textbook pages, and the like. These helped me to understand lessons once transcribed, and I sometimes analysed the empathetic content of handouts created by teachers in its own right. Curricular artifacts also assisting in understanding the context in which teachers operated.

Final Interview

The questions for this semi-structured interview, which lasted from one to two hours, were to a considerable extent tailored to the individual teachers (though see Appendix B for common questions). I used the interview partly for respondent validation: it began with my presenting the cluster of statements about empathy I had gathered over the year from each teacher to check that I had them all correct, to clarify where necessary, and to serve as a prelude to asking them whether their ideas had changed at all. I then asked about the lesson identification process, about effects of the research itself, about strategies they used that I had not seen, about constraints, influences on pupils, and a handful of other issues about which I felt some gaps still existed. I also used this opportunity to ask them to respond to statements about empathy teaching made in the research literature. Heretofore I had resisted presenting them with any empirically based *or* theoretical ideas, and now I wanted to see what they thought. To a person, they appeared intrigued by what the literature – brief quotes as they were – had to say, but did not allow themselves to be led by it; they resisted statements that failed to square with

their experience. I also used the Final Interview to thank them for their extreme generosity with their time and insights.

My Role and Influence

While I tried to design and implement the data collection for this study in ways that promoted authenticity, I could not escape Hawthorne effects altogether: my presence definitely altered the teaching scene. Ultimately I could not control how teachers perceived my role, but I took steps to make it clear and unthreatening (as noted earlier). I emphasised that I did not want them to “perform” – not that this would have been sustainable over so many lessons. I mentioned that I was a history teacher myself, which seemed helpful for breaking down feelings of distance or formality by showing I was an “insider” to classroom life. Yet I was clearly visiting their schools in a research context, on top of which I was American, which made me a kind of “outsider,” but also aided me in seeing things with unhabituated eyes. While I do not think the teachers were bothered by my nationality – all were cosmopolitan in outlook, three had lived in America at some point, and Joslin was American though a long-term resident of England – I myself experienced the transnational differences in schooling as quite profound. Through conversations with my supervisor, independent reading, and an early discussion of empathy in British classrooms with three history education staff members at Oxford (that I recorded and transcribed),³⁸ I was able to familiarise myself with much of the context so as not to appear too surprised. This was important, as I aimed to present myself to the teachers as “alert and informed in relation to the current state of English education and schools, while at the same time being someone who needed the intricacies of the teaching in their specific contexts explained” (Cooper & McIntyre, 1996: 32). The outcomes of this approach, in terms of researcher effects, are explored further in Chapter 8. How I proceeded to deepen my understanding of those intricacies – through analysing the data – is the subject of the next chapter.

³⁸ Anna Pendry, Katharine Burn, and Gary Mills

Chapter 3

Data Analysis and Interpretation

Analysis

The analysis of data, a necessity for extracting meaning from it, is often presented in terms of its characteristics. Coffey and Atkinson put it thus:

Analysis is a cyclical process and a reflexive activity; the analytic process should be comprehensive and systematic but not rigid; data are segmented and divided into meaningful units, but connection to the whole is maintained; and data are organized according to a system derived from the data themselves... Analysis is not about adhering to any one correct approach or set of right techniques; it is imaginative, artful, flexible, and reflexive. It should also be methodical, scholarly, and intellectually rigorous (1996: 10).

Their description aptly alerted me to both the standards and freedoms that I faced in making sense of an alpine heap of transcript data, as well as supporting lesson materials and my own field notes. I needed to create a system of breaking down the complex social realities of classrooms and of teachers' cognitions in order to describe, explain, and ultimately theorise about them in the form of written propositions – but without losing their subtleties. And as the quotation above suggested, doing so proved to be neither a serene nor linear process.

The bulk of data for this study took the form of transcripts, whether of lesson observations, follow-up interviews, or stand-alone semi-structured interviews. Given that most of the interview content was closely linked to the lessons to which it referred, it seemed logical to build a system of analysis that could account for the totality of this integrated data, but also allow isolation of the data types when necessary to analyse their separate contribution. I used my own notes taken during the lessons to assist my understanding of the transcripts, and to reflect on future lines of inquiry, but did not analyse them directly. Lesson materials provided to students largely played the same supporting role, and were only imported into the transcripts for analysis, either verbatim or in the form of brief summaries of their relevant contents, when

they added new information about empathy-related proceedings. Since teachers generally commented extensively to students about resources like handouts and texts, it was rarely necessary to add to what the transcripts already captured of their words. Effectively, this meant that all data took the form of transcripts, and a single analytical system with categories responsive to the existence of various types of knowledge could be applied to the whole of it.

The Constant Comparative Method for Grounded Theory

The theoretical approach I selected as most appropriate for analysing my data was the “constant comparative method” (CCM) proposed by Glaser and Strauss for the creation of “grounded theory” (1967). Not only was it applicable “in the same study to any kind of qualitative information, including observations, interviews, documents, articles, books, and so forth” (104), but it conceived of the system of codes designed for analysis as both a mechanism to develop propositions and as a form of theory itself. The procedures of CCM, used carefully, would “provide the grounding, build the density, and develop the sensitivity and integration needed to generate a rich, tightly woven, explanatory theory that closely approximates the reality it represents” (Strauss & Corbin, 1990: 57). While the methodological procedures were described by Glaser and Strauss in terms of four stages of analysis, a helpful overview of CCM was offered by Goetz and LeCompte:

[T]his strategy combines inductive category coding with a simultaneous comparison of all social incidents observed. As social phenomena are recorded and classified, they also are compared across categories. Thus, the discovery of relationships, that is, hypothesis generation, begins with the analysis of initial observations, undergoes continuous refinements throughout the data collection and analysis process, and continuously feeds back into the process of category coding (cited in Lincoln & Guba, 1985: 335).

This inductive and pattern-seeking approach suited my study of historical empathy, a topic where few analytical concepts were available for borrowing from the literature. It also offered sufficient flexibility to be tailored to my work: the stages were not intended as rigid rules, order could vary, and alternatives at every step could be pursued (Strauss and Corbin, 1990: 59). As

my analysis proceeded, I occasionally took advantage of this adaptability to add analytical steps I regarded as necessary (see below).

Fortunately, I had a highly compatible tool at my disposal: the computer software program *ATLAS/ti*. Designed with the principles of grounded theory in mind, the program allowed for the inductive creation of a system of constructs, and even used Glaser and Strauss' terminology for procedures, such as "open coding," "in vivo coding," "code families," and "memos." With *ATLAS/ti*, I could store transcripts, assign codes to data, write analytic notes to myself, group documents and codes into families, and perform sophisticated searches for particular information, which I could then view either in transcript-context or as output in the form of a list. This powerful program made data storage and retrieval easy and concise, but it is important to stress that it did not actually *perform* analysis. It was simply a vehicle that allowed me to explore my data thoroughly without causing a great deal of paper to fly about the room; the thinking behind the analysis remained my responsibility.

Principles for Coding

As I approached the task of formulating and assigning codes, I found it necessary to compile a set of principles to guide my work, ensuring consistency, validity, and rigour. I adopted the following rules:

- *Clarity and coherence*: codes had to be defined clearly and applied coherently and systematically to the data.
- *Groundedness*: data would not be forced to fit preconceived constructs, but rather codes would be derived from the evidence. In some cases, concepts were brought in from the literature, but only if they were also substantiated by the data itself. Definitions of codes might be adapted over time to accommodate new understandings as analysis proceeded.
- *Comprehensiveness*: adequate account would be taken of all data of relevance, and the system arrived at would suffice to represent the thinking of those studied. In practice, the former statement meant that nothing except non-disciplinary comments concerning classroom management were excluded, for example "stand by your chair." This

inclusive approach was chosen because it was rarely easy to identify portions of the lesson that definitely did not relate to or influence the teaching of empathy; ostensibly discrete segments often laid the foundation for empathy later in the lesson.

- *Recognisability*: although teachers were not asked to validate the coding system as respondents, it needed to be designed such that they could perceive its connection to their practices and thinking.
- *Relevance*: coding categories had to address the research questions.
- *Economy*: codes would be applied in mutually exclusive fashion, although overlaps would be permitted in two quite prevalent cases:³⁹
 - a) when a statement by a teacher represented use of several types of knowledge at once (a major purpose of analysis being to understand how teachers brought to bear a variety of forms of knowledge – separated only for heuristic purposes – to advance empathetic understanding);
 - b) when a statement represented different levels of analysis, or performed multiple simultaneous (and theoretically interesting) functions at the same level of analysis. So for example the teacher question about proper burials of corpses in WWI, “[Would] you [have] got the *energy* to do it? Is it likely you’re going to have *time* to do it?” (T5: 438-9) was coded both as *humility/respect or encouraging* and *logical reasoning/ implications or encouraging – teacher initiates*, because it performed both of these functions. Likewise, a statement could be coded at the descriptive level as *role-taking: teacher* if that is the strategy she was employing, and at the inferential level as *what it means to empathise* if that is what she was seeking to illustrate. As Miles and Huberman note, “multiple coding is actually useful in exploratory studies,” and “A good case can be made for multiple-coding

³⁹ Because of the difficulty of back-applying new codes to transcripts, I erred on the side of over-inclusivity, and pared down the incidents of code-use later, a much easier manoeuvre in *ATLAS/ti*.

segments with both a descriptive and inferential code; these are legitimately two necessary levels of analysis” (1994: 64).

- *Independence*: each code will be assigned to a *unit of meaning*, defined as the “smallest piece[s] of information about something that can stand by itself...[and] be interpretable in the absence of any additional information other than a broad understanding of the context in which the inquiry is carried out” (Lincoln & Guba, 1985: 345). This unit might range in length from a word to an exchange of several paragraphs depending on the content; typically in this study, it involved a phrase to a few sentences.
- *Precision of name*: the codes should have names that capture the essence of their content.
- *Identification of initiative*: the codes should reflect who, teacher or student, initiated a new direction or theme of empathetic significance, and thus accurately reflect the conditions of dialogue and interaction in the classroom.

Procedures of Analysis

Preliminaries:

Before embarking on the stages of analysis comprising CCM, I needed to undertake initial familiarisation with the data and preparation of the transcripts for analysis. I achieved this by listening again to the tapes of each of the sixty-four transcripts, recapturing the flavour of the lesson as I checked for transcription errors. As I listened, I added comments in brackets to impart a sense of the feel of the events. These included indications of vocal emphasis, pace, volume, use of pitch (high and low tones), assumption of various voices, moods or accents (such as fear, bewilderment, excitement, joking, imitations of people), gestures and other movements, pauses, exclamations, and the like. I also noted levels of quiet or hubbub, type of background noise, and signs of pupils’ engagement, eagerness, boredom, or deviance (assisted here by my field notes) so I could understand classroom conditions during analysis. I enriched the transcripts in this way partly because of my own sense that these

were also forms of communication, and partly because I was aware that analysts of classroom language had faulted researchers' omission or subordination of non-verbal cues (Edwards & Furlong, 1978). I was trying to heed the advice that

if we are going to make sense of the process of classroom education, then we need careful records of gesture and activity as well as detailed transcripts of classroom discourse, that these need to be closely integrated, and that we do not make the error of trying to account for educational processes solely in terms of classroom talk and discourse structures (Edwards & Mercer, 1987: 142-143).

As a final step in orienting myself to the transcripts and preparing them for use, where applicable I added statements from or information about the lesson resources (as noted above) and contextual details from my notes such as relevant pre- and post-lesson comments not on tape, date and time of class, number of students present, year-group, level (if not mixed-ability), and any unusual circumstances. As I went through the transcripts, I also began to note words, phrases or themes repeated by the teachers, and to keep record of them. For example, my early notes show that Dow emphasised the "power" of sources, and "depth" of understanding, while Joslin talked often about the importance of sources seeming "real," and used the phrase "at the time" a lot.

When I designed my study, I had identified which forms of data – for example, lesson transcript, follow-up interview, or final interview – would contribute to answering each research question, and I realised that during the analysis process I would need to be able to distinguish which instrument was the source of any given statement. This was important for examining how knowledge was used in different ways from lesson to interview. For instance, teachers generally did not speak about knowledge of their individual students' capacities in class; I knew their thoughts only through interviews. Or they spoke more abstractly during the three major interviews than in post-lesson follow-ups. Because I would later use whole lists of quotations to craft propositions, I wanted to be able to discern the speaker and type of data at a glance; thus I used the headings attached to *ATLAS/ti* output and formatted lesson transcripts with T for teacher statements and S for students, and interview transcripts with Q for my questions, and A for teachers' answers.

One last point is worthy of mention regarding my decisions about preparing to work with different types of data. There were three instances when teachers simply had no time for follow-up interviews after class or even within a couple of days. Not wanting to sacrifice their comments completely, when I did have the opportunity to do a follow-up interview (days later) or, in one case, had a teacher respond to questions via email, I provided the teachers with a copy of the lesson transcript to refer to. The status of this interview data is different in some ways: it doesn't capture immediate post-lesson thoughts, and it does include matters reflected on at greater leisure with a text in hand that potentially reveals aspects teachers may have been unaware of. Knowing the conditions under which the data for these three interviews were generated allowed me later in the analysis to be sensitive to minor differences in the types of commentary that could stem from these circumstances.

Stage One

Glaser and Strauss call the first stage in the creation of grounded theory “comparing incidents applicable to each category” (1967: 105), and define the rule of the CCM: “while coding an incident for a category, compare it with the previous incidents in the same and different groups coded in the same category” (106). This comparison, they note, can often be based on memory. This stage, then, involves the early assignment of units of meaning to a category (i.e. code). The standard for putting information in the same category is initially a fairly loose resemblance, a “look-alikeness” or “feel-alikeness.” As for length, the units of meaning varied from a word to several teacher-student exchanges, depending on the code and the transcript content; most commonly, they contained a few sentences developing the same idea.

Where, though, do the categories come from? Glaser and Strauss skip this question in their first book, but Strauss and Corbin later take it up, as do other writers. There are three main sources: from the data, from one's impressions, or from other studies or writings. For my research, a primary analytical challenge followed from the fact that no *a priori* set of concepts or categories particularly related to teachers' work on historical empathy existed.

While the teacher knowledge literature offered a few helpful ideas, and the empathy-teaching accounts sensitised me to some strategies I might expect to see used (such as *role-taking*), the bulk of the categories had to be generated from the “ground up,” reading the transcripts and identifying codes that captured what was happening in them. Observing how my supervisor coded part of a transcript helped me learn to create relevant categories. Attending to the language of the teachers allowed me to create some codes borrowing their words, like *knowledge of feelings*, since they were talking about historical figures’ feelings directly, it was obvious they viewed this as important. Other codes were suggested by the research questions: *facilitating factors* and *constraints*, for example, both derived from the question “What factors facilitate or constrain teachers’ work in helping students to develop empathetic understanding?” So while I had a small “start list,” as Miles and Huberman (1994: 58) call it, I mostly held an awareness of possibly valuable ideas in my head. This was particularly true of my approach to categorising teacher’s *knowledge*, an almost overwhelming number of frameworks for parsing it and thinking about it existed, and I decided that as I trial-coded the first sixteen transcripts (four per teacher), I would first see which categories made sense empirically. Then I would refer back to the literature for substantiation and clarification.

During this Stage 1 coding of the sixteen transcripts, which were chosen from the ones then available to represent the greatest *variety* of approaches to teaching empathy,⁴⁰ I developed an initial list of thirty-eight codes. While some of the codes were unambiguously descriptive (e.g. *anachronism highlighted*), others already contained an element of interpretation on my part. Sometimes this appeared in the *way* I assigned a code to a textual unit of meaning – was a teacher’s description of sixteenth-century people’s alarm at the number of vagabonds wandering the roads to London more fittingly called *knowledge of conditions* or *knowledge of thoughts/beliefs/logic*? Other times the whole code had an interpretive slant. For instance, teachers only occasionally

⁴⁰ Data collection was ongoing as I began to develop the coding system; most of the transcripts at my disposal were from the first three months of the study.

explicitly defined *what it means to empathise*; more often, they discussed empathy using proxy verbs and giving illustrations. Thus, coding these indirect indicators involved making inferences, which I attempted to do in a consistent fashion for all the teachers. In itself, this interpretive aspect seemed justifiable for capturing some phenomena, and several texts on methodology had asserted its legitimacy (Coffey & Atkinson, 1996; Miles & Huberman, 1994).

As I began coding, I kept a file of what Glaser and Strauss termed “analytic memos,” or what might be informally called “coding notes.” For each transcript, I recorded how I had made decisions about assigning codes, and reflected about how I might alter the system. In one typical case I remarked, “Doesn’t *exploring alternatives imply logically reasoning?* Resolve” – and later made the former a subcategory of the latter. Gradually I built a consensus in my own mind about needed changes, which I employed in the next stage of analysis. At the same time, some of my analytic memos looked ahead to interpretation and further data collection: I began to develop ideas about how to interrogate the data, and also about what issues could inform my ongoing interviewing. For example, one memo reminded me to watch for “How do teachers use paradoxes?” and another suggested the interpretive guideline, “Look for which codes dominate at certain times or for certain uses.” So coding was not just a mechanical process, but one which looked ahead toward *functions* of the system I was generating. Such insights are apparently common in the analysis process; Miles and Huberman write

As coding proceeds, if you are being alert about what you are doing, ideas and reactions to the meaning of what you are seeing will well up steadily. These ideas are important; they suggest new interpretations, leads, connections with other parts of the data, and they usually point toward questions and issues to look into during the next wave of data collection (1994: 67).

Because they represented thoughts and reactions that I had while immersed in the totality of particular transcripts, I later found these early memos helpful in the development of propositions. They presented an alternative to the ideas emerging from looking at isolated code-contents that cut across transcripts, and as such were an important complement.

Toward the end of this stage of analysis, I decided to write holistic portraits of two of the teachers in action, Hayes and Dow, in order to assess whether my fledgling coding system was sufficiently picking up on elements of their work that seemed important for the cultivation of empathy. I also wanted these portraits to be grounded in detail, so I did close readings of three transcripts for both of them. The combined effect of profiling the teachers and reading scholarship that affirmed the importance of classroom dynamics for empathy (such as Blake, 1998) caused me to add new codes to capture these aspects, such as *teacher interactional style*, *teacher values*, *priming/salience* (striving to excite students about understanding an event), and *teacher's empathy/wonder*.

Finally, my attempt to code the data comprehensively converged with insights from my reading in another way: I realised I could not make sense of what was happening in the classroom without attending to both how students were contributing and how structural factors (those outside of teachers' direct control) were impinging on events. I came to share the perspective of Clandinin and Connelly (1996) that curriculum is not so much a document, or even set of potentialities, as *what actually happens* in a classroom when teachers and students interact to negotiate and shape it.⁴¹ This view of curriculum as something enacted or lived-out was held by many researchers, I learned (Feldman, 1997; Webb & Blond, 1995; Zumwalt, 1988).

At the empirical level, Cooper and McIntyre (1995: 182) drew attention to Shavelson et al's concept of "bi-directionality" (1986), meaning the recursive patterns of teacher-student influence in the classroom. They noted that most research focused on each teacher's or pupil's influence on the learning situation and called for work combining the two. While a thorough examination of students' perspectives was outside the scope of my study, my own attempts at coding supported the notion that teachers' practice and thinking on empathy simply were not comprehensible in isolation from students' classroom comments and behaviours. I had, for example, been struck

⁴¹ Mention of "the curriculum" throughout this thesis refers to curriculum construed in this way.

by the fact that pupils were employing many of the same strategies for grasping past actions that teachers used (such as *analogies* or *picturing the world/what existed*), sometimes with prompting and sometimes without. As a result, I created a set of codes specific to students and began to systematically examine their contributions.

Finally, my own observations of lessons, in addition to teacher's interview statements, substantiated the attention given in teacher knowledge literature to the importance of external factors in the construction of the curriculum. Writing about history classrooms, Romanowski (1996) gave examples of how teachers modified subject materials and tempered the expression of their personal values in response to community beliefs, expectations, and pressures. Parker (1991) claimed that understanding of social studies teachers' thinking was hampered by lack of consideration of institutional context. Evidence from science classrooms (Nott & Wellington, 1994) pointed to seven major factors influencing the teaching of science: two related to the teachers themselves, two to pupils and their parents, and three to structural factors such as the National Curriculum, the department, and the school (headteacher, politics, ethos, etc.).

Such insights were not entirely new, of course: Doyle (1986) had drawn attention to intrinsic and contextualising features of classroom life that exerted constant pressure on the task of teaching: multidimensionality (of matters to attend to), simultaneity, immediacy, unpredictability, publicness, and a class's shared history. Such mediating features had to be given consideration to understand teachers' work. More recently, the "major role of sociocultural context in shaping teachers' practice" has been highlighted (Ben-Peretz, 1995: 105). What researchers are stressing is how teacher's actions, beliefs, and goals are conditioned by their sociocultural milieu, or what Connelly, Clandinin and He call their "professional knowledge landscape" (1997). Moreover, teacher thinking research is moving away from a focus solely upon what is in a teacher's head to an examination of how their practice and purposes are socially situated; Yinger and Hendricks-Lee write, "We propose *ecological intelligence* as a more inclusive term that shifts the focus from individual

cognitive processing and technical action to the relationships between the individual and the environment” (1993: 102). And Michael Eraut, writing about non-formal learning and tacit knowledge – including that of teachers – summarises evidence of *distributed cognition* and *situated learning*, and asks

Where then is the evidence for individual cognition, if explicit knowledge and implicit knowledge are both socially constructed and socially mediated?...To understand any situation involving several people we need to adopt two complementary perspectives. One should focus on the situation itself – its antecedents, wider context and ongoing interaction with its environment – and the transactions of its participants throughout the period of enquiry. The other should focus on the contribution of the situation to the learning careers of individual participants, the learning acquired during their ‘visit’ (2000: 131-132).

In response, I have made an effort to take account of the wider factors influencing the empathy curriculum, by coding the *constraints* and *facilitating factors* on their work, by examining *other academic goals/skills* they feel they need to cultivate, and by looking at *sources of teacher ideas/knowledge development*, and their *Knowledge of educational context* and *Knowledge of self/own thinking, learning*. Much of what I have learned about structural factors (such as time or resource availability) or student factors arrives through the lens of teachers’ thinking, but the analytical system also contains many independent examples of how context shapes events.

Stage Two

This stage involves “integrating categories and their properties,” as incidents begin to be compared to properties of the category rather than to other incidents; rudimentary rules for each category are established (Glaser & Strauss, 1967: 108). I began the process of defining rules by calling up the set of statements marked by each code and reviewing these examples in the context in which they occurred (the software program jumps from quote to quote across transcripts). This, as well as my memos, drew my attention to matters where consistency had to be established and decisions made. I also referenced a list of questions called “Issues for my observations” that I had compiled while researching and writing an early draft of my literature review; it included all manner of themes and lingering questions about empathy-

teaching raised in the literature, and I found it useful to check whether the system I was devising would have the potential to shed light on at least some of them. Codes were merged (*student pinpointing knowledge gap* became part of *student comment/question about what known/thought/felt*), added (*knowledge/evaluation of significance/meaning*), subtracted (*student conception* – too vague to be helpful), and renamed (*improvement* became *assessing success at encouraging empathy/improvement*). Seventy-six codes now comprised the list; it had doubled in size. I now had to back-apply the new and altered codes to the original sixteen transcripts – which in effect meant recoding them almost entirely – and begin coding the remaining forty-eight transcripts. This process enabled me to validate and substantiate the constructs I had developed by checking for exactness in their application, and to develop basic rules (later to be refined) for applying them.

As I clarified the codes, I also started to see the relationships between them, an analytic sequence which has been described as

mov[ing] from one inductive inference to another by selectively collecting data, comparing and contrasting this material in the quest for patterns or regularities, seeking out more data to support or qualify these emerging clusters, and then gradually drawing inferences from the links between other new data segments and the cumulative set of conceptualizations (Miles & Huberman, 1994: 14).

The codes naturally clustered into families according to their function or nature, and sometimes related in hierarchical ways within these groups, which were:

- 1) Types of teacher knowledge
- 2) Teachers' empathy strategies (including several subcategories)
- 3) Knowledge-conditions for empathy
- 4) Students' contributions
- 5) Other impinging factors

Table C on the following page shows the contents and subcategories of each family as they appeared in the final incarnation of the coding system.

TABLE C: CODE FAMILIES AND HIERARCHIES

CODING SYSTEM	
<p>TYPES OF TEACHER KNOWLEDGE</p> <p>K aims/achievements</p> <p>K content</p> <p>K educ context</p> <p>K integ emp w/ other goals</p> <p>K kwg-cond or cond for emp</p> <p>K self/own thinking, learning</p> <p> assess succ at enc emp/improv.</p> <p> source of tcr ideas/kwg dev</p> <p>K st/ped capacities</p> <p>K st/ped diff or easy for emp</p> <p>K st/ped gen</p> <p>K st/ped how react</p> <p>K st/ped preconcep, exist kwg</p> <p>K strategies/resources prompting emp</p> <p>source's/exercise's emp value</p> <p>K/B value of empathy</p> <p>what it means to empathise</p> <p>assessing success at emp</p> <p>teacher values</p> <p>macrotheories</p> <p>TEACHERS' EMPATHY STRATEGIES</p> <p>activity</p> <p>sequence</p> <p><u>Cultivating disposition to empathise</u></p> <p>explicit talk abt emp/issues</p> <p> humility/respect or enc</p> <p>differentiation/alt views or enc</p> <p>judgment or enc judg – T</p> <p>lang/term/def issue</p> <p>enc link-making/use contextual kwg</p> <p>logical rsn'g/imp or enc - T init</p> <p> deducing or interpreting perspectives</p> <p> exploring alternatives or enc – T</p> <p> exploring paradox or enc – T</p> <p><u>Establishing relevance</u></p> <p>analogy</p> <p>relating to students' lives</p> <p>then/now comparison</p> <p>personal illustration</p> <p>(continued in next column)</p>	<p><u>Dramatising or enlivening</u></p> <p>role-taking: teacher</p> <p>tcr interactional style</p> <p> priming/salience</p> <p>teacher's empathy/wonder</p> <p>KNOWLEDGE-CONDITIONS FOR EMP.</p> <p>kwg of conditions</p> <p>kwg of feelings</p> <p>kwg of narrative/events/facts</p> <p>kwg of peo/psych/tendencies</p> <p>kwg of prev or other contemp hist</p> <p>kwg of thoughts/beliefs/logic</p> <p>kwg world today/how things work</p> <p>kwg/eval of signif/meaning</p> <p>anachronism accepted</p> <p>anachronism highlighted</p> <p>inaccuracy accepted</p> <p>inaccuracy addressed</p> <p>R emph/translate/shift/steer off idea</p> <p>STUDENTS' CONTRIBUTIONS</p> <p>S c/q abt what known, tho't, felt</p> <p>S c/q pict world, what existed</p> <p>S c/q re facts past action/event/sys</p> <p>S c/q world, thinking today</p> <p>S judgment</p> <p>logical rsn'g/imp - S init</p> <p> S c/q exploring alternatives</p> <p> S c/q exploring paradox</p> <p>role-taking: student</p> <p>sources of student knowledge</p> <p>student interactional style</p> <p>OTHER IMPINGING FACTORS</p> <p>constraints</p> <p> student capacities</p> <p>facilitating factors</p> <p>other academic goals/skills</p> <p>using sources info, skills</p> <p>tcr feeds answer sought</p> <p>research effects</p>

As I proceeded with the coding, I added two new sorts of memos to my repertoire: remarks on what sort of information I was unable to bring into

focus using the mechanism of coding and its outputs – many of which became the guidelines for a later fine-grained analysis that I performed on twelve transcripts (see below) – and initial propositions about what factors seemed to be having the most impact on teachers’ thinking and students’ empathetic performance. My propositions were hunches based on what I had seen so far; they drew some connections and hypothesised about how things worked together, but had not at this stage been subjected to a search for discrepant evidence or tested for validity against all the data (since at this stage not all of it had been analysed). These propositions included observations like the following:

- 1) Empathy with a group or type of people is more commonly sought than empathy with an individual
- 2) Consensus seems to exist about the role of powerful images in stimulating empathetic reactions in students, but there is less agreement (or perhaps just less commentary) about the power of written language to do the same
- 3) The availability of suitable curricular materials exerts a major influence on the shape of the empathy curriculum

I also continued to note areas where my coding was more characterised by inferences than descriptions, so I would know when to be more tentative about my propositions.

During Stage Two I also realised that there were several thorny issues I needed to resolve to map what was happening in classrooms. One of these related to how I would code strategies for teaching empathy. The literature mentioned many different organising activities or exercises, but my analysis was not showing sufficient examples of each to justify having individual codes for them. On the other hand, little mention was made of the various “teacher talk” strategies employed to cultivate empathetic thinking – what I came to call *discourse strategies* – and these appeared with such frequency as to demand classification. I resolved this issue by categorising all major types of exercises as simply *activities*, and later in the analysis charted which activities each teacher used, and how often (see Chapter 7). The discourse methods received individual codes; they are also treated and discussed as strategies in their own right in the same chapter.

The other major issues all concerned ways of characterising teacher knowledge; here, theoretical matters merged with practical implications for my research. For one, should teachers' cognitions be referred to as *knowledge* or as *beliefs*? Should they be divided into categories of knowledge or belief, and if so, what should the categories be? And what was the relationship between them and reality? Were already-proposed "domains of knowledge" suitable for adoption, or did a study of empathy teaching require a fresh look at the sorts of cognition that were brought to bear? Far from peripheral debates, these matters affected the way I came to conceptualise my coding system and the ways I would think about the content of the "Knowledge" codes⁴² during my interpretation process; for this reason I now digress to review particularly relevant strands within academic writing about teacher thinking.

Teacher Cognition Research

Perusing the literature describing teachers' knowledge can be daunting: there are literally dozens of terms characterising various aspects of teacher cognitions and exploring how they hold and deploy their complex mental resources. To start, some writers distinguish beliefs and knowledge, saying that beliefs rely more on affective or subjective evidence, and are more disputable (Grossman, Wilson, & Shulman, 1989: 31), or asking whether "knowledge" not shown to be effective can truly be called knowledge at all (Fenstermacher, 1994). Others use the concept of knowledge more loosely:

It is important to realize that in the label "teacher knowledge," the concept "knowledge" is used as an overarching, inclusive concept, summarizing a large variety of cognitions, from conscious and well-balanced opinions to unconscious and unreflected intuitions. This is related to the fact that, in the mind of the teacher, components of knowledge, beliefs, conceptions, and intuitions are inextricably intertwined...although beliefs are seen roughly as referring to personal values, attitudes, and ideologies, and knowledge to a teacher's more factual propositions (Verloop, van Driel, & Meijer, 2001: 446).

⁴² For the coding I used a capital letter K for teacher's types of Knowledge, in order to distinguish them from the varieties of knowledge (no capital) they were trying to cultivate in students as a base for empathy.

Because of the way forms of knowledge are braided together, as well as the interpretive and judgmental leaps necessary to brand many cognitions as either “knowledge” or “beliefs,” in this study I use the term “Knowledge” in the overarching sense and label a family of codes as such – but I bring in a wider variety of terms in discussing specific statements to capture more subtle distinctions.

In fact, the debates about knowledge address a host of issues: what teachers know, how they know it, and how they hold and mobilise this knowledge in the course of teaching (Ball, 2000). Many researchers have subdivided teacher knowledge into categories, but Calderhead notes that “The knowledge which more directly informs practice seems to be held in a form which cuts across these categories...and has been described using such concepts as belief systems, implicit theories, schema, images, rules of practice, and scripts” (Calderhead, 1989: 47). Brown and McIntyre might add that it is structured as “cases” (1993: 10). Wilson & Berne take up the multifaceted theme by explaining, on the authority of empirical studies, that “Knowledge entails skills, ways of talking and interacting, ways of observing and noticing things in the environment, and dispositions toward action and interpretation” (1998: 178).

A major trend in current research is to argue that exploration of teacher’s knowledge simply may not yield a tidy picture of generalisable knowledge for sharing: knowledge is deeply personal in character, connected to a teacher’s personality and prior experiences (Connelly & Clandinin, 1990, cited in Kagan, 1992). As Sockett writes, “Context, personality, temperament, and style are not merely adjuncts to the knowledge base; they are the very stuff of practice” (1987: 209). This view is affirmed by a nuanced empirical study by Charles Anderson of a highly effective science teacher he calls Ms. Copeland. He describes her knowledge as being expressed in a *pattern of practice* that includes

the social norms and expectations that prevailed in her classroom, the kinds of work that her students did and her ways of evaluating it, the judgments that she made about what science content to teach and how to teach it, her ways of treating individual students who encountered problems, and many other facets (1989: 5).

The knowledge undergirding her work is social and pedagogical, and oriented to students as well as content. It is also both personal and context-bound: it

takes the form of her success in developing a rich and effective pattern of practice with those particular students, in that particular course, using the particular teaching materials and other resources available to her at that time. It is hard to say to what extent Ms. Copeland knew how to develop this pattern of practice in a more general sense (*Ibid*: 9).

Verloop echoes this theme, saying, “it has become clear that the greater part of teacher knowledge is strongly related to specific domains or contexts.” If knowledge is as local as he argues, then he is right that “much time-consuming research will be needed in order to depict the relevant aspects of teacher knowledge for a wide range of specific topics and contexts” (2001: 456). The aspects of teacher knowledge supporting Ms. Copeland’s lessons on photosynthesis may not be the ones supporting a history teacher’s lessons on empathetic understanding, and one history teacher’s techniques may not work for another – or even for the same person in different circumstances. Claims must be tempered. As Carlsen concludes,

If teacher knowledge is more – rather than less – context-dependent, individualistic, and historically contingent, then clearly we cannot avoid struggling with some difficult questions. For example, by studying what expert teachers know, we cannot automatically answer the question, “What should novice teachers know?” And the “wisdom of practice” discovered in affluent schools offers few simple lessons for teaching in general. Contingencies persist (1999: 140).

Despite these contingencies, however, the *types* of knowledge Anderson identified ring familiar from the teacher knowledge literature. In 1986, Lee Shulman ignited a trend by outlining a “knowledge base for teaching” comprised of seven types of knowledge: knowledge of the curriculum, learners, educational aims, other content, general pedagogy, subject matter, and “pedagogical content” (Wilson, Shulman, & Richert, 1987: 113). This last component is defined as including,

for the most regularly taught topics in one’s subject area, the most useful forms of representation of those ideas, the most powerful analogies, illustrations, examples, explanations, and demonstrations –

in a word, the ways of representing and formulating the subject that make it comprehensible to others...[It] also includes an understanding of what makes the learning of specific topics easy or difficult: the conceptions and preconceptions that students of different ages and backgrounds may bring with them to the learning (Shulman, 1986: 9).

Subsequent writings have clarified that this sort of knowledge is intended to include more than didactic teaching, as the original description implied; activities like debates and role-plays also fall within it (McDiarmid, Ball, & Anderson, 1989).

Though Shulman later toyed with his own categories (Carlsen, 1999), which did not appear to have been empirically derived in the first place, the approach of typologising teacher knowledge caught on and many similar versions arose from work in various school subject areas. For example, its categories overlap significantly with those of a speculative model proposed by Peter John (1991) for the professional craft knowledge of the history teacher. This model includes knowledge of history (subject matter) and knowledge of teaching history, which is comprised of pedagogical content knowledge, curriculum knowledge, organisational knowledge (which he defines as general pedagogical knowledge), knowledge of the institution (a new category), knowledge of education (meaning the teacher's perspectives and beliefs about education in general, similar to "knowledge of educational aims"), and knowledge of how children learn history. He also notes the importance of teachers' beliefs, values and attitudes. These are implied but not explicitly stated in the Shulman model, according to Gudmundsdottir, who emphasises the importance of a teacher's values and vision in teaching effectively (1990). Based on a single intensive case study, Elbaz (1981) developed another model – this one empirical – of a teacher's "practical knowledge," which separated it into five categories: knowledge of subject matter, curriculum, instruction, self, and the milieu of schooling. Pintrich (1990) also suggested that teachers' knowledge of self, and ways of managing personal goals and motivations, were fundamental to expert teaching. As can readily be seen, these and other models (Barnett & Hodson, 2001; Cochran, DeRuiter, & King, 1993; Dunkin, Welch, Merritt, Phillips, & Craven, 1998; Marks, 1990; Verloop et al., 2001)

bear striking similarities, and it is a rare typology that does not combine, to assorted degrees of emphasis, the elements of subject matter, pedagogy, students, curricular materials or strategies, and context.

In considering how to characterise teachers' knowledge about the cultivation of historical empathy, I was aware of these subdivisions of knowledge and felt that several were potentially useful. However, I was looking at a particular aspect of a discipline, and could not be certain whether they would actually apply given this lens until I began trying to code interview data for myself. In this process, I made several discoveries:

1. It was not possible to separate teachers' talk about *strategies* and *curricular resources* for teaching empathy, as use of a resource implied at least the beginnings of a strategy, and most strategies, for example showing a video, implicated certain resources (a similar conclusion was reached by Husbands, Kitson and Pendry (2003) in their empirical research on teaching). These forms of knowledge were thus blended in the *Knowledge of strategies/resources prompting empathy* code.
2. Knowledge of aims for empathy and achievements of it also manifested as two sides of the same coin, one facing the future and one the past but both depicting what counted as empathy and often spoken of indistinguishably.
3. In commenting on students, teachers were typically focusing on aspects of their learning, which then were treated as automatically implying something about teaching or pedagogy. Often the connection was stated outright in quick succession, and trying to code them as independent left incomprehensible units of meaning, so in four of the codes, knowledge of "students/pedagogy" were merged.

Several other codes not mentioned as knowledge-types in the literature on teaching various subjects proved helpful for understanding the teaching of empathy, so the system I finally developed for characterising this dimension of teachers' knowledge included the following:

- Knowledge of aims/achievements
- Knowledge of content
- Knowledge of educational context
- Knowledge of integrating empathy with other goals
- Knowledge of knowledge-conditions for empathy
- Knowledge of self/own thinking, learning⁴³
- Knowledge of students/pedagogy re capacities
- Knowledge of students/pedagogy re what's difficult or easy for empathy
- Knowledge of students/pedagogy general
- Knowledge of students/pedagogy re how react
- Knowledge of students/pedagogy re preconceptions, existing knowledge
- Knowledge of strategies/resources prompting empathy⁴⁴
- Knowledge/Beliefs about the value of empathy
- What it means to empathise⁴⁵

Most importantly, developing this coding system led me to two conclusions, one about the value and purpose of this way of conceiving of knowledge, and the other about the utility of “pedagogical content knowledge” (PCK) as a concept. To take the first, I often found myself coding interview data with more than one “Knowledge” code at once. Mulling it over, I realised this was not a problem – it was a statement about the highly integrated nature of teachers’ knowledge. They often actually *deployed* several types at once to make sense of a situation. As Carlsen wrote, “The ‘domains of teacher knowledge’ are best viewed as a *heuristic*, not an immutable roadmap of any real individual’s cognitive structure” (1999: 135, emphasis added). The revealing aspect of breaking them down into types was to see how they (usually) combined in practice for the achievement of particular teaching goals.

⁴³ This included the subcategory *assessing success at encouraging empathy/improvement*, where the focus was on the teacher evaluating himself or herself.

⁴⁴ This included the subcategory *source’s/exercise’s empathetic value*, where the teacher spoke to students *during the lesson* about the value of an activity or resource for empathetic understanding.

⁴⁵ Because this code was applied to both lesson and interview data, often inferentially, I didn’t name it the same way as Knowledge codes used exclusively on interview data. This code included the subcategory *assessing success at empathy*, where the focus was on students’ accomplishments.

Secondly, I drew the conclusion that PCK was too broad a concept to shed light on the phenomenon of teaching for empathy. Even its original promoters quickly found it necessary to break it down into “three clearly defined areas, ...each influenced by one type of knowledge [content, general pedagogy, or students], yet qualitatively different from the sources” (Gudmundsdottir & Shulman, 1987: 60). But some of codes I had developed (which resembled the categories illustrated in their article) transcended these “clearly defined” boundaries: *Knowledge of aims/achievements* spanned the areas of content and students, and *Knowledge of strategies/resources* sat on the fence between content and pedagogy. PCK was not helping either as a general or subdivided concept.

Other researchers encountered problems in applying it, too. Rick Marks’ study attempting to locate the concept in the thinking of mathematics teachers suggested that PCK included the highly *integrated* areas of subject matter for instructional purposes, students’ understanding of the subject matter, media for instruction in the subject matter and instructional processes for the subject matter. After providing examples of their overlapping or integrated nature, he concluded that “Any precise demarcation of pedagogical content knowledge from subject matter knowledge and general pedagogical knowledge is somewhat arbitrary” (Marks, 1990: 9). Studies by both Pendry (1994) and Carter (1990) raised doubts about whether PCK is in fact a separate facet of expertise, especially for beginning teachers, and McEwan and Bull argued that “all content knowledge, whether held by scholars or teachers, has a pedagogical dimension (1991: 318).

Finally, while PCK was praised for drawing attention to the issue of how teachers transformed their subjects, it also came under fire for its ideological bias and for its theoretical weakness. Some scholars denounced the way that it foregrounded subject matter knowledge while ignoring the broader social and moral context of teaching, and veiling the importance of knowledge about students (Cochran et al., 1993; Sockett, 1987; White, 2003). Others questioned its normative slant toward a particular image of “good” teaching based upon content expertise and the capacity to *articulate* thinking – a

product of its political origins in the effort to gain recognition for teachers as professionals (Pendry, 1994; Hagger, 1995; Burn, 2003). From both a constructivist point of view (Cochran et al, 1993) and a poststructuralist perspective (Carlsen, 1999), it was critiqued for presenting knowledge as static and systematic, and external to both teachers and students, rather than as something formed anew in new educational contexts. It was also faulted for failing to take account of the connection between power and the definition of knowledge; Carlsen suggested that modeling school subjects on academic disciplines led to the subordination of teachers' conceptions of subject matter to those of more powerful experts (*Ibid.*). Finally, the model of pedagogical reasoning promoted alongside the concept of PCK was challenged from a number of angles. This, however, will be addressed in Chapter 6, as it has little bearing on data analysis.

Stage Three

The next procedure in the CCM involved “delimiting the theory” – adding new incidents according to the rule of the properties, as well as “clarifying the logic, taking out non-relevant properties, integrating elaborating details of properties into the major outline of interrelated categories and – most important – reduction.” The goals of this stage are *parsimony* of variables and *scope* in the application of the system to a wide range of situations (Glaser & Strauss, 1967: 110-111).

I engaged in this process by conducting an exhaustive review of every code. In effect, I was checking for *reliability*, which according to Hammersley “refers to the degree of consistency with which instances are assigned to the same category...by the same observer on different occasions” (1992: 67). As I clicked through incidents assigned to each category in *ATLAS/ti*, I noted on paper each way the code was applied and whether they truly fit together and represented the same sort of information. Sometimes I developed subcategories within the codes, which comprise a finding about the variety of ways that different concepts were used by teachers. I added and back-applied codes when a category needed dividing, and eliminated or re-coded anomalous

examples, essentially “cleaning up” and standardising the entire system. Then I wrote a definition for the code that also included whether it had been assigned to lesson data, interview data, or both, and developed rationales for determining this. As I proceeded I collapsed some categories and removed a few codes (such as *focus/theme*) that were offering no insights into my research questions, so the final number of constructs came to seventy-one. (See the abbreviated code definitions in Appendix C.)

Stage Four

The final stage in creating grounded theory is presenting the theory, which at this point should be “systematic” and “substantive” (Glaser & Strauss, 1967: 113). Since the “theory” in the case of my study involved two parts, the actual analytic system and the writing of propositions using it in conjunction with other forms of analysis, I will focus on the former here and describe the latter later in this chapter as the process of *interpretation* – of re-integrating the separate bits of meaning into a new synthesis.

What I possessed at the end of the grounded theory process was a finding in its own right, a map of the constituent elements in the teaching of empathy of four individuals – a kind of definition of empathy-teaching as reflected upon and operationalised. I had also gained several tools that were deliberate by-products of its creation: a set of questions to guide my interpretation, initial propositions to review and possibly refine, and a picture of what sorts of remaining analyses would be profitable – namely, fine-grained analysis regarding already identified points, and where appropriate, quantification of teachers’ strategy-use. Finally, I had a deep knowledge of the contents of the transcripts, having now read or reviewed each at least four times in the coding process.

Fine-Grained Analysis

Despite my efforts to preserve some context for the segments of data by reading them *in situ* in the computer, it became clear during this process that the *ATLAS/ti* coding system could not shed sufficient light on significant aspects of teaching for empathy, such as the sequencing of classroom events, the ways students shifted the direction of the curriculum, and many finer points of teachers' language use, such as the ways they framed questions or injected new historical content as queries arose. Some of these matters, such as sequencing, were both too diffuse and omnipresent to work well as separate units of meaning; others such as micro-level characteristics of discourse were in theory codable, but proved too difficult to regularly attend to while simultaneously bearing in mind seventy-one other codes. Thus I now decided to systematically investigate the list that I had kept of sixteen inadequately addressed topics through a close reading and fine-grained analysis of twelve transcripts, three for each teacher. (See Appendix D for the transcripts chosen.) In this phase of analysis, rather than simply assigning codes, I read slowly through each transcript, marking them up by hand and scribbling notes on these sixteen issues specifically (further details of my methods follow).

To ensure that my analysis would be maximally useful, I sampled twelve from the complete set of transcripts according to certain criteria. First, I wanted to look at what teachers felt did and did not work well, so I chose two lessons they had regarded as largely successful, and one where their expectations were not met. I made sure that the transcripts also represented work with three different ages of student (with one exception, because two of Ms. Hayes' Year 7 lessons were too rich in terms of theory to pass up), three different historical topics and periods, and a variety of teaching strategies.

Because twelve transcripts was a lot of material to analyse systematically in detail, I needed to limit the number of topics that I would explore and examine what appeared most important and fruitful. While my approach was partly informed by techniques of conversation analysis – I was sensitised to some typical classroom discourse trends, for example – I needed to hone in on aspects of talk that mattered for empathy specifically, not

features and structures of dialogue generally. An unfocused analysis would be unwieldy given so much data.

To identify the topics for examination, I began with my initial list of inadequately addressed issues and read through the chosen transcripts bit by bit, jotting notes relevant to these issues and circling and underlining features with several colours of pens. After doing this for four or five transcripts, I started to see which characteristics would be most informative to investigate, and developed systems for looking at these in each transcript, including counting them where applicable. The characteristics – with my means of analysing them given in parentheses – were

1. The activity structure (listed all activities in sequence)
2. The nature of teachers' questions and framing of tasks (identified categories of 'who' questions, 'why' questions, etc.) and number of each (counted). Also, whether patterns emerged in types of responses made to each type of question (counted clear examples of obvious/mechanistic or thoughtful/probing responses)
3. Instances of students' shifting the direction of the curriculum (counted)
4. Length of student comments (counted according to the categories of *single word or phrase, one sentence, two sentences, three sentences, or four sentences*)
5. Patterns of turn-taking and control (recorded pattern of speakers, for example teacher-student-teacher)
6. Whether *descriptive* or *explanatory* empathy was the goal in various lesson segments (marked as D or E or both inseparably, made notes on how these were employed; supporting documents also coded in this way)
7. *Who* exactly students were asked to empathise with (listed)
8. Instances of teachers' adding new information or developing a point of historical content in response to a student comment or question (marked as A for add or D for develop in transcript, then counted)
9. How teachers diagnosed and handled misconceptions (made notes on whether these were addressed or bypassed, and in the former case how extensively)
10. Evidence that students were taking the content or activity seriously, or not (noted language and where possible affect of their responses to particular topics)
11. Themes in the teachers' choice of words and ways of using language, such as instances of humour, drama, affect (listed examples)
12. Whether teachers presented the past in *deficit* terms vis à vis the present, or in *developmental* terms, as having changed from

- what existed before the events studied (marked in transcript as *def* or *dev*, then made notes on which orientation was used for which topics, and at what point in the chronology of the lesson)
13. Quotations that particularly reflected the teachers' personal beliefs and values (listed)
 14. What sort of documents the teachers chose to support the lesson, and empathetic values or messages embedded within them (listed documents and examples of language – such as framing of questions and amount of contextual detail – and type of visuals – such as images from the time or modern cartoons – used in them)
 15. Striking features of the lesson: for example, unusual amount of teacher modelling of empathy, or exceptional amount of preparation work involved in collecting lesson materials (listed examples and materials)
 16. Lesson's place in larger, usually unobserved, sequence of lessons (highlighted teachers' comments)

As I proceeded, I summarised my findings from the marked-up transcripts, often in list-form, on a separate sheet. Having gained a clearer picture of how different features of classroom events were interacting – specifically with regard to their empathetic outcomes – I then incorporated the fine-grained analysis summaries for each lesson into the procedures for interpretation and proposition-writing described below.

Quantification

In the course of both analysis and interpretation, I occasionally employed simple counting, or calculated the mean number of instances of a phenomenon per lesson, in order to compare certain aspects of a teachers' work. However, this could not be done indiscriminately with textual units of meaning that varied in length, so I used certain criteria as to when it was appropriate. Units of meaning had to be discrete instances of a concept, not dialogic exchanges, and of roughly the same length; only codes applying to lesson data could be used; teacher and student statements could not be mixed; and examples of the content had to be meaningful in comparative terms. In practice, only three families of codes, and not every member-code within them, could be considered in this way: knowledge-conditions for empathy, teachers' empathy strategies, and students' contributions. The approach had the

advantage of offering insight into which aspects of historical knowledge certain teachers emphasised as laying the foundation for empathy (though only four of the knowledge-condition codes met the criteria for this sort of analysis), into the historical subjects with whom they encouraged empathy (see Table J, Chapter 6), and into their preferred activities (see Table K, Chapter 7) and discourse strategies. Mostly, the quantitative approach yielded further evidence and added clarity for making qualitatively-based claims about ways that individuals resembled or stood apart from one another in their practice.

Interpretation

Purposes

No sharp line divides the processes of analysis and interpretation in working with data, as they often permeate each other or function cyclically. The very process of breaking down social realities spurs questions about relationships between the parts and how to build a new synthesis. However, it is the heightened emphasis on *making meaning* from the bits that seems to mark what Harry Wolcott terms a “threshold,” because in the interpretation phase “the researcher transcends factual data and cautious analyses and begins to probe into what is to be made of them” (1994: 36). The purpose of interpreting data is to derive propositions or claims suggesting relationships between the coded phenomena, and to answer the questions posed by the research in the first place.

Principles

As usual, adherence to certain principles helped to ensure that the end products would have validity. I abided by the following requirements:

- All propositions must be supported by evidence from the original data, and qualified in accordance with how strong or weak that evidence is. Thus for example a teacher’s single tentative musing about differences in the empathy of boys and girls had to be presented as speculative, whereas consistent mention of the importance of pupils’ age, backed up

by different approaches to the year-groups in practice, could be confidently expressed as a characteristic of a teacher's (or teachers') thinking.

- All data relevant to a point must be collated for consideration; findings from all relevant *ATLAS/ti* codes, fine-grained analysis, quantification, and card-sort data amassed.
- Inferences made must be logical, so for example a teacher's decision to abridge discussion could not be attributed to preference if the reason was patently lack of time.
- Propositions may not exceed the limits of what the data will allow. Claims could not, for instance, be made for the history teaching profession as a whole on the basis of a case study of four teachers.
- In the move from raw data to abstractions, the teachers' actual language should be preserved as far into the process as possible, and in a judicious way into the findings themselves (see quotations in Chapters 4 to 7).
- A check for disconfirming evidence must be conducted and propositions revised if necessary – so for example the idea that teachers initiated explicit discussion of empathy issues had to be revised when it emerged that in some cases students were the ones raising the issues (occasionally more than their teacher).

A few additional words about validity of my findings are in order here. In judging validity, Hammersley (1998) recommends that the *plausibility* and *credibility* of the claims be evaluated, and where there are doubts, that of the evidence as well. As noted in passing, I have primarily attempted to certify my claims through developing systematic, critical, and careful procedures of analysis and interpretation (the latter described below), and in successive chapters I attempt to include sufficient references to my original data that readers may judge the claims for themselves. The methods of data collection described in Chapter 2 were also designed to strengthen the validity of the findings.

In a project of this nature, two other possibilities for establishing validity exist: triangulation and respondent validation. The former involves checking whether different methods of data collection (such as observation and interviews) and different kinds of data (such as transcripts, quantitative information, and card-sorts) corroborate each other. This I have done. On the other hand, I opted to only pursue respondent validation – having the teachers in the study verify the findings – in the most limited of ways. Apart from soliciting feedback from them during the follow-up interviews about various hunches, I tested aspects of my characterisation of their ideas on them in the Final Interview. However, I did not present them with the full claims of the study because of evidence that when confronted with this situation teachers tended to focus on different aspects of the contents than the researcher (especially on their own words) and not to offer much response or further insight to analytical or theoretical claims of meaning drawn from the data (Jaworski, 1994; Norman, 2000).

Procedures

In devising methods of interpreting my data, I structured my approach around the goal of answering my research questions and the fact that I wanted to do so at two levels, that of the individual case and of comparison across cases.⁴⁶ It followed that for each aspect of each question, there were these two levels of examination. The logic of my project suggested that I first attempt to draw conclusions about the first research question (RQ1), which asked how experienced teachers conceptualised empathy and its role in historical understanding; this seemed a key issue to understand before investigating their thinking, practice, and learning processes through the other four questions. So for this question, I developed a procedure that I was later able to employ in parallel for the others, even though they were less clearly bounded and more complicated.

⁴⁶ Technically, the individual cases are *sub-cases*, since the case itself is empathy teaching. I use the terms “individual case” and “cross-case” to refer to the particular teachers within the main case, as these terms are less awkward and easily comprehensible.

To answer RQ1, I first extracted all data that I deemed relevant, mainly from the transcripts, but also from the fine-grained analysis summary sheets and where helpful from supporting documents or from the card-sort about teachers' goals used in the Initial Interview. The bulk of my data was now coded in *ATLAS/ti*, and I readied the program for searching by creating "document families" that included every transcript for a particular teacher. This way, when I searched for every statement assigned to a code like *assessing success at empathy*, I would get output in the form of a list of *only that teacher's* ideas about assessing success. By pulling up one teacher's family of transcripts at a time, I could perform a within-case interpretation and then only when I had a clear picture at this level, take the step of comparing the results across cases.

Naturally, the next step was to identify all codes that spoke to a particular question. For RQ1, for example, this included *what it means to empathise*, *Knowledge of aims/achievements*, *Knowledge of integrating empathy with other goals*, *Knowledge/Beliefs about value of empathy*, *assessing success at empathy*, *teacher values* and *research effects*. Then I would choose one at a time, output the list, and read each quotation. As I went through, I began to identify trends, categorise what I was seeing, and reflect about how the teacher's thinking (or actions) as revealed within that code-category fit together. For example, Joslin usually seemed to speak about empathy in terms of grasping historical, as opposed to back-projected, attitudes. When working with codes that cut across data types (teacher as subject or informant), I monitored the nature of information contributed by each and linked them to construct a picture of the teacher's thinking – thus Joslin's questioning strategies focused students' attention firmly on the past; her thinking and practice appeared highly consistent. Sometimes teachers used similar types of knowledge in different ways depending on context – for example, they might talk about *what it means to empathise* differently in interviews than they demonstrated in a lesson. How did various forms of data square up, and when dissonance existed, what might it signify? Sometimes real tensions between hard-to-reconcile goals emerged, sometimes teachers'

thinking was in flux, sometimes matters just required clarification – as when Dow said he thought empathy was about how *ordinary people* felt, but in practice often focused on powerful individuals; it turned out he had meant only that his *personal interest* focused more on ordinary people, while empathy was applicable to both.

Fundamentally, I was condensing, describing, organising, and trying to explain what I saw, and writing all the details into a new document – a findings summary – that I created as I went. This summary was meant to be a thorough characterisation of the teacher’s views or practices for that code, as revealed through the transcripts. It included illustrative quotations and any typologies or hierarchies suggested by the evidence. After I had all the useful transcript information in my new document, I reviewed it *alongside* the fine-grained analysis summary and other relevant findings, thought about them, reduced and abstracted them further into essential findings, and when possible wrote propositions about them. Often I revisited the initial propositions and hunches about a teacher that I had developed during analysis and decided whether they would be saved and developed or refined, or dropped. When it proved helpful, I also imported interpretive concepts from other studies – such as Gaea Leinhardt’s notion of *routines* (1986) – to try to account for a particular teacher’s actions, and I frequently pondered what I was discovering in relation to claims made in the literature. (Other examples are explained in the ensuing chapters in discussion of the findings they illuminate.) I then re-read the output listing and other data sources to check for discrepant information, and if all appeared to be justified, I followed the same procedure for all other relevant codes and then for the other three teachers. This common approach paved the way, methodologically, for cross-case work.

Now I was ready to examine the four individual cases in comparative perspective, which involved the intriguing business of searching for similarities and differences, gauging variety between the teachers and formulating fresh theoretical generalisations. It also meant interrogating the data in terms of the interpretive questions I had been recording throughout the process of analysis, or that were raised by literature I had read along the way. For example, I

asked “How do teachers’ ideas, approaches, and expectations vary according to the age or perceived capacities of the students?”

Having explored the data in every pertinent way I could imagine from a *within-code* perspective, I then sometimes wrote comparative propositions – for example, the two more experienced teachers possessed more formal systems for evaluating empathy in written work – or claims that would later be arranged as sub-points of more-encompassing propositions. Other times I delayed this step until I had findings summaries for the other codes and data-sources relevant to a question, and then mulled all of these findings simultaneously. Interpretive frameworks from other scholarship sometimes aided in explaining what I observed, though I was cognisant of not wanting to coerce my data into ill-fitting moulds. Occasionally, I found it helpful to turn the findings summaries over in my mind for a few days before pressing on to the propositions stage.

I repeated this process using the findings summaries for all codes relevant to a question until I felt the data had nothing new to offer. While this was a relatively straightforward process for my research question about conceptions of empathy, answers to the other questions were more interwoven. For example, tacit aspects of the *knowledge* addressed in RQ2 were *expressed through* the actions spotlighted in RQ3. RQ5 about factors helping or hindering teacher’s work actually constituted a sub-question of RQs 2, 3 and 4; it was kept separate mainly for heuristic purposes. The research questions, derived from the literature and influenced by divisions found there such as the thinking-practice dichotomy of Argyris and Schön (1974), were helpful as analytical devices, since they allowed me to identify and explore key aspects of teachers’ work. But in interpreting the data, I found it necessary to look *across* research questions, to seek patterns from all angles. For example, I asked how teachers’ conceptualisations of empathy (RQ1) shaped their instructional practices (RQ3), or how the constraining realities of the classroom (RQ5) influenced the ways they thought about empathy as a concept (RQ1). As I began to group the propositions I was developing into emergent themes, I discovered that I needed to find a way of reporting my

findings that was true to their highly interlinked nature, rather than prising them apart to conform to a research-question-and-answer format.

Ultimately, I decided to use a different writing technique to present the individual cases than the cross-case findings. Wanting to give a flavour of the style of the teachers in action, and to try to present their beliefs and work as holistically and colourfully as they appeared in life, I decided to pen *portraits* of each of them at work. Through this vehicle, I could show how the areas addressed by the research questions came together in the creative choices made by each person, and could report approaches too idiosyncratic to be picked up in the cross-case comparisons. These portraits, then, form the substance of Chapter 4.

The following three chapters report the findings of the cross-case analysis and interpretation, or the single case of empathy teaching. They present my final propositions divided in the way I felt most natural for the data and simultaneously manageable for me. Chapter 5 focuses on teachers' ways of conceptualising empathy and its role in the history classroom; Chapter 6 addresses the factors influencing the teaching and learning of empathy, principally through the lens of the teachers' understanding of these issues; and Chapter 7 describes the construction of the empathy curriculum, particularly with regard to the strategies employed and how teachers learned from their own efforts and other sources.

Chapter 4

Portraits of the Teachers in their School Contexts

This chapter focuses upon crafting a rounded sense of each teacher's classroom persona. It looks especially at how the participants used *themselves* – their experiences, convictions, and humanity – as vehicles for encouraging empathetic thought. What did they value in their interactions with students, and how did the styles they adopted support their goals for students' empathetic learning? How, in turn, did students interact? These dimensions did not lend themselves to measurement, so I have opted to sketch portraits of the teachers situated in the context of their departments and communities. These also serve to introduce the teachers prior to presenting their empathetic knowledge and practice in the following chapters.⁴⁷ Teachers' groupings of their history teaching goals from the card-sort exercise in the Initial Interview are also presented in Appendix F. In addition, their own distinctive voices are captured in Appendix G, where I have included one full lesson transcript for each, chosen as fairly characteristic in terms of the teaching style employed, range of activities, and students' contributions.

My rationale for attending to how the teachers' personalities came across in the classroom originated with comments they made. Quite early in the data collection process, each of them identified students' motivation as a condition for empathy; pupils had to possess a *desire* to understand historical figures. In practice teachers felt they engendered this in a number of ways, one of which concerned their interactions with students and the tone they set of was what possible and permissible in classroom life.

The scholarly empathy literature also suggested that examining “classroom climate” issues was worthwhile. In an article about historical empathy, Christopher Blake argued (without empirical evidence concerning *history* teachers in particular) that

⁴⁷ For three of the four teachers, I believe these portraits enabled me to capture a sense of their skill in cultivating empathy; key aspects of Joslin's expertise, however, emerged more clearly through the deeper analytical probing associated with the subsequent chapters.

Further exploration is now needed into the area of human dynamics in the classroom and how these affect the scope and operation of empathy, since my own studies suggest that the intersubjectivity of students and teachers is an essential prerequisite of empathic thinking. Put simply, empathy requires a certain kind of human learning environment...Up to now we have considered empathy primarily in terms of source materials and their associated processes. Now we need to examine how the issue of human relationships impinges on the potential for empathy... (1998: 30).

Another author described teachers as “emotion workers,” people who laboured to create feelings or states in pupils through the establishment of emotional links and a persona (Labaree, 2000: 230, following Hochschild, 1983: 147). Parlaying this into achievement required a certain delicacy:

Teachers are asked to use the leverage obtained from their primary relations with students to support the teaching of a curriculum that is external to these primary ties. To be really good at teaching requires a remarkable capacity for preserving a creative tension between these opposites, never losing sight of either teaching’s relational means or its curricular goal (*Ibid.*).

Finally, Connelly, Clandinin, and He (1997) elaborated in case-study form how a teacher’s total setting – her personal life and experiences both inside and outside the classroom – were interrelated and important for understanding her teaching.

In response to these various influences, I decided to offer portraits of each teacher at work during the 2001-2002 school year.

MR. DOW

At the time of this study, Dow was in his tenth year of teaching and his third year as Head of Department at a large mixed comprehensive for ages 11-18. His school, located in a small southern English town, served pupils from relatively advantaged social and economic backgrounds, few from ethnic minorities, and about 15% with special educational needs. His “mixed-ability” year-groups during this study included a sizable Year 7, a Year 9 that ranged from lively to unruly, and Years 10 and 12 that were a little low in past-attainment terms. Like colleagues in his department he also taught Religious Education and Geography, though he specialised in History and possessed a passion for it which he clearly enjoyed transmitting:

It’s a brilliant subject, it’s ceaselessly fun to do. The dynamic you can get going in lessons...the last GCSE lesson was just pure bliss, they just responded so well. They came in really excited, wanting to know what they were going to be doing, and they are just loving history (T57: 186-190).

Outside of his own lessons, Dow was involved broadly in the profession. He presided over a reflective department where members sometimes co-created curricula and discussed matters like whether (and then how) a disturbing film like *Amistad* should be used in the classroom. Additionally, he voiced his concerns at Examination Board meetings and in letters to the Board about the accessibility of the GCSE History examination in literacy terms, and about the exclusion of the Holocaust from a number of GCSE syllabi. He also reached independent professional judgments about what was best for pupils, rather than catering unquestioningly to the notions of Ofsted.

Within the classroom, Dow sent the message to pupils that there was no time to waste. From his own quick pace of speech to the fast back-and-forth interchanges in classroom discussions, a polite sort of briskness was the order of the day. However, the tone was not all seriousness; his lesson about D-Day, for one, contained five separate instances of joking or levity with students (sometimes followed by their responses in kind), and his Henry VIII lesson, which included the playing of a game of chess, had ten instances of playful ribbing and jests. He wheedled one of his players, “You’re looking very worried

there, Marcia. Come on. Pucker up!” (T17: 10), and admonished another student to “At least appear convincing in your guess” (63).

Students felt comfortable enough to tease their teacher too, accusing him of “making up ridiculous questions” (296). Though intense in terms of content, the class had an informal vibe, with students referring to Dow by his surname, not “Sir,” spontaneously applauding him on the last day of class, and in the summer asking to move out of the classroom when it was very hot (he could be responsive to such requests). Furthermore, Dow used language of a sort that pupils could easily relate to: he described a guest speaker, a World War II veteran, as “not like a *big tough brave* soldier going out there like a John-Wayne-style hero” (T33: 26-27).⁴⁸ He portrayed Tudor characters as knowable, using language like “old Henry” (T17: 42), “a bizarre character” (637), or “a goner” (251). He also included sensory details, calling Campeggio the “wily, gout-ridden old Cardinal” (143-144). This incidental-seeming language contributed to a sense of the past’s being within reach, and for Dow it was important that history be accessible and not elitist.

The teacher also gave an impression of being on the pupils’ side when he crafted humorous mnemonics for various facts; for example, he suggested they think of Archbishop Warham as “Fighting Pig” (T17: 88). In the same 65-minute lesson, on six different occasions, he did brief role-plays of a historical figure’s thoughts, and the students responded unprompted with four role-plays of their own. On nine occasions in the Henry VIII lesson, Dow found ways to relate the historical information to his students’ lives, for example asking analogically, “So is it like...the normal teenager rebelling against how his parents brought him up?” (446). He also told them when he personally found historical events moving, powerful, or amazing, giving a sense that he cared deeply about these matters and was focused on his own feelings as well as intellectual understanding. And in both lessons he offered students clear reasons for his curricular decisions – reasons intrinsic to history, such as telling his Year 9 class that “The *Saving Private Ryan* video...is a deeply moving

⁴⁸ Here and throughout this research, I use italics within teacher quotations to indicate their original emphasis on the words, unless otherwise noted.

experience for [the veteran who came in] because he feels like he was back on the beach when he sees D-Day because it is so realistic. So we're going to watch that" (T33: 96-99).

While setting high expectations for pupils' learning, Dow expressed support and respect for their efforts, for example saying to Year 9, "I'm interested in the sort of views you have on that [video]" (T33: 373-374), and responding to Year 12's ideas with comments like "brilliant explanation" (T17: 396), "That's a good point – that's getting into his character" (463), and "Superb! He [student] is on a roll today...absolutely right" (220). He gave lots of written feedback on their coursework, and explained to me,

My marking policy is that you start off with a positive comment. Everyone here has tried extremely hard, so if the comments seem a bit over-exuberant it is deliberate to try and boost them...Then I try and think of a constructive comment, so I normally try and lead my comment off based on something they've done a little bit but could have done more on (T61: 471-476).

Dow used a number of unconventional, experimental approaches in his teaching to enrich it empathetically – such as simulating the shots at Kennedy's assassination through popping balloons in conjunction with playing an actual tape of the event (which confused pupils exactly as intended about the number of shots fired). While not everything worked this successfully, students appeared to treat these ventures as fun rather than derisive, probably partly because they recognised their teachers' expertise and confidence as a historian. He gave his view on topics when they asked for it, but reminded them it was open to challenge, and on two occasions pupils did contest his positions. Perhaps one good indicator of his pupils' motivation to understand the content in the Henry III lesson was the fact they raised nine fresh questions or new angles during class discussion (T17) – and these became new foci of attention.

MR. INGRAM

Ingram, a young Scot in his fourth year of teaching and his third serving as Head of Department, taught at an average sized comprehensive school for boys aged 11-18. Though serving very few pupils from ethnic minorities, the school population included those from a full range of socioeconomic backgrounds, including some from a housing estate. While the town was growing, Ingram also noted that many families had remained there for generations and possessed rather parochial views about the world outside. Ingram had assigned himself several of the most challenging classes to teach, in order to lighten the burden on a newly qualified teacher in the department; his pupils included bottom band Year 7, 8, and 10 groups. All of these classes contained a higher than normal percentage of students with special educational needs, and not a few with chronic behaviour and maturity issues. In light of these realities, Ingram, who described himself as politically “left of centre” and permitted only socialist posters to be put up on his classroom walls, held social as well as history-related goals for students. For instance, he tried to instill a sense of manners and of responsibility for arriving prepared to learn, worked to counteract racist and sexist ideas, and encouraged a higher degree of self-belief. After a lesson on the Germans after their 1918 defeat, he remarked of his students,

I think the principle thing is that they don't have the confidence to believe they can do it – *maybe* that will change. But with most of them it is that they don't believe they can do it, and they don't want to, and it's not cool – so how much I can change that, I don't know (T22: 516-520).

He also tried to serve as a positive role-model for them, and to promote the value of education. When a pupil became riled up about losing his pen, Ingram directed, “I'd like you to concentrate on actually improving your education at the moment...it is merely a *material* good, your pen. It can be replaced. This is your *one* shot at education, we can't lose that” (T30: 433-435).

Though he upheld certain values, preachiness was not his style. He conducted whole-class sessions in tones of high energy and high volume, strove to keep things entertaining and fun when possible, and moved around

the classroom trouble-shooting during small-group work. At times he bantered in mildly insulting ways; for instance, in discussing medieval woolens he noted, “So – clothing isn’t going to be – I was going to say, as nice as you lot have got, but looking around – ” whereupon a student broke in, “Thanks,” and Ingram chuckled (T7: 324-329). Or when in setting up a role-play, he stated, “What you have to do now is you have to imagine that you are among the most *powerful* and *important* people in the country, [lower pitch] that shouldn’t be too difficult for you to imagine” (T3: 47-49). He was lavish with praise when they performed well – “*Excellent* amount of learning there. I’m very impressed” (T34: 95-96) – and correspondingly blunt when exasperated with their lack of initiative – “You’ve got them [the answers] written in your bloody books! It’s not rocket science to actually look at them” (T30: 652). Overall, he cajoled them to focus, exhorted them to think, and bellowed praises – but equally boomed out threats and communicated when their work was “dreadful” or “appalling.” He did not treat their sensibilities as particularly delicate. They responded quite eagerly to this style of interaction, if not always that seriously; often there were more hands raised than he could call on, particularly with the younger boys.

Ingram’s lessons tended to follow a pattern. He began by writing the day’s key questions on the board, and started class with a review of previous topics. He then introduced new material and often had them do a short written exercise to process the information and record it on paper in preparation for a more extensive and active empathetic performance of some type. The coda for most lessons was a recap on the day’s learning. Exchanges tended to be fast-paced, with shifts in the basic activity common, which he felt prevented them from losing concentration. This routine, with minor variations, allowed him to keep control and gave pupils multiple opportunities to grasp the salient points through reinforcement. Repetition, as well as focusing on one general topic in depth, were major strategies he used since he felt they made points stick in students’ minds.

Among Ingram’s strongest pedagogical goals was accessibility; thus he was particularly pleased by sessions marked by high levels of engagement and

participation. Influenced by a university lecturer who taught history not as a body of received wisdom but as something of which all were part, he cultivated a similar sense of openness:

I tell all the kids that 'History's a great subject. You don't need to know anything, and you can still have an opinion on it, and there's nobody's right or wrong, you know?' And I think – I would really like to think that everybody can be involved (T54: 277-280).

Over the course of the year, Ingram spoke more about his concerns with the factual rigour, security and extent of the students' knowledge base grounding their interpretations – he wanted to use their preconceptions as material to be explored – largely (it appeared) as a product of his own research and reading for a Diploma course that he was doing. This was a year of significant changes in his pedagogical thinking. But through these shifts, he retained a view of the importance of making history approachable by all, and worked to find little handles and hooks that would draw students in given their own starting points.

MS. JOSLIN

Joslin, who had thirty-two years of experience in the classroom, had taught for the past twenty years at the girls' school in the same town as Ingram. Her department members collaborated on sharing ideas and producing curricular resources to a considerable degree, though in the year of this research Joslin had personally undertaken the creation of several new units of work and was teaching them for the first time. Her classes included a mixed group of Year 7 pupils, one calm upper band Year 9 and one slightly distractable, lower band Year 9 group, as well as a top band Year 10 class. This last group contained a number of pupils with an arrogant streak, whom Joslin characterised as "too cool for school," and another subset of girls who were dutiful but quiet and "not much fun to teach" (T47: 819). This combination of traits – an aberration from her usual experience at the school – affected her own ways of interacting in the classroom:

*I feel more restrained with this group... This has been an odd group for me *right* from the beginning. The ones that I taught last year and that were *very* interactive last year...have clammed up, and they weren't at all that way last year...So it could be some social dynamics that's making them clam up, but it's having a snowball effect, it's having a sort of chicken-and-egg effect. I'm not at my *best* with that class. As soon as I find them being distant and quiet, I don't relax with them in the way that I do with other classes... (T36: 633-637, 643-646).⁴⁹*

Joslin's interactive style generally involved jumping straight into a historical topic at the start of a lesson: she believed in motivating pupils by "engineering success," and maximised use of time that was already short. In this sense, her style appeared to have been shaped partly by the school context in which she worked; since an orderly learning environment was the norm, there seemed to be less urgency or demand to "hook" pupils into a topic to keep them on task. Rather, she devoted a great deal of thought to designing activities such that students had the knowledge and equipment to perform well, which she believed tended to boost morale. Once they were engaged in

⁴⁹ As noted in Chapter 2, Joslin's occasional practice of drawing attention to the radio microphone and taping equipment used for this research – intended as both a management technique and a motivator – may have actually intimidated some pupils from talking. When asked about this, she agreed it was possible but probably not the reason.

an activity, she was most affirming of their efforts; for example after they had written role-plays, she said, “It’s great! Stop criticising yourself; it doesn’t matter if it’s not perfect” (T6: 627), and another time she commented, “I knew you were smart, but this is excellent” (T52: 280). When students were confused – relatively infrequently since she repeated instructions a number of times and often wrote them as well – she gently steered them onto the right track. In discussions, she took time to make sure she understood what their ideas actually were before addressing them; she considered diagnostic skills important and fine-tuned the use of her own by listening carefully.

Stylistically, Joslin was quick to laugh, colloquial in language, and expressive with her language and face. She also often crafted amusing lines and voices for historical characters off the cuff, which made pupils smile, and signaled her interest in them as people by taking pictures during their field trip and posting them on the wall.

In terms of organising lessons, Joslin appeared to have a clear sense of what she wanted to emerge, both in terms of understanding and in terms of oral outcomes and written notes that pupils could take away for review. She believed in having high expectations, but also in providing pupils with the tools and resources they would need to meet them. To get there, she sometimes tended to manipulate the course of question and answer sessions, framing questions rhetorically when they were not the answers she wanted to hear, as in “Okay [repeat of pupils’ answer], but were there any other...?” or “but the thing I was thinking of and that nobody has said yet...” She occasionally projected feelings onto students, saying for example

You have some information after the lesson on witchcraft on Thursday, but you don’t have a complete picture. Now that leaves some of you feeling quite frustrated and worried, I’m sure... So we’re going to put some sort of order to it all during this lesson, and that I’m sure will make a lot of you feel a lot more secure, because we’re preparing to do an assessment which will take the form of a causation essay (T32: 6-12).

Indeed, with her top band group, discussion of rationales in examination terms was quite a common method of motivation; she knew that it was important to them and was concerned that they be well prepared.

It was difficult to tell at times what the pupils made of these types of interaction. They sometimes joked, and often got excited about the historical materials at hand, which were colourful and varied. At the same time, they rarely seemed infected by fiery curiosity or care, and occasionally appeared annoyed when “tangents” that interested them were largely bypassed; some lessons they asked few or no questions of their own accord. Two of the groups were not forthcoming enough with contributions and thoughts to make it easy to sense their inner thought processes. But class responses varied hugely from group to group. Her Year 7 girls appeared to thrive with the highly structured and controlled circumstances, while the older ones sometimes resisted in subtle ways, and generally seemed to feel little group cohesiveness. Joslin’s surprise at this sort of reaction suggested that it was not the lively atmosphere of discussion normally kindled in her classroom – indeed the contrast was greater since she reported that other groups during the research year were engaging enthusiastically in the subject matter. It was difficult to alter the tone, however, when the pupils were offering minimal input to work with – a reflection of the high degree to which they could exert influence on the resulting curriculum regardless of a teacher’s plans and intentions.

MS. HAYES

Hayes taught in a medium-sized comprehensive school for 11 to 18-year-olds, in a quite small southern English town in an economically advantaged area. Pupils' attainment was above average on entry, and the percentage of students with special education needs was slightly below average. Most of the students were white, and many had limited experience beyond their hometown.

During this study, Hayes was starting her fifth year as a part-time teacher, a career she had enthusiastically taken up when her own children were no longer small. Her teaching responsibilities included a fairly rambunctious Year 7 group, one bottom and one middle set of Year 9s, and a Year 11 group that was mixed but "weighted toward more able" (T55: 102). She was gaining particular satisfaction from learning to tailor curricula so that weaker students understood, and found herself very interested in their learning struggles. Her department was a major source of support and camaraderie; all of the teachers appeared to talk often and share resources, if not always approaches.

Hayes' preferred mode of teaching was whole-class work and discussion. Teacher-led, it was nonetheless interactive; Hayes often ran conversations with a sort of floating agenda, allowing students' immediate concerns to shape the direction but making sure vital matters were addressed at some point. In addition to relating her own experiences, she made considerable space for pupils' anecdotes, about which she said

I feel strongly that this gives the kids 'a handle' on the topic, it lets them realise that history is all around us. I really want them to appreciate that the past is not just a museum exhibit but about real people with real feelings! (T49: 819-822).

Though she approved of a skills-based approach to history, she also saw value in narratives:

When I was taught history we were often told stories, and I suppose in a way that is the thing that makes you interested... But now you don't teach stories, you give them evidence and let them work it out for themselves. I think that's okay, that should be 80% of it, but how are they going to work it out if they haven't got some sort of a story in the

first place, if you don't say, 'This is a version of the Spanish Armada that was accepted for years. Now look at the evidence and see if you think that version is right'? And the story business is not good and it's something you are not supposed to do. I am a control freak and I do like structure, but I think the way that history is going is trying to make it very structured and very quantifiable. And history isn't maths or science at the end of the day (T55: 711-720).

Hayes' stories appeared to have a big impact on students, no doubt partly due to her skill in relating them. Her style of speech could be characterised as deliberate and dramatic, full of juicy adjectives and adverbs as well as strong emphases and pauses. Some of the stories also had morals, or brief comments on the values involved. In one lesson, she told the story of her visit to Therezin and Auschwitz concentration camps, and used that as a transition to the topic of what happened there historically, keeping a normally fidgety class spellbound and silent for fifteen minutes. On this and other occasions, she shared a great deal of information about her personal life and her feelings with her pupils, for example in relating the story of how, "because I'm a mum" (T27: 171), she couldn't stop crying on seeing a child's rag doll at Therezin, or revealing her part-Jewish ancestry and current religious persuasion (319). In a medieval history lesson, she expressed her personal sense of wonder while looking at an artwork: "Now I think the Bayeux Tapestry is absolutely amazing, because you've got to remember that this is nearly 950 years old. That is really, really quite incredible" (T49: 19-21). Her sharing of personal anecdotes seemed to have the effect of encouraging students to do the same: on four occasions her Year 7 students either brought in materials relating to medieval life or contributed their outside knowledge and experiences to the discussion, and Hayes responded to a student's tale of staying in an Edinburgh castle by saying "Wow" twice and asking him to bring in some pictures (597-601).

Indeed, Hayes' lessons showed a teacher extraordinarily tuned in to her students as individuals, a fact that harmonised with her historical comment that "people fascinate me" (T55: 223), her tendency to spin out the full human significance of events, and the fact that four of the six goals she pulled out as ranking most highly in her card-sort were those concerning effects on pupils

and their growth. When her students made comments that she found useful, she revisited them later in the lesson, crediting the sources. She genuinely seemed to like and enjoy kids: she praised her students on six occasions during the Therezin lesson and follow-up, saying things like “Dan says he would have fought and helped his friends – I think that’s really good, Dan,” (T27: 425-426) and commenting afterward, to me, about how students were “very sweet” (583) or “really good and really into it, they were lovely” (721). Hayes also liked a laugh; she joked disarmingly about her “failed” attempts to be trendy and cool, and informed her Year 7 students that at Roman feasts, “If you did talk, you were supposed to talk about really important things like *life* and *death* and great teachers, it was not polite just to have a gossip” (T11: 522-523). She also good-naturedly tolerated the ribald humour of some students in her Year 11 class.

Linking history to students’ lives was a key feature of her interaction with them. In one lesson, Hayes crafted nine illustrations relevant to their lives, and in another gave eleven illustrations connected to their experiences, as well as six examples from her own. Analogies and brief role-taking also served to render the foreignness of the past accessible; in her session on castles, she used just one analogy and five role-plays; for her concentration camps lesson, she used nine analogies and four role-taking episodes (sometimes making actual students characters in the examples, for example as Aryans because of their colouring). Pupils appeared to find Hayes’ approach quite engaging; they participated eagerly in both lessons, sometimes clamouring for the floor, and their interest shone through in the twenty questions and comments they offered without elicitation in the castles lesson, and in the eighteen in the other.

Chapter 5 (Findings I)

Conceptualising Empathy and its Role in the History Classroom

Introduction

This chapter describes the major comparative findings of my study with regard to how the four teachers thought about and operationalised their conceptions of historical empathy, and how, dialectically, the practice of teaching shaped their conceptions – for their practical ways of thinking about empathy contrasted with the sharp conceptual clarity of ideas in the philosophical literature. Two main aspects of their thinking are examined: what they believed empathy to be, and what the process of empathising involved. They revealed their thoughts in several ways: through their stated definitions and ways of talking about empathy and its role; through their identification of empathy-related lessons for me to observe; through their comments about and actions to create the conditions required for empathy; through their choice of teaching strategies and their rationales; and through their assessment beliefs and methods. Several thematic threads also weave through the chapter. These include influences on teachers' existing ideas and on changes in their thinking during the year, the interplay between their perspectives and practices, the responses of students and what they suggest about the effectiveness of certain approaches, and the relation of teachers' ideas to claims and interpretive frameworks put forth in the history education literature. Propositions distilled from the text are listed at the beginning of each section, denoted with the ♦ symbol.

Conceptualising Empathy

Definitions

♦ The teachers' formal definitions of empathy were similar.

Because this research aimed to uncover teacher's personal ideas about empathy, I asked them in the Initial Interview to define the concept as they construed it. They expressed their ideas with ease.⁵⁰

Dow:

Empathy is the ability to understand how someone would think and feel and react in a given situation that they're in. So the way I explain it to students is to put yourself in someone else's shoes, or take your head off and put their head on. But it's being able to effectively recreate the parameters, the limits, the guiding forces of their actions and their thoughts, and to clear your mind of what guides our thoughts...and to replace them with their values and thoughts (T57: 392-397).

Hayes:

I think we have to be careful. There is a danger of thinking that we can identify with people in the past, and I don't think we really can totally identify with them. I like to think of empathy as an understanding of people in their historical context, an understanding of the experiences of people in the past and an understanding of why their experiences led to them behaving or reacting the way that they did. I suppose you're effectively trying to get yourself in the body of the person and see it through their eyes... (T55: 457-462).

Ingram:

Empathy is to understand how an individual or group of people would have felt about an event in their life, I suppose...and then trying to imagine how you would react in that same situation...you've really *also* got to then put *yourself* in that situation, which is the more difficult bit, because you're bringing all your own modern-day baggage with it...And I suppose then going on and understanding why people acted in the way they did because of that (T54: 371-372, 384-392).

Joslin:

I used to think it means that you're putting yourself in the shoes of someone who lived in the past and you're trying to describe the way they would have felt about things... Now I think of it much more broadly. It's all about understanding...why people acted in the way that they did in the past. And that goes back to attitudes because attitudes inform actions, and attitudes are the product of the environment in which you live and the historical context... And so anything that helps gain insight into why people think and do what they do given the time in which they live must be somehow in the realm of...empathy (T56: 531-534, 538-547).

⁵⁰Their articulateness was probably influenced by their receiving the interview protocol in advance, but their later off-the-cuff comments resembled these both in terms of content and ease of speech.

The definitions resemble each other in several respects: they focus upon understanding perspectives held in the past, while highlighting the importance of context and expressing some degree of wariness about injecting one's own views into the effort. While there are differences, they are most striking for their basic similarity. When Dow defined empathy for his class – and he was the only teacher to do so as a matter of principle⁵¹ – his presentation of it was consistent with his interview comments, with extra emphasis on the switch in mindset: “To try and put yourself a hundred years back, in the situation of someone who is fighting in a war in appalling conditions, takes quite a leap! You’ve got to clear your head of all the thoughts you’ve got and put on the head of someone else” (T29: 29-31).

The teachers' statements also reveal the aforementioned two major aspects of conceptualisations of empathy. They speak about *what empathy is*, for example an “ability” or “exercise,” and of *what empathising means* (or what it involves doing), for example “understanding,” “identifying,” or “imagining.” The first two sections of this chapter will explore these aspects, and the third will trace the expression of the teachers' ideas through their assessments of students' empathy.

What is Empathy?

◆ Teachers defined empathy in terms of five categories of nouns (see Table D), which they did not treat as mutually exclusive.

Teachers described empathy in a number of ways, all of which coincided with the conceptions raised in the literature reviewed in Chapter 1. They variously called empathy an *achievement/performance/goal*, a *vehicle/route/approach/tool*, a *skill or ability or set of skills*, an *activity/exercise*, or a *habit/disposition*. While some of these representations of empathy co-habitate in a state of friction since they suggest slightly different outcomes and procedures, the teachers did not seem to feel compelled to pare

⁵¹ Joshn briefly defined it for students as “how people in the past thought and why they thought the way they did,” but this was a research effect, a result of her introducing me to the class. As explained later, she typically avoided use of the term empathy.

down the number of meanings. For example, one might speak of doing empathy exercises (in the short-term) to cultivate a habit of empathy (over the long-term), or speak of empathy as a vehicle for building understanding of particular ideas as well as an achievement in its own right. Notably, none of the teachers talked about empathy in certain terms sometimes disapproved of by researchers, as an *intuition* or *special power*. While they may have thought of empathy in terms other than the ones they used in their interviews, the table below shows what each actually said.

TABLE D: WHAT EMPATHY IS

	Dow	Hayes	Ingram	Joslin
Achievement/performance/goal	✓	✓		✓
Vehicle/route/approach/tool	✓	✓	✓	✓
Skill or ability (or set of them)	✓		✓	✓
Activity/exercise	✓		✓	
Habit/disposition		✓		✓

Identifying Lessons: Empathy as Integral or Discrete

◆ What teachers believed empathy to be, and especially whether they characterised it as an integrated tool or skill or a discrete exercise or skill, had a strong influence on how they organised practice and identified lessons of relevance for this study. All of the teachers ultimately expressed that the integral view of empathy best characterised their position.

How the teachers conceived of empathy had a strong impact on which lessons they invited me in to observe. As discussed in Chapter 2, two teachers' concepts of empathy changed – subtly for Dow and fundamentally for Ingram – over the course of the year. For all teachers, the extent to which they viewed empathy as discrete from other historical skills appeared to be influenced by the way national curricular documents and examinations conceived of skills. Ultimately, all of the teachers identified the integral view as the one that most closely matched their own; they saw it as linked to skills including causation and consequence, the use of evidence (in terms of source provenance, deductions, and argumentation), and understanding of change and continuity. It also was integrated with work on more instrumental skills like ICT and

literacy, and used in a way that aligned with teachers' pedagogical values, such as broad student participation, active learning, enjoyment and variety. In crafting lessons, teachers were not weighing empathy alone in the calculus.

For Hayes, her method of pinpointing lessons with an empathetic component remained stable over the whole year; her definition of it did not appear to change at all (though her thinking about how to help students develop their capacities did). This was the case because from the beginning she believed that you couldn't teach history without empathy: "...it permeates it" (T55: 623-624) – "You seem to get into it in most lessons, because as soon as you start talking about what happened you have to start thinking about the thinking that led to it" (T49: 765-767). She simply selected lessons where empathy played a key, *if integral*, role.

Empathy was integral, but distinct from other skills: it might *inform* an argument, be cultivated *alongside* evidence skills, be *delivered through* causation, be *involved* in making judgments, and be a *vehicle* for making sense of complicated topics or simply for engendering interest. Because it was no longer a National Curriculum lesson target, she felt she could only "get away with designating the odd lesson as being for empathy, but we can't really focus on it" (T63: 134-135). Like Dow and Ingram, she thought of empathy as secondary to assessed skills, which had to be prioritised to give students a fair chance on the exams. In fact, she viewed it as separate from knowledge as such; before a lesson on the Hitler Youth, she said, "I'm not sure how good this and the next lesson will be for empathy. "With this [Year 11 curriculum], it's got to be a compromise between 'How do you feel about this?' and 'How well do you know this?'" (T14: 10-12). Empathy in her mind seemed to be connected with the feeling and discussion-oriented parts of a lesson, which were somehow distinct from other types of knowledge-cultivation and procedures. Despite her chagrin at how time for empathy had to be sacrificed for other skills, she did feel that small steps, over time, would lead to students' acquiring more of an *empathetic disposition*:

I like to think that if they get into the habit in History lessons of trying to think of what life was really like for these people, whoever these people at that point might be, that eventually they'll do it more or less

automatically, and that will be something that really interests them anyway (T63: 209-212).

Joslin also explained early in the year that empathy was bound up with other concepts and skills like causation and evidence-interpretation, “almost the foundation of them in a sense,” and rarely a discrete thing (T56: 689-690). In the central skills and concepts for Key Stage 3 and GCSE, it was also no longer separated out, but subsumed, especially under causation. She felt that all lessons had an empathetic element; it would be impossible to teach a lesson without (T64: 608), and it was already so prevalent that if it were flagged up separately in the National Curriculum she would not necessarily do it more (T64: 697-699).

This broad view encouraged her to think quite openly about identifying lessons where empathy would play a role. Over the year, she did not seem to shift her concept of what empathy was, probably because she had already done considerable thinking about it in earlier years. She explained that in the past, she had thought that empathy was limited to “imagine you’re a ...” role-play activities, and that in the time of the original GCSE requirement it meant writing empathy-style essays in timed conditions. The exam boards

dictated our thinking for a while and stopped us from thinking broadly as good historians about what empathy really was...we were teaching empathy without questioning...whether the way they were testing it was actually really historically exactly valid or whether it could be done in that way... Thinking more broadly about it has come gradually (T56: 130-131, 701).

It appeared that Joslin had experienced growth in her conceptual thinking about empathy, just outside of the temporal bounds of this study.

In contrast, Dow for the purposes of this research was initially thinking about empathy in terms of producing a type of *exercise*, just as he might produce an activity on change over time. He regarded it as an *end result*, associating it with traditional kinds of assignments like the World War One letter from the trenches. Before the research formally started he expressed concerns about whether it would be fruitful for me to observe his older students:

I was thinking through my Year 10 lessons I'm teaching, and I'm struggling to think of pure empathy lessons, what I would think of as pure empathy lessons that you can be able to visit. There's nothing as clearly focused as this [WWI unit] is on empathy in my Year 10, partly because the course is so tight that I really haven't got time to sort of start delving into the different skills which aren't on the examinations (personal comments, 14/09/01).

In particular, he considered it a "bit of a luxury," something you could do in the Lower School (with students up to age 14) where GCSE and A-Level exam pressures did not exist (T65: 130). In those situations, the most important goals were getting students to understand the events, being able to handle sources, and being prepared for the questions. Through reflection over the year, he came to be "more aware of how much you use it without necessarily realising that you're using it, that it's quite an important component" – crucial, in fact (T65: 293-294).

Something of an epiphany seemed to occur in a discussion of a Year 12 class on Henry VIII, Anne Boleyn and the Church. He began by saying,

The empathy comes through developing an understanding of what was going through Henry's mind. I'm not going to make a claim that that was pure empathy as such. You could say it was historical analysis of what one person was doing...most history teachers probably wouldn't describe it as empathy (T17: 665-667).

As he pondered it further, he began to shift his view:

And so if you are trying to understand someone's conscience then you've got to start trying to get on the *line* in which he was thinking. When you start doing that you are effectively putting yourself in someone's shoes, which is, effectively, empathy...yes, I would say that at heart there is an empathetic exercise there. So yeah, I'll come off the fence! (690-696)

Thus by the end of the year he had expanded his definition from the "traditional, pure kind" of empathy (where it is the sole focus) to a "grey area" where it is not just an exercise, but also a *route or vehicle* involved in many things – "as much a route to a goal as a goal in itself" (T65: 149-151). And through this altered awareness he recognised that it was not just for younger students, but for GCSE and Sixth Form, too.

Lastly, Ingram underwent the most significant changes in his thinking about empathy, perhaps partly because his departmental context differed from that of the other teachers. Where they often shared ideas and resources with their colleagues, Ingram was relatively isolated in a small department where not everyone taught history. The study therefore provided him with a somewhat unique opportunity to debrief about his own practices. At the same time, coincidentally, he participated in a Diploma course at a local university, where he began conducting his own research on historical interpretations and perusing the history-teaching literature. The combination of these two factors seemed to incite major changes in several of his viewpoints concerning empathy.

For most of the year, Ingram identified empathy lessons as those with specific *exercises* involving a written or acted empathetic performance such as hot-seating⁵² or re-enactment. The *methods* were the empathetic part, and could be applied to different topics as befitted them. Equally, empathy was not to be mixed with other goals: lessons on primary evidence needed to be separated from empathy lessons so as not to overwhelm students. He explained,

And that's the whole debate, whether history should be broken down into different – little chunks, you know, this is this, that, or all together. I do believe that it should be into different chunks, I think it's – it's too difficult to expect a Year 7 to be good at history. What does that mean? You know. So I think source interpretation is a completely separate lesson. And as they progress through the school, you then begin to put those things together. But, I mean, even the new AS's, they're examining different skills. You know, it's not about bringing them together; if anything, it's about keeping history, you know, the different bits (T54: 666-674).

This view changed, and he came to see that empathy was “not a stand-alone thing, but...something that underpins all of the study that we do” (T62: 89-90). He planned to use empathy primarily as a tool to add interest and promote greater understanding (whether or not he followed through on this was out of the bounds of the study to determine). It didn't always have to

⁵² Hot-seating refers to an exercise in which the teacher or student(s) take on the role(s) of a historical figure and are presented with questions by the class about themselves and their lives, and must answer in character.

involve the creation of a product, it could be present whenever students were engaged in a thinking process. Particularly, it had a bigger role than he had originally imagined in helping students understand cause and effect (T34: 932-934). Sometimes Ingram appeared to surprise himself with the new ideas that emerged in the interviews, such as when in discussing his use of an analogy between attitudes toward the poor in Elizabethan times and today he said it wasn't particularly empathy-related, just intended for *understanding*, and then concluded, "I suppose that is empathy, about understanding attitudes" (T42: 590-591). Though his thinking was changing, he only expressed most of his resulting fresh ideas about implementation during the Final Interview, and in the form of *plans*; even examining his last few lessons in light of his shifting thinking, I could not detect changes already enacted beyond the lesson identification differences noted in Chapter 2. My sense is that he was just reaching clarity about his thoughts and deciding how to realise them as my visits ended. As he stated in July 2003,

I think in the past I have probably pigeon-holed things, and now I am looking at a much more 'together' picture of how to teach history. I think that I would be using sources and interpretation an awful lot in future...as part of my teaching...I'll be thinking 'This is an interpretations lesson where we have to use sources, and then from those sources we will hopefully then begin to empathise with the authors of those sources' (T62: 230-232, 238-240).

What Does It Mean to Empathise?

◆ The teachers' conceptions of the mental activity of empathising emerged through the four categories of proxy verbs they used to characterise it. While differences of emphasis in the teachers' use of these verbs were evident, they were united in speaking about empathy in ways distinct from the academic literature.

Teachers did not speak of empathy solely as something arrived at or displayed, as in Table D, but also in terms of mental activities as listed in Table E – processes often doubling as products – that led to or enabled the expression of empathy in Table D terms. Subtle variations in teachers' ways of characterising what one was *doing* when empathising emerged most clearly through the proxy verbs they used for empathising, both in the classroom and

in interviews. These fell into four categories or dimensions, with verbs of similar meaning grouped together. However, the categories are not meant to be rigidly bounded, but rather to suggest different emphases. Sometimes there is overlap because the teachers' liberal approach defied strict categories; they are not always mutually exclusive. Teachers also used the words differently at different times or in such a way that meanings across categories shaded into one another.

TABLE E: TEACHERS' CONCEPTS OF WHAT IT MEANS TO EMPATHISE

TO EMPATHISE IS TO:	EXAMPLES OF TEACHERS' LANGUAGE IN TRANSCRIPTS
<p>1. THINK / REASON / PUZZLE OUT This refers to analytic acts aimed at explanation.</p>	<p>Think about what it would be like Consider the alternatives Think about how you would feel Work out why they reacted in different ways Make links between the events</p>
<p>2. EXPERIENCE / FEEL / SENSE / RECREATE / GET INTO This refers to experiential and affective cognitions and generally also means to IDENTIFY in some measure.</p>	<p>Get such an intensity of experience Sense the frustration Get immersed in a period Re-live the experience Be stirred</p> <p>Identify at a level beyond gory details You must identify with people or it won't work Overview helped them to identify in some way Relate to why people respond differently to things</p>
<p>3. UNDERSTAND / GRASP / SEE / KNOW This involves a cognitive appreciation of attitudes that can be known (non-speculative).</p>	<p>Understand what it meant to individuals Understand what led to their actions See the framework and restrictions Be able to explain what the attitudes were Get your heads 'round that situation</p>
<p>4. IMAGINE This refers to envisioning or supposing in a way intended to join the evidential dots into a descriptive or explanatory picture. In some cases it refers to a more creative process.</p>	<p>Imagine the kind of fear Imagine if these rules were brought in today Imagine you are a villein in medieval times Just imagine those smells Pretend you're at a gladiators' tournament</p>

With the exception of Dow, who did not use the verb "to identify," all of the teachers spoke in terms of all of these dimensions, often using and interchanging them in a relaxed manner that contrasted with the analytical refinements and advocacy of a discrete meaning for empathy characterising

much of the academic literature (see for instance Boddington, 1980). However, their classroom and assessment practices also showed individual differences in accent on the categories; analysing the teachers' language revealed *both* their shared terminology and their individual weightings of concepts.

Expressing Ideas of Empathy through Classroom Practices

◆ Conceptual differences led to different emphases in terms of classroom strategies to cultivate empathy.

In terms of his empathetic aims, Dow constructed his practice and resource-selection to provide as powerful and vivid a sense of history as possible – to him the *experiential* aspect of empathy (category 2) where history was brought to life held great value. He did not shun the affective component in terms of what he wanted students to undergo:

Some of the things that we study I feel hit my emotions quite hard, and I want to try and transmit that. I'm sure I'm not alone in this. You want to try and make it hard-hitting, make it dynamic, make that moment come to life again, and if you don't throw yourself into it and try and find interesting ways of doing it then you're not going to be able to recreate it. Just try and transmit the character of the moment (T57: 578-582).

Videos, which provide a kind of simulated immersion experience, were one strategy he used fairly often to achieve this; he also used slides as “emotive data” to build up a rich composite picture of conditions (T13: 570). He spoke of the impact of visits to historic sites, such as the WWI battlefields, on pupils, and used a number of simulations of varying degrees of verisimilitude. He also favoured the thinking/reasoning view of empathy (category 1), and leaned toward decision-making approaches wherein students had to figure out a course of action in light of given historical constraints.

Without excluding the place of thoughts and mindsets, Hayes tended to speak most about empathy in terms of thinking about *feelings* in a way that could be interpreted as invoking both reasoning and imagining (categories 1 and 4). Many of her questions took the format of “How do you think you would you feel if you...?” She also used the idea of identification (a

subcategory of 2) more than other teachers; making history relevant and accessible to pupils was a dominant value of hers. She enacted this idea through strategies such as then/now comparisons (brief and extended), and whole-class question and answer sessions where she could translate historical ideas into terms understandable to students.

Joslin's approach was focused on empathy as the understanding of *attitudes*: what they were and why they were held (categories 1 and 3). She worked on developing students' knowledge of people's feelings only about half as often as other teachers. Believing that students would revert to the personal, emotional sides of empathy naturally – usually drawing ahistorical parallels with their own experience – she stated, “I don't do anything to *encourage* them to live in the experience,” but instead directed them toward concentrating almost exclusively on what people in the past would have thought (T64: 169-170). Consistent with this, she emphasised working with sources, and had developed several types of disconfirmation exercises⁵³ to combat misconceptions.

Ingram reserved a strong place for imagination (category 4), both as supposal and creativity, in the empathetic process – he often instructed students to imagine themselves in a particular scenario. This stance reflected his view that “history is about imagination anyway. And it's about creating as clear and vivid a picture of the past as you can with what you've got” (T54: 704-705). He tended to use imaginative reconstruction exercises, projective exercises,⁵⁴ and role-plays. Further details of the teachers' strategies are given in Chapter 7, but these examples provide a glimpse of how teachers' conceptions of empathy shaped their curricular plans.

⁵³ Strategies “that rely for their impact and effectiveness upon the shock of things being other than was confidently expected or predicted” (Shemilt, 1984: 72).

⁵⁴ These exercises take the form of a “direct invocation to project one's psyche into the past” (Imagine you are a...), a personal diary written as a historical figure or type, or a letter home (Shemilt, 1984: 67).

Setting Boundaries

- ◆ The teachers' conceptions of empathy were not philosophically parsimonious but they did in every case exclude certain key "misdirections."
- ◆ The two teachers (Joslin, Dow) who set and maintained the clearest bounds on what empathy was *not* were also the two most aware of the media/political debates over the concept and its assessment; their comments suggested the connection was not accidental.
- ◆ The teachers (particularly Hayes) verbalised tensions between the cultivation of "pure" historical empathy and what they sometimes encouraged in practice; inconsistencies tended to be products of their need to reconcile multiple values and goals that pulled in different directions. For teaching *students* to empathise, they could not adopt an uncompromisingly discipline-based model.

The teachers had views about what empathy was distinctly not, often expressed through the types of activities they regarded as legitimate. While Ingram accepted a less-restricted role for the imagination than other teachers, he called actual attempts to live in the past, as in the television show *The 1940s House*, "rubbish exercises" (T54: 388-389). He also avoided showing historical-fiction films in the classroom, because of the problems of aligning them and the understanding they engendered with "*real* history" – he would show only documentaries in class⁵⁵ (T54: 342-343).

Dow said empathy did not involve creating "pure narrative," simply sitting and imagining you were somebody without any greater preparation or depth (T57: 411). Before urging students to "imagine" – which Peter Lee has pointed out is actually an instruction to cash knowledge already possessed (1984a) – Dow spent considerable time building their knowledge base and helping them to understand the parameters of plausibility. He mentioned his awareness that empathy exercises attempted without a sufficiently solid foundation of context had come under fire in the past.

Joslin echoed that empathy was not just about writing in first-person "I am a medieval peasant" (T40: 1000). She added that it didn't involve imagination in the creative sense of the word – which "is coming from you as a

⁵⁵ Ingram did mention using an excerpt from *Blackadder*, however, and said that he would have used *Gladiator* if he had a copy, so he was open to making occasional exceptions but didn't do so in the lessons observed for this study.

twenty-first-century individual and is going to be anachronistic” (T56: 599-600) – nor did it mean sympathy, nor the imposition of one’s personal views and attitudes onto past figures. Notably, as the most senior teacher, with thirty-two years of experience, she had taught through the raging political debates of the 1980s over the meaning of empathy and how to formally assess it, and the clarity with which she defined and bounded empathy was partly a product of her experiences during those times. Preserving empathy-as-a-historically-valid-endeavour in the face of its detractors involved some honing of her views on the subject, though she never agreed with those who felt it should be excised altogether.

Finally, Hayes ruled out several conceptions of empathy, but in doing so raised important questions about the relationship of theory to practice. On the one hand, she distinguished empathy from sympathy and generally kept them separate in her teaching. However, in an “empathy” lesson about deserters in World War One who were shot despite the military’s admitting to a lack of proper evidence during their courts-martial, sympathy appeared to be the primary reaction sought. Both the disturbing video *Shot at Dawn* that Hayes showed and the subsequent research pupils did on the internet focused almost exclusively on the point of view of the deserters and their families who were seeking posthumous pardons; the army’s logic received only brief attention. When students were asked to write a letter to Tony Blair arguing either for or against these pardons, it would have been difficult for a pupil to fully reconstruct the general’s rationale – and brave to attempt to do so. Likewise, Hayes rejected a view of empathy as “pretending you are a (fill in a role)” – which she equated with play-acting. Yet she used this strategy despite misgivings, saying, “[W]hen we do role-play at school I am sometimes not that happy about it. The kids love it, but I think there is a certain arrogance in assuming that we can act how people acted in the past” (T55: 463-465). And lastly, she was aware of conflicts between how past people understood their situation and how we would view it, but she often encouraged students to think about how they themselves would feel anyway. She recognised this tension in the very first interview:

We have to realise that there is a real problem here. It's like the saying 'to take the historian out of the history,' we've almost got to take ourselves out and our own experiences out before we can empathise and have a real understanding. But I think from a teaching point of view...it's important that we at least try, and that we encourage the kids to realise that they have to understand that these people were different. It's not a case of how you would feel if you were in a trench. Yes, that is largely the way we approach it, to be honest: 'How would you feel in this situation?' In a way your feeling of this, your understanding of this, is going to be so different to how it was (T55: 469-476).

What to make of these unresolved issues, which have such a strong bearing on practice? One interpretation might be that Hayes lacked clarity in how she conceptualised empathy, or lacked knowledge about how to follow through in practice. However, I think these views are both flawed for at least the latter two cases mentioned above; she showed a distinct awareness that the sort of empathy she was cultivating was not "pure" from a historical point of view, and neatly problematised the issue herself. Without a doubt, she had the skill to adapt her practices to match the sort of empathetic standards to which historians aspired. However, as a history *teacher* she wasn't using academic norms as her sole model; she had other matters to consider, including the role of moral judgment in the classroom, and issues concerning students: what would motivate them, what would provide them with an entrypoint to a bygone time? While she had a set of views about what constituted proper empathy, she at times prioritised other, competing goals; empathy was rarely the only objective in the lesson.

Effectively, Hayes was grappling with what Magdalene Lampert has described as a "set of forced choices" (1984: 13), and like the teachers Lampert wrote about, she possessed "a variety of alternative strategies for coping with conflicts that enabled [her] to work *without* choosing" – for example, even as she asked students to think about how *they* would feel in some situation, she would remind them how difficult it was to re-capture the actual feelings past people had – inserting this caveat helped her to serve two agendas at once. However, while it was accurate to characterise the relationship between thinking and doing as "created by the teacher in moment-by-moment classroom interaction" (16-17), she could also analyse the contradictions

abstractly, and knew that she was “*managing* problems, rather than *solving* them” outright (15).

Here, as in other respects, the pressures operating on teachers differ from those affecting historians or educational researchers, and their ways of talking about empathy reflect this. Unlike scholars, who have taken great care to delineate different concepts of empathy and examine their validity in terms of the academic disciplines of history and philosophy of history⁵⁶ (see, for example, Lee, 1983, 1984a), or to define the teaching of empathy as a process consisting of four distinct but interrelated phases (Yeager & Foster, 2001), teachers are only as philosophically rigorous in their talk about empathy as it serves their purposes to be; they reject important misdirections in terms of what qualifies as empathy, but do not bother much with fine distinctions. They do not seem to feel a need to be parsimonious in their thinking; for them, empathy is an umbrella term covering several related notions. In some cases they override their convictions about “pure” historical empathy when there is a higher goal at stake, such as cultivating *sympathy* for a certain moral or civic view. Their functional conceptions appear to be shaped in the classroom by the process of trying to *teach* empathy – to specific students, under certain constraints – and there may be little point in thinking of empathy in terms of nuances and strictures that are not helpful in those circumstances.

To be fair, even as some academics criticise compromises with “content integrity” (Ball, 2000), there are hints of awareness in other corners of the history education literature that empathy for students has different requirements than disciplinary empathy, that a separate logic may apply. Peter Rogers (1987) suggested that a presentist frame of reference may be necessary for students to make connections and see the relevance of a topic, and from a psychological point of view, Nancy Dulberg (2002) demonstrated that ten-year-olds of all ability levels needed to make personal links with historical material before striving to understand it. Peter Lee (1984a) acknowledged that maybe students needed to identify, to actually *share* the perspective, of those

⁵⁶ Although there is nothing like agreement among historians as to which of these conceptions is valid, and their own descriptions of the empathetic process use a wide variety of terms, often loosely and unapologetically.

they studied in order to make sense of it, and Christopher Portal (1987) argued that several modes of teaching might be necessary to help students progress through the stages toward sophisticated empathy. Among these he included personal projection, background knowledge, and an opportunity to identify. Finally, Christine Counsell, in response to press attacks on “trendy teaching” of empathy, defended teachers’ efforts at the level of classroom strategies not used in academic circles:

Highly imaginative, fun activities are not an attempt to bypass the serious work of history but rather to provide access to it for those pupils who were previously fobbed off with low-level colouring-in, missing-word exercises and model-making. The problem is that some commentators confused ‘accessible’ with ‘easy.’ History teachers only make things ‘accessible’ in order to help the refractory learners into a truly challenging task that they would otherwise shun or fail in (1999: 19).

Dimensions of Difference in Teachers’ Thinking and Practice

◆ These teachers’ thinking differed considerably on four conceptual dimensions:

- ✧ the role of imagination in empathy – the teachers generally used it in a restricted fashion. In terms of effects, it appeared detrimental chiefly when it was not *firmly connected* to use of historical evidence;
- ✧ the framing of empathy as personal or historical: how would *you* (students) feel/think versus how *they* (people in the past) felt/thought – there was consensus that the latter was a more sophisticated type of empathy, but varying views as to whether the former could usefully serve as stepping-stone and aid to relevance. Effects indicated that “you” formulations led to more presentist responses, though students sometimes moved past these, and a delicate balance of the two could produce positive empathetic results given enough time.
- ✧ the dilemma of the potential liabilities and assets of trying to engage students’ emotions and concern through connections with their lives – tentative outcomes suggested that some measure of emotional engagement (as opposed to strictly historical engagement) could support historical thinking by motivating students to care and then focusing that caring on matters historical.
- ✧ the relation of empathy to moral judgment – teachers were more wary about the *idea* of making or encouraging value judgments than the practice of doing so in lessons, though they all avoided

sensitive areas concerning the students' identities. When asked, they justified their practices in terms of the civic or social role of the study of history.

Many of the questions facing teachers in teaching for empathetic understanding had no obvious answers, and they negotiated them in their own ways. Four dimensions of difference across (and sometimes within) teachers' thinking about empathy as a concept show how varied these approaches could be: the role of imagination, the issue of how *you* would feel versus how *they* (in the past) felt, the often related dilemma of engaging students' emotions, and the relationship between empathy and moral judgment.

The Role of Imagination

Imagination in history has a number of meanings: it can be a synonym for "thinking" or "envisioning," it can serve as the adductive thread connecting the evidential dots, it can involve a pondering of alternatives available to someone in a given situation, or it can evoke a more creative and fantastical process. It is therefore necessary to look at what particular teachers in my study meant when they told students to "imagine." Joslin used the term infrequently, and in interviews she connected it firmly to making sense of evidence, to "developing through the imagination a picture of how things were" (T64: 513), not "just grasping at anything that comes to your mind and that leads you to everyday empathy and writing wildly off the topic and out of focus" (T64: 183-184). She used one imaginative first-person writing exercise about the Black Death because it satisfied certain criteria:

This is just what I've asked these rather weak twelve-year olds to do because they can engage at that level. And I wouldn't be asking them to be a medieval peasant when they're doing GCSE History, but at age twelve I think they can engage at that level. They don't have to know every detail about peasant life in order to do a good job about what a peasant would think caused the Black Death. It's limited enough somehow not to become historically misshapen (T40: 1000-1005).

Dow, similarly, evoked imagination rarely, and with regard to a specific, *limited* scenario or source, for example "Imagine the kind of fear that is so

agonising it just twists your stomach up and you feel you can't do anything" (T29: 463-464). He was aware of the dangers of imagination run amok:

I think that, in terms of empathy, teaching in the past had a bit of a bad press, that people would put a question 'Imagine you're a Russian soldier in Moscow or St. Petersburg during the Russian Revolution. How would you feel?' Boom, straight into it, with no greater preparation or depth to it than that. So, in a negative sense, empathy can be associated with a piece of fiction, pure narrative. Children like it, children like writing stories, and so they'll write very copiously and with great gusto – but it's not very historical. So I think good empathy has got to have a discipline about it, and it's got to have effective build-up and it's got to give the students parameters and limits on what they can or can't say (T57: 407-415).

For the most part, Hayes followed a similar pattern, calling upon students to "imagine" in connection with using particular evidence, not pulling something out of a hat but thinking in an informed way. Sometimes she loosened the strong tie to evidence, though, and the perils were evident. In a lesson she taught to Year 7 on castles, for example, students had little testimony to consult except for two pictures of a wood and a stone castle. In the course of imagining the feelings of the Norman lord and lady about their abode, they let their imaginations soar, as younger children especially seemed prone to doing – suggesting, for example, that they simply build all their houses in a circle with one big fire in the middle to solve the problem of smoke from fires, or huddle for body heat. Hers was not the only class where this difficulty emerged with younger pupils, especially on topics that were naturally challenging given their age and experience; unmoored from sources, logical reasoning often was treated as a highly speculative endeavour. This occurred, for example, with regard to imagining the feelings of someone captured as a Roman slave (Hayes: T11), with projecting Elizabeth I's feelings toward Mary Stuart and how to cope with her rebelliousness (Ingram: T3), or with guessing what many nineteenth-century women did on a regular basis that made them weak (Joslin: T9).⁵⁷ Younger students were seemingly as eager as older pupils to try to reason things out, but (with notable exceptions) just did it less effectively on the whole.

⁵⁷ Answer: had babies

By contrast, for Ingram, “imagine” was a favourite verb, used most heavily during the early and middle parts of the year. He continued to employ it throughout the study, but to a lesser extent, and by May he was both linking it more tightly to evidence and logical reasoning and discussing some of its liabilities. Right to the end, however, he asserted the responsibility of students to help fulfil imagination’s positive potential:

...there is only a certain distance that empathy can go, and that’s in *explaining* what the conditions were like, and then it’s down to individual imagination – and you can’t really teach that, I don’t think. You have to give them enough information to then hope that they have some *imaginative* understanding (T38: 661-665).

He occasionally used his own descriptions of past events and places – as of the execution of Charles I, the atmosphere in the Roman gladiatorial ring, or High Street in medieval Oxford – to set the scene and spark the students’ imaginations about historical details. Sometimes this sort of exercise was connected to a source, as of an engraving of the crowd at Charles’ death. Other times the exhortation to imagine was used in wide-open fashion: “try and *imagine* what it would be like to *be* the person you’re going to create on this sheet [a member of medieval society]...imagine how you feel about life” (T7: 194-195, 415). This led students to state feelings about life that more closely resembled those of the year 2001 than 1201 – such as medieval women’s resenting their husbands for oppressing them. Such formulations call into question Christine Counsell’s optimistic pronouncement that the “Imagine you’re a badger” approach – the “naïve” version of empathy questions – is altogether a thing of the past (2000: 2). By the end of the year, however, Ingram was in fact relegating it to history:

[B]ecause of doing this [participating in the research], and also principally because of my Diploma course,⁵⁸ then there are perhaps things that I would do in the future that I haven’t done now. I think they are the same sort of basic exercises, but I’m going to structure them a lot differently. Q: Such as? A: Such as stopping asking kids to ‘Imagine you are ...’ I would get them to imagine what another person was thinking more, move away from that (T62: 11-19).

⁵⁸ Ingram was participating in a professional development Diploma course on history teaching at a local university during the data collection year for this study. For the course, he conducted a research project on interpretation in history.

The Nature of Understanding Sought: Personal or Historical?

Ingram's transition from "you" to "another person" brings us to another dimension of difference across teachers. All of the teachers at times used both the "you" and "they" pronouns, asking students questions like "What would you think (or feel) if you were in this situation?" and "How did they did view this?" Because of the usage of "you" to mean "one" (third person) in many cases, the semantics of the issue often made it difficult to interpret what the teachers wanted, precisely. The fine-grained transcript analysis showed that Dow tended to frame questions in the "they" format – "What would *they* understand about what caused the war?" (T29: 44-46) – but when switches of pronoun took place, there was no clear pattern, only a likelihood to mimic the version students used in their comments. Much of the time, teachers did not seem to be choosing the pronouns consciously during interactive discussion. When asked how he differentiated between the "you" and "they" formulations that he sometimes used back to back, Dow seemed to be working through his ideas afresh:

I think I'm not quite clear in my mind. I think there is a bit of confusion there and I think there is a hell of a lot of overlap. I think, going from the top of my head, that the second of what you said ["they" version] is a more developed sort of style, where you're trying to achieve a higher level which requires a deeper understanding of the context or the historical situation...I think I'm just being a bit contradictory in the words I use [in class], so I don't want to read too much into it (T65: 201-204, 222-223).

However, they did sometimes think about the issue outside of class, and in the case of Joslin had mostly banished the "you" phrasing of the question even from her in-class speech. She didn't want to encourage pupils to put *themselves* into the past, but rather to stretch to understand authentic *historical* reactions. In fact, in the lesson on attitudes toward vagabonds, she gave dozens of reminders to "put your sixteenth-century hat on" and consider views "at the time"; she also gave five warnings not to let their modern views and opinions interfere. The results in the presentations that followed were, she said, something to celebrate: "they were *totally* immersed in the sixteenth-

century way of thinking and none of the attitudes that they expressed seemed anachronistic” (T6: 713-715).

As indicated in Ingram’s original definition of empathy at the beginning of this chapter, he believed from the beginning that using *both* the “you” and “they” orientations was vital to students’ understanding. In his usage, he mixed the order of his directions and often did not differentiate between these tasks, as illustrated in the following excerpt.

- Ingram: [W]rite me a short extract explaining why it is that you – imagine that you are your age now in Germany in 1936 – why *you* would join the Nazi Youth... [one sentence later] Why is it that somebody would join the Nazi Youth, why did they decide to join the Nazi Youth?
- Pupil: So it’s *my* ideas.
- Ingram: Yes (T38: 361-365, 400-402).

This approach, which often caused students to seek clarification and also to give present-minded responses (more with younger year-groups than older ones), also underwent change in the course of the year as a product of Ingram’s own research. In the Final Interview, he stated, “It’s very difficult for them to imagine they are a Roman soldier. They need to try and imagine what that particular Roman soldier would be thinking, because they have to realise they’re putting their own interpretations on it” (T62: 50-52). A few moments later, I checked to validate my understanding of his future focus, and he responded

How another individual would have felt, yes, rather than ‘What would you feel like?’ There is still a role for that, for generating debate at the beginning, but I don’t think once you’re getting to the end I would want to be using those questions. It would be something like ‘How would you feel if that happened to you? Okay, then let’s see how this person then reacted.’ That would be a slight change to it (T62: 115-119).

Some of Hayes’ thinking on the “you”/“they” question was outlined earlier in this chapter; like Ingram, she deliberately focused on the students’ own feelings as a way of drawing them in. So for example she presented her students with a list of rules restricting the freedoms of Jews in Nazi Germany, and asked them which they would find most difficult if they were Jewish children at the time. She then switched the question to focus upon how the

students *as themselves* would feel if they happened to be living then. Finally, in the follow-up interview, reflecting upon two pupils' requests for clarification, she said she intended to switch the wording again to ask what *they [students] as non-Jewish children* would feel living under such rules, "Because you're too distanced from it if you're thinking 'What would this person in a museum think about this?' It's 'What would I find hard?'" (T27: 633-5). She saw the need to be clear about her own purposes before calling for them to imagine themselves projected back in time, and decided that the spotlight was meant to be on her students' feelings, not those of actual Jewish children. In her assessment, this was what her students' capacities allowed. As with the other teachers, she designed her approach according to her beliefs about students, about issues of relevance versus remoteness, and about standards of historical validity. Such calculations led teachers to different conclusions, and in some cases to their treatment of the "you"/"they" dilemma as an open question:

Certainly a lot of the work that I've done on historiography with the A Level group has made me very aware of the historian and how the historian has influenced history, so that you're trying to keep the two separate, and if you're empathising to try and keep yourself out of it. The danger is that because I repeat it a lot, that that could be a turn-off for the kids who think 'Well, if it was so different I can't hope to relate to it anyway. And who cares? They're all dead anyway!' So I think it's a double-edged sword...(T63: 345-351).

Because brief and not very thoughtful or historical answers tended to be exactly the sort of response that asking pupils "How would you feel?" most commonly produced, this topic is worthy of a bit more exploration in terms of teachers' rationales for relying on it. After her Cuban Missile Crisis lesson, Hayes commented,

It's hard to get them beyond this [liability inherent in the question], because if you say 'How would Castro feel?' you always get these silly responses – which are *true* – [lazy student voice] 'He'd be annoyed' or 'He'd be pissed off.' It's right, but it's not getting beyond that. You're looking down the barrel of a nuclear holocaust and what are you going to do? (T51: 761-764).

She also noted that in a lesson on Castles,

At first we were getting stuck in the groove of ‘angry,’ ‘scared,’ ‘cautious,’ i.e. one word, automatic responses which indicate that the student is not really empathising, but is really stating the obvious...I did feel that they (or at least some of them) started to get it as the lesson wore on – so maybe I should just be more patient and realise that empathy is not an immediate response for Year 7! (T49: 794-799)

Here lies a potential clue to her continued use of this sort of scripted question-answer pattern about feelings, used by all teachers at times, which following the model of Gaea Leinhardt (1986) I call the “inferring feelings routine.” She recognised the superficiality of what it often evoked, but saw too that students moved past this, usually with probing from the teacher. This seemed to be a key insight that teachers sometimes employed: students might begin with basic, back-projected ideas and move toward historicity in time. Joslin too noted that predictable initial reactions often preceded considered attempts to understand. In reflecting on students’ reactions during her Black Death lesson, she said, “When we first looked at the treatments, they did all the usual sort of ‘Ick!’ and ‘Yuck, how could they possibly think that?!’” (T40: 855-856). But then one of the students came up with the analogy of herbal medicines today and people’s not knowing what was in them: it could be ground-up frog in those bottles, she said.

In a lesson on Roman education, Hayes employed the back-projection to historical sequence with Year 7 in an overt and rather risky way. Having had students identify features of today’s British education system and that of the Romans, she then asked the anachronistic question, “Do you think education was better or worse in Roman times than today?” followed by the historical question “Do you think Roman students enjoyed school?” When she added, “Do you think that the Romans would have *preferred* their sort of school?,” one student quipped, “How would they know what school we have?” As students argued for the superiorities of the present system in their exercise books – exactly as one might expect given the question – a few of them started to note, “They didn’t know that in the future people wouldn’t get whipped,” and “They would have grown up like knowing about it, because their mums and dads would have told them” (T8: 525-569, excerpted). Hayes drew these insights to the attention of the whole class, and more and more students

seemed to be able to grasp that different standards were not necessarily worse in their own time. Somewhat ironically, Hayes' anachronistic questions gave *students* the opening to produce sophisticated historical insights – which, she pointed out, was “good for Year 7” (T8: 618-619).

The Role of Identification and Emotional Connection

One aspect of teachers' expertise appears to be their ability to employ several modes of questioning: rather than rigidly adhering to one method, tailoring their approach according to the demands of the topic (its foreignness or accessibility, for example) and the capacities of the students. To point out that “you” questions more frequently led to presentist responses is not to suggest that such tactics have no positive role to play in the history classroom. It appears that students' ultimate understandings depend partly on the *way* that they are used.

Hayes' decision about the rules for Jews aptly represented the value she placed on students' engagement, their relating to some of the emotional impact of the topic at hand. She used a broad variety of strategies to make students *care* about the issues (detailed in Chapter 7), and particularly when the subject matter meant a great deal to her, as with the Holocaust or her lesson on poverty, she worked to convey a deep sense of its significance. Hayes did not shy from encouraging students to *identify* with subject matter that might reach them emotionally; she recounted the value of an exercise she had once observed where a boy sobbed when learning about appearing before the nineteenth-century Poor Law Guardians about going into the workhouse. She also described a lesson (not her own) where the topic of loss of fathers to war was derailed by a heartfelt discussion of students' loss of fathers to divorce and death.⁵⁹ She judged these episodes as educationally worthy: “...in all activities, in everything we do, we're asking them to get their heads around the past, and

⁵⁹ Hayes commented, “It completely got away from life in the eighteenth century, but then they probably started to appreciate it far more, and it was a really worthwhile lesson because they all started talking about their problems and this all came out in the open. That lesson, as regards the eighteenth century, went out of the window, but having got them to talk about their experiences – how can we understand anybody else, when we don't really understand ourselves?” (T55: 656-660).

to do that they have to identify with it. It's all about people and so you must identify with people, it won't work otherwise" (T63: 137-139). However, in the lessons I witnessed she also skirted topics that she claimed were too sensitive or potentially embarrassing. For example, because her "How would you feel?" question-style during a lesson on poverty might strike too close to home, she avoided using it. Other teachers also mentioned steering clear of identity issues – what Hayes referred to as "the family links problem" (T23: 555) – such as aspects of religion or views on working mothers.

Joslin seemed the least comfortable with engaging her students' emotions and their personal connections to subject matter. From experience, she had seen where this led:

...the danger of it with youngsters, really, is that they will revert to everyday empathy because the part of the experience that they're interested in is the emotional part: the feeling of missing your girlfriend, the feeling of being devastated by the death of a friend, the feeling of always being dirty and cold and uncomfortable or something like that, the emotional things...I'm afraid of it, in a way, because I've seen how it can go all wishy-washy and emotional and totally everyday empathy (T64: 163-172).

Imposing one's personal, projected views onto historical minds was not actually empathy at all, she felt, but an illusion of understanding, what empathisers needed to try to avoid. The personal opinion, if it should be registered at all, could come into play only *after* the truly historical had been investigated. In fact, there was rarely time allotted for students to air their own views or feelings on a topic at the end. Her stance seemed partly a matter of disposition; where Hayes enjoyed the personal element, Joslin preferred to avoid it. As she expressed,

I hate the 'I, personally' stuff really because if it's really personal it could be touchy and sensitive, and I don't know if it's necessary to tap into those kind of depths. You never know what can of worms you're getting into with kids' own lives. They can be just so fraught, and I like to be really careful about that (T64: 1054-1057).

However, she also at times spoke approvingly about students' getting emotionally involved, which they showed through questions like, "Did their feet ever get better after they got home if they looked like that when they got

trench foot?” and she also noted with concern that one student appeared to have a lump in her throat when they were discussing Wilfred Owen’s poem ‘*Dulce et Decorum Est*’ (T52). Ingram’s thinking resembled Joslin’s in this respect. Dow’s was closer to Hayes’; he was pleased that when students heard the Last Post at the WWI graveyards in France, they were “affected by it. Lots of feelings, lots of thoughts come through” (T41: 625-626). In fact, pupils had been in tears there in the past, he said.

While some teachers would dispute the wisdom of leaving students’ personal feelings out of the empathetic effort almost entirely – for it is a major route to ensuring that they care, connect with the topic, and view history as relevant – there is also ample evidence of the truth of Joslin’s view concerning its dangers; students readily transferred their conceptions from the present onto the past. Hayes in particular voiced the conundrum of striking the right balance between encouraging students to use the self as an instrument of understanding and of leaving personal thoughts out to avoid corrupting that understanding. Here the daily dilemmas of teachers aligned neatly with the philosophical concerns of scholars – Sam Wineburg described this very problem as “the tension between the familiar and the strange, between feelings of proximity and feelings of distance in relation to the people we seek to understand” (2001: 5). Toward which pole should teachers swing?

The recent literature on empathy teaching has devoted as much emphasis to the affective as cognitive aspects of empathy.⁶⁰ For example, the classroom teacher Kathleen Roth, in an article about efforts to cultivate empathetic understanding of Native Americans and Columbus, reached this conclusion:

I clearly see how fearful I was of letting any emotions or controversy into the social studies classroom... But by keeping things at an emotionally safe level, I was constructing an important barrier to students’ learning. The learning could be intellectually powerful but not emotionally powerful. And in addressing social issues with fifth graders, I am now convinced that the intellectual issues cannot become powerful

⁶⁰ This parallels a trend in the discipline at large. Wineburg notes, “One might even claim that in our postmodern age, historical works that abjure emotion are themselves suspect, viewed as devices that mask, through rhetorical means, the underlying polemical nature of their arguments...the profession celebrates subjectivity and positionality...” (2001: 238).

until the students can connect with the issues in very personal ways that often involve powerful emotions (1996: 154).

As with so many tools of teaching, engaging students' emotions carries with it what James Wertsch has referred to as "affordances" and "constraints" (1998); it is worth asking what is sacrificed in keeping empathy rigorously past-focused. In some of Joslin's lessons, for example, the students showed few outward signs of being gripped or concerned with trends in sixteenth-century witchcraft or twentieth-century attitudes toward Conscientious Objectors. They were, however, very engrossed in their discussion of modern homelessness that preceded their historical study of vagabonds.⁶¹ And they were much more engaged by the issue of attitudes toward boys and girls today, as expressed in the differences between their all-girls' school and the boys' school across town – than they were by different nineteenth-century attitudes toward women. However, they were not given much time to explore this topic.

Barton and Levstik called this approach into question in "Empathy as Caring," a chapter of their forthcoming book. They wrote,

Care-less history strikes us as a soulless enterprise, a constraint on motivation that warrants reconsideration of the subject's place in the curriculum. We cannot interest students in the study of history – something they enjoy outside school but often despise within it – if we reject their cares and concerns ... We also believe educators have a moral and ethical responsibility to address topics students care about; how can we call ourselves teachers if we ignore what students want to learn? In addition, we have a responsibility to extend the range and variety of students' concerns, so that they have a fuller and more complete foundation for democratic deliberation: Not only do we respond to their cares, we extend them to respond to ours (in press: Ch. 12).

Perhaps a measure of identification with the topic, of personal connection, is a useful way-station to understanding.

The Relationship between Empathy and Moral Judgment

One special case within the topic of empathy's relation to other concepts is the issue of how it relates to moral judgment. Joslin's view on this topic was

⁶¹ According to Joslin; I didn't observe this lesson.

the most straightforward: empathy had a role to play in making *historical* judgments because it involved looking at events in context, and making assessments that were balanced and fair. *Moral* judgments played only an indirect role in her classroom, however, in line with her statement during a card-sort activity on teaching goals: “The word ‘judgments’ makes me nervous and I would throw it out if I thought we were really talking about making judgments and you were stamping people as good or bad, or right or wrong or something like that” (T56: 308-310). While she viewed empathy as helping to achieve certain moral purposes, like discouraging students from being critical of people whose reactions they did not immediately understand, in practice she did not stress the connections between content and moral or ethical principles in the lessons I witnessed.

Dow’s classroom had a bit more scope for such dialogues. Like Joslin, he was not interested in judgment in the sense of “dismiss[ing] people as being evil” (T57: 289), though he did believe in learning from history. He emphasised the historical type of judgments – understanding what led to certain actions – but *after* they were explored he saw a role for value judgments on past actions (T37: 705). These sorts of judgments incorporated empathy, because to judge people you needed to know the context in which they acted, but values were part of it. After teaching a whole lesson on General Haig’s decisions at the Somme, and their bloody consequences, Dow raised the question of whether Haig’s actions were *right* – not just in terms of winning the war, but in terms of the number of lives that he was willing to sacrifice (over 60,000 just on the first day). Powerful figures in particular, he believed, needed to be held accountable for their choices. Consistent with this thinking, Dow carved out time for students to express their opinions about Blair and Bush’s policies toward the Afghanistan war, which was happening at the time.

Ingram’s view on the question of empathy and moral judgment was slightly different: he felt that simply by encouraging empathy with a historical figure, he was sending a message about values. He worried that in presenting conflicts in history, he was “becoming too preachy and moralistic” when he was only encouraging an understanding of one side (T54: 563-564). In

reflecting about cases when that happened, he felt judgment was appropriate: “certain issues, obviously, this is *wrong*, I mean, if you’re doing the Holocaust and stuff, but I guess it is important to be able to make judgments about ultimately what is right and wrong, and history can do that” (T54: 234-236). However, at other times, he expressed that he was “a wee bit concerned” about making value judgments, and in class would “always try and emphasise the fact that you can’t judge these people, because at the time they probably thought the same as we would” (T62: 578-579). Making sense of these inconsistent beliefs – which probably indicate that he was still working out his views on the place of value judgments in the classroom – was not possible with regard to lesson data, because while values were certainly implied in how he approached topics, he did not invite students to directly discuss them. Nor did these particular transcripts show instances of his emphasising to students that they should refrain from judgments.

Early in the year, Hayes captured the range of her views about judgments both moral and historical – and their interconnections – in the comment

I don’t really think we should make judgments, although we do, and the way I would change that is to say that if you are going to reach a judgment about the past you have to do it in the context of the past, which involves the empathy side of it. Like with Mary Tudor, you could say she was a terrible person and she shouldn’t have burned people at the stake, but equally well you’ve got to understand why she did it (T55: 325-329).

She continued during the year to both emphasise contextual judgments and to approve some moral judgments. In practice, she was not particularly restrained about offering value judgments; comments like “girls got a bit of a raw deal in Roman times,” “I’m glad Milosevic was caught and brought to trial,” “It was wicked to think of killing Muslims,” and “It is very, very wrong to blame people just because of the way they look,” peppered her lessons. Most of these are matters of considerable consensus in modern British society – she seemed to be more cautious about areas of controversy. She also, uniquely (and obliquely), pointed out that people in the past made judgments about their own and their

contemporaries' lives, and were not in total agreement. Linking this to empathy, she said,

I think part of our role as a teacher is not just to teach them History but to turn them into responsible and caring individuals as well. I think that looking at the past can really help you to do that, that people are treated better in so many respects today than they were in the past. I think perhaps an awareness of a conception of right and wrong in its largest sense, in that 'Was it right for people to live in slum housing in the past? Didn't working people deserve more?' I think it is useful from an empathy point of view as well, in order for them to understand the experiences of the past but also to understand why things change. It's a causation thing, but then you've got to understand why people felt the way they did about changing things. It's all very intermeshed, but I think from a moral point of view it's very important for Citizenship. But it's also important for opening their minds as well (T63: 511-521).

Overall, the results of this study in terms of empathy and moral judgment are sometimes consistent and sometimes not with the findings of Bodo von Borries, who claimed that "historicism as a norm, antihistoricism in practice," was common in a study of European history teachers (1994: 354). His teachers rejected condemnations of the past in principle, but showed plentiful and strict moral reactions in practice (though the meaning of "practice" is dubious, since their responses were based on a text-reading *task*). Von Borries suggested that a "split concept" was a trait of these teachers, but the cases I observed suggested less a split concept than two agendas – historical and moral/civic – held as simultaneous goals, despite tensions, because of their common value and service to the present. Teachers took both obligations seriously, though they spent more energy on the historical one – even Hayes, who saw the two as something like equal partners.

The Issue of Scale

◆ Empathy with the experience of a group, or representative type, was more commonly sought by all four teachers than empathy with a specific individual. The latter were usually brought in as illustrative examples of a type, or because of the person's power and influence on events.

The final issue in teachers' characterisations of empathy was the matter of *scale*. Teachers viewed empathy as applicable to different types of subject.

Ingram spoke of empathy with an individual, and of generalised empathy where the aim was to understand a group's belief. Hayes conceived of empathising with an individual as a whole person – which she viewed as the highest form of empathy – or with an individual in role, for example, Kennedy as president during the Cuban Missile Crisis. Sometimes these two were completely intertwined, she felt. She also noted empathy could be with a group (which kept it on a surface level since no account was taken of individuals), or with the position of a nation. Dow elegantly summarised that empathy could be for an individual, group, nation, or for all – you “zoom right out to see the big sweep of change” or “zoom in” and look at someone's individual emotions (T57: 619-621).

Looking across teachers' lessons, which often required students to empathise at several levels at different times – to move back and forth, as the historian Robert Darnton put it, from “idiom to individuality” and “texts to contexts” (1984: 262) – empathy with the experience of a group, or representative type, was more commonly sought by all teachers than empathy with a lone person. Individuals were usually brought in as illustrative examples of a type; when the unique psychology of an individual was explored, it was usually because of the person's power, as with Henry VIII or Queen Elizabeth I. Like many commentators in the history education literature, Ingram initially considered it a problem to present primary sources from a single individual, because he felt his students would copy the views of that person too much, and take them as read for the whole period. Later he came to feel that the individual level of empathy could be a helpful antidote to back-projecting, and a way in for students (T62).

Conditions Required for Empathy

◆ The teachers showed great consensus about the conditions required for students to empathise; among the most important conditions was students' personal motivation or effort.

Whether teachers considered empathy a matter of reasoning or experiencing, believed it to be a tool or a culminating performance, and

targeted it to a person or nation (or all of these on different occasions), they expressed a remarkable degree of accord about the conditions required for students to achieve it. Most of these are quite straightforward, and are also discussed elsewhere in the findings chapters, so a summary of their views here will suffice.

The teachers felt that empathy could not be looked at as an abstract concept apart from learners; to cultivate empathy was to cultivate it *in pupils*. This required that students meet certain conditions: all of the teachers believed that students had to recognise that the past was different, and bracket themselves out of the effort at some point. All felt they needed to have a secure knowledge base. Likewise, all spoke of the importance of intelligence and imagination. Dow, Hayes, and Joslin mentioned the crucial role of an experience base; as Joslin put it, they need a “broad general knowledge of how their own world works; otherwise differences in the past can’t be spotted or understood” (T64: 453-454). Hayes and Joslin felt that sensitivity to sources was vital – a capacity for listening hard, attending carefully to what was said, and sometimes reading between the lines. Dow, Ingram, and Joslin emphasised the importance of language skills that enabled students to express what they meant with power, subtlety, range, or precision. Hayes and Dow discussed the necessity of appreciating the significance of events for individuals, of bringing things down to a human level. Finally, the teachers agreed that students had to possess a mindset of curiosity and openness, as well as a sense of care and motivation. This *disposition* to empathise was not some sort of gift that teachers could present to their pupils, but rather a matter of creating conditions where students could and would make the effort that real understanding undoubtedly involved.

Recognising and Assessing Empathy

◆ The teachers all envisioned empathy as a multi-level achievement, not all or nothing. They identified six parameters of sophistication, about which their views were not uniform.

The last way that teachers' actions revealed their concepts of empathy was through their beliefs and practices about evaluating students' work. The teachers all envisioned empathy as a kind of stepped achievement, not as simply present or absent – as Hayes claimed, “You’re trying to get halfway there, and you’ve always got to be happy with just as far as you can get” (T55: 517-518). Independently, they described the low-end of empathy as “superficial,” “basic,” or “limited” – meaning general, descriptive, feeling-centered, undeveloped empathy, often impressions at a “bog standard – ‘They smell,’ and all that sort of stuff” (Ingram T42: 731-732), or at a “pretend you are a ...” level (Hayes T63: 35). At the other pole they mentioned “deep,” “sophisticated,” “high-level” empathy exhibiting such features as depth of understanding, “really, really tr[ying]...to get their heads ’round it” (Hayes T55: 504-5), differentiating between people’s views, developing ideas beyond the obvious, and setting opinions in a historical context.

Parameters of Empathetic Sophistication

Analysis of the language teachers used to draw distinctions between different grades of empathetic performance showed that (collectively) they recognised six parameters of sophistication. Preserving their terminology, these were:

- A) Personal/everyday empathy or contextualised/historical empathy – the former was defined by Joslin as “emotions and feelings and experiences that the type of person...could have at *any* time in *any* place, as opposed to in a particular historical context” (T60: 184-186). This term came into vogue after 1985, as one of the levels promulgated by the GCSE exam boards to assess empathy. Neither Joslin nor Dow rated the everyday variety as “proper empathy,” but Hayes and Ingram treated it as a starting point toward more historically accurate ideas.
- B) *Your* feelings/thoughts or *their* feelings/thoughts – As explained above, they regarded the latter as more difficult.

- C) Obviousness or subtlety – All of the teachers were aware that students could produce mechanical, rote ideas about thoughts and feelings in the past in the same way that they might regurgitate other facts. To assess this, they looked for development and elaboration beyond what was provided. They all also acknowledged that there were times when they had to “spoon-feed” pupils.
- D) Stereotypical or differentiated empathy – the degree to which pupils recognised that not everyone in the past thought alike or in deterministic ways. Dow also mentioned the related parameter of black and white figures versus rounded and complex characters, and figures regarded as static or as changing over time.
- E) Descriptive or explanatory empathy – At various points during lesson follow-up interviews, and without prompting, teachers referred to these two types of empathy and noted that they involved different levels of difficulty. In order to learn more about their thinking, I followed up in the Final Interview by presenting them with a researcher’s claim that methods focused on explanation were generally more effective than those aimed at description (Shemilt, 1984). The teachers stated that the two types were interconnected but not identical, and upheld a general sequence and hierarchy. Ingram explained, “You can’t separate them, I don’t think. You need the description to be able to move on to the explanation” (T62: 606-608), and Joslin “seconded” that notion, so to speak: “Description is just picking up the lines and plugging them into the right places, but you have to *start* with knowledge that is descriptive, you can’t leave it out. But that’s not your ultimate aim, and you can’t demonstrate an understanding of empathy with just description” (T64: 1019-1022).⁶²

⁶² My own subsequent fine-grained analysis of lesson transcripts indicated that in many lessons, it was next to impossible to separate the two types – they wove in and out, and in the course of explanations, descriptions of context and conditions were continually refined and recalled as parameters.

F) Empathetic understanding of *feelings* or of *thoughts* – Dow and Joslin also felt that higher-level empathy involved capturing past thoughts, since they believed this required rejecting one’s own ideas and entertaining past views. As Dow put it,

for me developed empathy is about thoughts, views, opinions set in a historical context more than it is about feelings, but at its lowest it is ‘This is horrible, I don’t like this. I’m sad, depressed.’ That’s less sophisticated... (T65: 464-466).

All of the teachers treated emotions as more easily analogised across time periods, and thus more straightforward to recapture,⁶³ than attitudes. At a couple of points in the interviews, Dow mentioned that reasoning about feelings actually led to what we *think* people felt in the past, but he did not elaborate or shift his questioning style to reflect this cautionary note.⁶⁴

Formal and Informal Systems of Assessment

◆ Two teachers (Ingram, Hayes) believed empathy by itself was not assessable; two teachers (Dow, Joslin) believed it was and possessed formal mark schemes derived from exam-based curricular documents for evaluating it. Those who considered it assessable devoted more energy to explicitly articulating their principles of assessment to students, and iterating them in coursework comments. The principles themselves were also more detailed and refined.

◆ Informally, all of the teachers assessed empathy in the classroom through a combination of subtle and overt cues (see Table F).

Two teachers – perhaps significantly those who had been teaching the longest, Joslin and Dow, the former of whom had taught through the contentious 1980s and both of whom knew about the 1990s debates – utilised formal levels of empathy that they had discovered in external sources and

⁶³ This assumption has been contested by scholars who argue that the experience and expression of emotion is strongly conditioned by time and place – for a recent summary of such views, see McLemee (2003).

⁶⁴ Having experienced the difficulties of coding bits of knowledge as feelings or thoughts, I suspect the distinction may be bogus a good deal of the time. Thoughts often were charged with affect, and feelings arose in conjunction with cognitive perceptions of a situation.

adopted or adapted to their own purposes. While Joslin mentioned that assessment was not an exact science – and would at times be fuzzy because empathy was this way – she possessed clear guidelines for her thinking. The “Key to skills and levels” formulated during the early years when the GCSE tried to examine empathy continued to inform Joslin’s standards as “notional guidelines” (T40: 961); the ones for empathy even hung as a poster on her classroom wall. In evaluating students’ written coursework on empathy, she explained that at Level 3 they could partly describe why people acted as they did, then at Levels 4 and 5 could explain the attitudes of a group, but without reasons for them. At Level 6 they could comprehend different actions by different groups and give reasons valid within a context, and at Level 7 they could explain why individuals’ views varied within a group, given a shared situation. Her notion of progression in empathy related principally to increasing differentiation among views and to the move from description to explanation, in her view a higher-level skill.

Dow also commonly referred to levels of empathy derived from empathy-teaching literature, mainly a book on teaching GCSE history by Chris Culpin⁶⁵ as “very much in my mind when I’m thinking about empathy” (T65: 187) – and he shared these levels with his pupils directly, a principle of the formative assessment philosophy he espoused. They ranged from “everyday/Flintstones” empathy, meaning the basic or obvious thoughts students could imagine themselves having minus any context, to “stereotypical/cardboard cut-out” empathy, meaning generalised, unsubtle views of what people might say, to “kaleidoscopic/differentiated” empathy involving a range of feelings and rounder figures with weaknesses and strengths. Dow also developed his own working system to assess students’ empathy coursework, with similar levels inspired by the original Schools History Project GCSE language of “simple,” “developed,” and “fully-developed statements.”

⁶⁵ He didn’t recall which book offhand, but one place where Culpin and others discussed these levels was in their book *Teaching GCSE History* (Booth et al., 1987).

In contrast, Ingram and Hayes appeared to share Christine Counsell's (1999) view that empathy in and of itself was not a proper area of assessment, for it only encouraged abuses and opened itself to derision. Hayes, for example, believed that "Just to examine empathy would be dangerous" (T55: 706) – possibly because of her feelings-centred approach, she seemed to view the evaluation of empathy as unrigorous and, whether for exam-related or historical reasons, unnecessary. When her Year 9 pupils completed a piece of empathy-related coursework, a WWI letter from the trenches, she marked it as an effort grade, typically writing just a sentence about their actual empathetic performance. Likewise, her in-class evaluations of their ideas were evaluative – "very good point," "well done" – but rarely included particular information about the quality of empathy she was looking for. The gap between how fully she could informally assess students' empathy in response to interview questions, and how much of this thinking she shared with her pupils was striking.

Ingram, similarly, claimed that "we don't really assess empathy" (T34: 875), and showed what he meant: apart from final marks, he did not write comments on the six students' coursework assignments that he shared with me. He later clarified that "You can't really officially assess it...It is still really important, but I wouldn't assess it...Empathy is a skill that is continually being *informally assessed* to make sure that the kids understand it and to inform your own planning for the future (T62: 467-470, 482-483; emphasis added). In this judgment, he seemed to be taking his cue principally from the National Curriculum and subsequent examination standards:

It's not assessed in any way, so you don't really comment on it. It's not a Key Stage unit, it's not one of the Knowledge, Skills and Understanding things...I would hardly ever mark them on that [the goal of linking feelings and facts that he outlined in assigning homework]. I am looking for historical accuracy more than anything else, because ultimately they are not going to be assessed on their empathetic understanding (T58: 104-116).

But he also commented that in its own right, the historical imagination (which was at the centre of his concept of empathy) was simply a very difficult thing to assess. Thus in evaluating students' accounts of the Battle of Hastings,

written as soldiers, he viewed empathy as related to writing style – and this belonged to the area of informal assessment – not a necessary part of understanding the conduct of the battle, which he marked.

In commenting on students' empathy in class, Ingram placed particular emphasis on the differentiation parameter – he was pleased when students showed understanding that not everyone felt the same in the past, and he often structured role-playing exercises so that the differences between groups were obvious. This was one major criterion he used. The other way he commonly evaluated how empathetic exercises had gone was to mention the *points* students had grasped, and note how many of the pupils had gotten them. He said in evaluating a lesson on Elizabethan attitudes toward the poor, “So that was my main concern, that everybody got the reasons, and they understood why it was that people believed these things” (T42: 718-719). If students could comprehend and reproduce certain key points, he often regarded the lesson as a success.

Assessing students' empathy during the flurry of interactive classroom teaching would be undeniably challenging for anyone, not least because of the frequent invisibility of empathy, the number of students, the typical brevity of pupils' comments, and the necessity to move the lesson forward rather than focusing on diagnosing empathetic efforts. However, all the teachers *did* in fact assess it informally, and when asked could articulate the signs they looked for. They found it easier to assess in the form of a written product, however – Dow and Joslin both commented on this, and Ingram used brief empathetic assignments in exercise books as tools to evaluate what his pupils were grasping. Teachers also were able to identify signs that empathy was lacking. Their standards for all three of these categories are compacted in Table F, listed together because of the extraordinary amount of overlap from teacher to teacher.

TABLE F: SIGNS OF THE PRESENCE OR ABSENCE OF EMPATHY

SIGNS OF EMPATHY – CLASSROOM	SIGNS OF EMPATHY – WRITTEN WORK	SIGNS OF LACK OF EMPATHY OR LOW-LEVEL EMPATHY
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Affective reactions ■ Tone of voice of answers students give ■ Level of interest, and degree to which pupils contributing, interacting ■ <i>Types</i> of questions students ask, and the <i>fact</i> of asking questions – ones that show thought, emotional engagement, pondering of alternatives, trying to resolve paradoxes, making links or leaps, looking in a new way, toying around with ideas, taking context into account, processing information, avoiding anachronisms ■ Types of comments do or don't pupils make (along the lines above) ■ Students actually <i>saying</i> they see images or a film version of history in their minds ■ Pupils making empathy issues explicit (usually problem areas) ■ Variety of thoughts and feelings raised ■ Language students use: first person, historical terms ■ Pupils' relating topics to themselves 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Accuracy and authenticity (of content, form) ■ Differences between figures' reactions (including conflicting views) ■ Range of reactions within one individual, and sense of development. ■ Subtlety in how ideas developed; some things implicit ■ Use of specialist language/historical vocabulary ■ Subject-specific detail ■ Development of a tone, a broader sense between words that much was happening in character's mind ■ Inclusion of key differences from today, and what <i>priorities</i> were then ■ Thoughts about what things meant, and their impact or extremity ■ Capturing little human ways of thinking, coping, expressing selves ■ Style of writing, literary twist (but can't expect from all students), drama ■ Complex picture of mindset, getting to grips with figure's humanity, individuality, roundedness – strengths and weaknesses ■ Explanation, not just description ■ Links between attitudes and conditions ■ Taking basic information and developing it further (with some imagination) ■ Sense of writer making own judgments from being there 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Obvious, basic answers ■ Giving mechanical, stock answers like bullet points (in prose writing) ■ When teacher has to push and lead quite a bit; pupils not assisting, unresponsive ■ Missing key points about beliefs or realities ■ Body posture (bored, tuned out) ■ Students' ideas work against whole point of lesson ■ Answers not developed, no sense of wider context ■ Everyday empathy, not historically-grounded ■ Anachronisms and modern language ■ Lack of specifics ■ Students working but not excited, no buzz ■ Reasoning about 'why' questions 'not on' ■ 'Ick,' 'yuck' responses that don't show thought ■ Give own opinion, resist putting selves in role ■ Can describe but not explain ■ Exaggerations ■ Just creative writing ■ Expressing idea that people in past were stupid ■ Not taking it seriously; goofy answers ■ Third person language

Note that the teachers did not view these cues as *guarantors* that empathy was happening, they were only hints that it might be, especially if several cues

appeared together. Naturally, their language was sometimes quite tentative about the degree of empathy they were seeing. Hayes, for example, said

I wonder how deep the actual empathy went. I felt that it increased their *understanding*, but whether they were – you know, sometimes you think that they really have thought ‘Oh gosh, I would feel awful if it was like that for me,’ but I wonder how far they went down that route... I think they got a better appreciation of the poverty, but whether it was poverty as another concept or whether it was ‘I’m very glad it’s not me,’ I’m not sure, to be honest (T31: 677-686).

Not surprisingly, the teachers who believed empathy could and should be formally assessed (Dow, Joslin) gave more feedback to students about whether they were actually achieving it. One way they did this was through explicitness in the classroom about what counted as good empathy. In addition to evaluative remarks like “absolutely brilliant,” they specified why, for example:

Dow: He’s getting deep into his character there, deep into the things that are motivating him (T33: 469-470).

Dow: There was a fantastic series of responses there, the range of thought and feeling that go through people in that situation (T33: 523-524).

Joslin: I think you’re doing really well to try and get both sides of an argument (T6: 412-413).

Joslin: I love the ending: ‘Cheap, effective and a good day out.’ And that’s very sixteenth-century, isn’t it, when everyone queued up to watch executions and the more people that got hung the better (T6: 699-701).

They also gave detailed responses in writing. So perceptive and thorough were their assessment comments, in fact, that they call into question the belief that empathy cannot be formally assessed. Neither teacher recommended this as a course of action at the examination level – they were aware of the problems it had caused in the past⁶⁶ – but they *demonstrated* that in their practice they could do it with integrity.⁶⁷

In making their assessments, the teachers all tailored their expectations according to the age and ability of their students, and the accessibility of the topic. Dow spoke of looking for greater sophistication from older students, and

⁶⁶ See Chapter 1.

⁶⁷ On analogical grounds, too, the notion that empathetic thinking cannot be assessed through its products is suspect, since historians’ work is evaluated in this way. While the standards for school history would surely be different, that does not imply there can be none.

Hayes remarked, “I don’t think that you are going to get hugely deep responses from Year 9 and also not from a middle set, really,” with regard to understanding feelings of soldiers about trench life (T53: 871-872). After a lesson on Roman gladiators, Ingram said

I want the less able to understand that people go along to watch this and it’s blood and gore and it’s a big spectacle. The more able should be coming away with the idea that people went there for a variety of different *reasons*, and people had different experiences from it. Also hopefully they would understand that there is a link with *that* to sporting events today and controversial issues today (T45: 346-350).

He also noted that students of differing abilities actually *interpreted* questions in the “you” or “they” format differently from one another, and in response to a query about his goals for them in the Battle of Hastings assignment, explained

I think with year 7 I would say that you are probably just trying to get them to think how they would feel if they were in that battle now. I think the higher level ones, like John, it’s thinking what somebody at that time would have felt. The higher ability ones probably pick up that difference and they don’t bring in anachronisms and things like that... I probably would not try and explain to Year 7 the differences...I think that’s too difficult a thinking skill for a mixed ability Year 7 to get... I don’t know how you teach somebody to do that (T58: 148-166).

The students effectively differentiated by outcome.

However, describing expectations aloud for students sometimes constituted part of teachers’ chosen repertoire of approaches, depending upon pupils’ capacities. While strategies are the focus of Chapter 7, “*explicit talk about empathy*” will be addressed here because it often served to set the standards for assessment.

Teachers held markedly different views about how cognisant they should try to make students about empathy as a concept and where it could go wrong or right. Dow was the strongest advocate of speaking directly about the issue: he discussed the definition of empathy with students, and said that depending on the ability of the group he might introduce the terms for the different levels of empathy. He deliberately used the word in class periodically, and when the time came for a written empathy assessment, he did outline the different levels of empathy as he saw them. He explained,

I think if you want someone to achieve a particular skill then you have to show them what they are trying to achieve. No-one can hit a dartboard blind, so to speak...I think it's vital to be open about the actual skill as well as the content (T65: 414-415, 421-422).

Joslin also defined empathy for her students at one point, but did not think it was important to discuss empathy at the meta-level, and generally would not use the term:

I would try to avoid that, I think, because especially with mixed ability classes or with the younger ones they can get bowled over by 'What's this complicated thing that she wants us to do?' instead of just letting the material draw them into doing it without actually putting a label on it or whatever (T64: 575-578).

With students aged fifteen and older, she did think it essential to explicitly set the parameters and mechanics of how to demonstrate empathy in writing. She would discuss with them how to combine actual textual information with attitudes and feelings – something that by then they would have had experience in doing. As noted earlier, she posted levels of empathy assessment on the front wall for all to read, further evidence that her explicitness about empathy was geared toward evaluation. In practice, Joslin was also outspoken about empathy-*related* issues, explaining what anachronisms were and how to avoid them, for example, and reminding students repeatedly to think about issues as people would have *at the time*.

Ingram, on the other hand, believed it would actually be misleading to focus on empathy with pupils. He commented,

I don't think it needs to be explicitly talked about...I think if you say 'We're going to try to understand why these people thought this about this' that is a much clearer path to go down, and that's built up. Empathy is part of that historical understanding (T62: 348-351).

As problems like the back-projecting of modern views arose, he would deal with them by introducing the historical facts needed to navigate students to a more accurate view. He would focus explicitly on what was needed for understanding, but saw no need to discuss empathy as such, since (in his new way of conceptualising its role) it just underlay so much of what he was doing with pupils.

Hayes discussed empathy issues, but did not actually use the term with pupils. She was prone to reminding them of how differently people felt and thought about things in the past and how different their access to information and experiences would have been. She emphasised that “even if we could go back, our ability to understand it would still be hampered by our experiences and our own selves. We still wouldn’t really see it as people living then” (T63: 172-174). She took the approach of “spelling out what I really want to know, but I don’t think I ever say ‘I want you to empathise with this person and this is what empathy is.’ I think it’s by inference...” (T63: 314-315). Interestingly, *students* in Hayes’ classes quite often explicitly raised issues concerning the problems of understanding past minds in response to questions put forth by the teacher, for example querying, “But would we still be the same person [if we lived in a different time]?” (T14: 456). In this example as in many others, *pupils’* capacities and contributions shaped the empathy curriculum. The next chapter explores their influence, as well as those of structural factors, on empathetic teaching and learning.

Chapter 6 (Findings II)

Teachers' Thinking about Factors Influencing the Empathy Curriculum

Introduction

Classrooms are ecosystems, to borrow a metaphor from Yinger and Hendricks-Lee (1993). Within them – and within the minds of teachers who know their constituent parts – a multitude of often unseen factors interact to produce a functioning equilibrium; when a change in one factor occurs, it reverberates throughout the system, causing adjustments. Understanding teachers' work, then, requires an exploration of their awareness of all of the factors that impinge on their practice, in this case in the area of empathy.

The findings reported here are the product of investigating thirteen different types of knowledge that teachers utilised to cultivate empathy (see Chapter 3). The issues they considered divide into three major categories: student factors, structural factors and teacher factors. These are presented with the pedagogical implications teachers derived from them.

While the factors must be described separately to shed light on their contents, they were integrated in the teachers' minds. Rarely did they focus upon just one; they tended to deploy their knowledge of relevant considerations as what Liping Ma called “knowledge packages” (1999: 17). While the term referred to mathematics teachers' viewing discrete pieces of knowledge in terms of their related roles in a package, I am expanding it to encompass the ways that teachers simultaneously drew upon various types of knowledge to further an educational goal. In making decisions, they considered matters such as time, pupils' capacities and moods, resources, and their own skills or states all at once. At the end of the chapter I show how various factors assumed central importance in their thinking at different times, and offer a critique of a model of pedagogical reasoning that fails to do justice to this variability.

Student Factors

Students' Capacities for Empathy

- ◆ The teachers all regarded pupils' empathetic capacities as limited in some respects, but not in predictable or deterministic ways. The degree to which they treated perceived capacities as a deterrent to empathetic efforts varied.
- ◆ The teachers felt empathetic understanding was supported by *several types* of capacities: emotional, analytic, linguistic/literary, imaginative, and dispositional.
- ◆ The teachers identified a number of factors as influencing the students' capacities: family background and exposure to history, personality, age, sex, and prior and current educational interventions.
- ◆ The teachers took account of differences in capacities in a variety of ways, but principally by varying the nature of the demands and by allowing students to differentiate by outcome.

Reacting to a quotation about whether students' experience bases equipped them for empathy, Joslin identified the challenge of thinking about capacities:

[S]ome pupils' experience can be too weak for some kinds of empathy. But that in itself isn't very helpful because, given that, some pupils' experiences can rise to almost any kinds of empathy even when they're quite young. And others, their experiences allow them to move into some areas of empathy but just not others, and it depends on what the area is... [Y]ou've got such a mixture in any group of 30 kids... (T64: 866-869, 876).

Hayes echoed that students could surprise her since she did not know *all* of their experiences, and Dow largely dismissed the focus on limits:

We can't empathise with someone in appalling situations like the Holocaust or whatever because we ourselves haven't gone through it, but it doesn't mean you shouldn't try...I can't think of many situations where I wouldn't want them to try and empathise at some level...Yes, certainly some experience-bases are too weak to do much, but I think that's just an easy generalisation. I still think most things can be attempted if you provide the context and the stimulus for it (T65: 550-557).

Ingram agreed with the approach but not quite the level of optimism; to the statement that some students' experience bases were too weak for some forms of empathy, he said,

Yes. Absolutely one hundred percent. You can try – and I think it is an important part of their understanding and maturity so it is important to try – but I think with some sorts of empathy they just won't be able to grasp (T62: 541-544).

While teachers' *resolve* to cultivate empathy appeared not to be greatly affected by their estimation of students' capacities, the *standard* of result that they expected was highly conditioned by it. For example, Dow said of his Year 12, "They are on the whole a weakish group... I have to tone it down, can't get the quality I want" (T17: 710-711), and Joslin remarked with regard to a poem, "I know from what I've seen the upper band English groups doing in Year 9 that they can cope with things at this level" (T52: 675-677), although a pair of girls found it over their heads: "they aren't moved by that kind of thing on the whole. It has to be simpler" (T17: 706-707). She also noted that setting the right level of expectations was crucial. Failure to sufficiently challenge pupils could lead to weak empathy because of negative attitudes, as when she used sources that were too basic in a lesson on Conscientious Objectors (T50). The students felt patronised, and didn't engage seriously with the content.

Rather than construing empathy as a single general ability, teachers mentioned relevant capacities that broke down into five types. From the examples they gave, it was clear that students could be strong in particular areas and weak in others, though shortcomings in any area often constrained display of other capacities. The types, arrived at through analysis of teachers' comments, were:

1. Emotional capacities – sensitivity; emotional intelligence; maturity; the capacity to relate to things. For example, Dow said,

I think empathy requires emotional intelligence, and you could be the *brightest, logical* thinker there is but not be able to put yourself in somebody else's shoes... [some] *haven't* got the capacity to *feel* for other human beings in the way that empathy requires (T33: 644-646, 655).

2. Analytical capacities – reasoning or logically deducing; grasping and managing complexity; handling a number of sources; internalising and remembering information; making links or applying knowledge gained; being sensitive to sources (listening, reading between the lines, or interpreting). Hayes, for example, felt that empathy capacities related to experience, but added,

I think the way that the intelligence side of it comes in is understanding the context. So for the brighter kids it's easier for them to get to grips with the period that you're studying...[and] discussion is much easier, because they will work faster and they will make more connections... With the weaker kids you've got to do so much explaining as you go along that you just basically run out of time (T63: 479-481, 496-499).

3. Linguistic/literary capacities – accessing language in sources; expressing one's understanding effectively; expressing all that one knows (not failing to select the detail that develops a point). Joslin and Dow were the two teachers who identified these as capacities involved with empathy, though Ingram also commented at one point that a linguistic usage like the first person (often invoked in empathetic writing) was completely beyond one of his students. Dow and Joslin diverged somewhat on how linguistic capacities related to empathy; for example in commenting on a student's WWI letter, he said

This person's obviously really thought a lot about the language, both the specialist language and also the general language. I think that really does help empathy. If you look at the literacy element of history, I think the effective employment of language can actually raise the quality of the performance in terms of empathy. It gives you the extra range of feeling. Talking about apprehension, solitude, growing feelings of pain, dread, fear: it makes it more effective because it's more powerful... (T61: 129-135).

Joslin felt that language did not necessarily reflect the underlying empathy:

I don't think there is any connection with their ability to feel and sense and understand how people would have felt, but their ability to write it down so that they can communicate their understanding in *writing* to myself or anyone who is reading their work is very limited by lack of vocabulary... (T44: 648-651).

4. Imaginative capacities – envisioning the past; putting oneself in role.

Ingram, for instance, said that “With a lot of the lower ability ones, their imagination is very, very good and they can perhaps be more empathetic about being in the battle” (T58: 296-297). Joslin described a conversation with a student: “When I’ve said, ‘This absolutely brilliant,’ ‘I just imagined myself there,’ they’ll say, and I know they’re seeing it like they’re watching a film or something” (T64: 190-191).

5. Dispositional capacities – openness and wonder; curiosity and the desire to know and understand; independence of thought; confidence to take risks and ask questions; concentration; willingness to shed one’s own knowledge and hindsight. On matters of openness and curiosity, for example, Joslin had this to say:

I think they have to have curiosity about...things that are not directly related to them, and as they get older they lose some of that. The bottom-band Year 9s, some of them, you can see them losing that. ‘Why should I care about Samuel Pepys and his relationship with his wife?’ and they can’t get drawn up in it... Some of them close down into their little adolescent world and they don’t want to know, and nothing you can do will make it interesting enough to draw them in... The bottom bands are more inflexible...but it’s not the same for all of them. Ones that appear less able or appear to come from more limited backgrounds can often be the ones who really just love history (T64: 463-466, 472-473, 489, 496-498).

In her concerns about students’ closure of mind, Joslin was in tune with findings reported in the research literature. A study of fifteen-year-olds throughout Europe showed students “neither willing nor able to accept pre-modern reality and morality, even in theory...The human rights argument is accepted without doubt for an era before the invention of human rights” (Korber, 1998, cited in Lowenthal, 2000: 67). Similarly, a paper describing the reactions of American students to a study of Chinese civilisations noted, “Some of these high school students seemed to have feelings or values or beliefs about their own culture that precluded learning much about other ways of life. Their

beliefs and knowledge did not seem to be readily available to be changed” (White, 2003: 18).

While teachers clearly thought about the capacities involved in empathy in nuanced ways, they also continued to use forms of shorthand in referring to their pupils’ capacities, such as lower and higher ability, younger and older (comments about age frequently served as general proxies for capacities), and top and bottom bands. They noted a variety of ways that students differed in their empathetic understanding, and thus needed to be catered for pedagogically. To paraphrase their language: Dow said that brighter students grasped thoughts, not just feelings, and that very bright students even at Year 7 resisted stereotyping people, while Hayes mentioned that clever ones needed to be “fed” less information, and that younger and less bright students might be thrown by an emphasis on differences from the present, so it was easier to begin with similarities with them. Ingram noted that more able ones came up with more appropriate language for tasks, and that low-ability pupils loved role-play because they could understand what was happening, while Joslin (in contrast) felt that least able students found it hard to put themselves in role, but instead responded as themselves, and that weaker students in general lacked an understanding of their own world that enabled them to make sense of another.

Teachers identified a number of factors that influenced the student capacities mentioned above. Dow and Joslin both indicated that family background counted; he cited a student who came from a “really *feeling* sort of family. They are the kind of family, I imagine, who discuss feelings a lot at home” (T33: 659-660), and she mentioned that parents could help their children develop a mindset of curiosity about differences in the past (T64). Ingram believed that family also mattered in a socioeconomic sense; some had the means to offer their children books and trips to historical sites, which contributed to their cognitive maturity (T62). Dow felt that students’ own personalities mattered, and that some pupils were more able to empathise than others. Joslin and Ingram (who taught in a girls’ and boys’ school, respectively) expressed tentative theories about sex differences. Ingram, for example,

thought that girls were “encouraged perhaps to share feelings and discuss emotions a lot more than boys, and so perhaps it is easier for them to understand the views of others” (T62: 737-739). Joslin several times commented that “girls especially so want to be right, they are so afraid of taking any risks” (T64: 391-392). She also noticed that girls were more interested in personal issues than boys. Sometimes their assumptions could lead them astray, however, as when trying to empathise with WWI soldiers: “She is a girl, she assumes you would feel stupid if you had to wear a uniform like that” (T60: 470-471). Age also played into what students achieved, though not in a deterministic way; it was nonetheless one of the factors teachers mentioned most. Joslin, for example, noticed that

in Year 7 you have a mixture of kids who automatically know that for William the Conqueror it was perfectly all right for him to lay waste a lot of land because he lived in a time when you did that because that was the way you showed your power... When I get them in Year 7 I haven't taught them those things, and some come very ready to understand it and quick to understand it, and others are still thinking of William the Conqueror listening to the radio to find out what's going on in Rome or something. Not quite that bad, but something like that (T56: 671-681).

General awareness of past difference and the importance of context in determining attitudes helped greatly, she felt. Hayes and Ingram also raised the theme of age and primary-school inheritance, expressing concerns that the highly directed nature of their experience there (with literacy hour and numeracy hour) was affecting their independence of thought and sending them to Year 7 more in need of guidance than groups had been in the past.

Of course, teachers did not stop at identifying capacities that students possessed when they arrived in their class; they credited their own actions, explanations, and provision of stimuli with influencing pupils' achievements. They also noted that time was a factor: with time to ponder people's rationales in the past, initially poor or non-empathetic reactions often gave way to more sophisticated thinking.

Teachers reacted to differences in student capacities by employing a variety of strategies. Most often, they set an exercise or task and allowed students to differentiate amongst themselves by their approach. It was striking

in some classes, for example Hayes' Year 7 and Ingram's Year 8, how a small number of pupils (often one or two) were consistently responsible for contributing empathetically profound insights that raised class discussion to a new plane. Other times, teachers adjusted instructions to account for gradations of capacity, as when Joslin assigned eight students in her Year 7 group to write a diary rather than story about the Black Death because it would be easier for them. Teachers dealt with varying capacities through a number of strategies:

- Simplifying content as necessary to not overwhelm pupils
- Supplementing written sources with oral and visual ones, and with vocabulary support (to allow empathy to emerge despite literacy struggles)
- Marking coursework according to different standards
- Leaning toward positive feedback during discussion to motivate all pupils and encourage them to take risks with ideas
- Telling and leading pupils versus having them research and use sources to acquire information
- Adjusting the amount of repetition for slower learners
- Appointing students to special roles of varying difficulty during role-taking activities
- Providing strong guidance or more freedom in assignments
- Providing extra "challenge" questions requiring students to take a different point of view.

Students' Preconceptions and Prior Knowledge

◆ Teachers used their knowledge of pupils' preconceptions to choose topics, predict the difficulty or ease of understanding, and plan pedagogical approaches to counteract misconceptions. At the same time, they recognised that their knowledge of students' ideas was partial, and that students employed their conceptions in sometimes unpredictable ways.

◆ Although all of the teachers had a high level of awareness of influential preconceptions, the more experienced teachers tended to think in terms of a greater variety of strategies to address them – and to express these fluently upon diagnosis.

◆ The difficulty or ease of empathy varied by topic and pupil. General factors influencing the level of challenge were the extent of prior knowledge of context, the foreignness or familiarity of an idea, the degree to which a student's identity was implicated, assumptions about past people, and the existence of contending sources of authority.

◆ All of the teachers regarded students' preconceptions constructively, as materials from which they could build a more refined or historically accurate picture of events. When highly apt comparisons weren't readily available, they used whatever glimmers of similarity or resonance with students' experiences they could find.

All of the teachers in this study took a deep interest in the sorts of preconceptions and prior knowledge that influenced students' empathetic understanding. Such considerations mattered in a number of ways; for one, they affected how teachers chose topics and estimated the complexity of a task, or whether to even attempt it. For example, Ingram chose the study of Medieval Realms because pupils had some exposure to the subject matter and would therefore find it relatively easy. Preconceptions also influenced teachers' thinking about pedagogical approaches. Hayes, for instance, knew that pupils would have difficulty differentiating the Nazis from *all* Germans, and would relate to the Western bloc more than the Eastern in studying the Cold War, so she made special efforts to help them consider other views. Joslin's expertise was characterised in part by the care she took to probe their thoughts until she was clear about the nature of their conceptions. The teachers relied upon their knowledge of preconceptions to predict the relative difficulty or ease of understanding and to plan ways to counteract misleading ideas. Their means of addressing them fell into four categories:

1. Validating them – when prior conceptions were accurate or helpful;
2. Using them/building upon them – to establish relevance and invoke analogical reasoning processes;
3. Counteracting them – when they were misconceptions; and
4. Tiptoeing around them – typically with subjects teachers claimed were too sensitive to address.

Reacting to preconceptions occurred at the level of *awareness* of their existence, and of *response* through strategies to work with or against them. One general trend was that while diagnostic skills seemed to vary with the teacher, the more experienced teachers (Dow and Joslin) moved quickly from an analysis of preconceptions to more detailed thinking about how to address them pedagogically. Joslin, for example, was particularly prone not to stop at problematising an issue but to consider strategic adjustments in her approach,

and would often name more than one possible remedy for an issue. She knew a bevy of ways to harness historical preconceptions to her advantage: for instance, she would select videos with characters who expressed attitudes that pupils coming from a twenty-first-century viewpoint would not expect (especially from that person) – she knew the value of paradox and surprise. In beginning her medieval studies unit, she had students weed anachronistic items out of a picture of a medieval village. Other times she built pupils' preconceptions into multiple choice or true-false questions to draw attention to them, thus creating an opportunity to debrief with students about why they had identified the wrong answer.

The level of empathetic challenge of a particular task varied according to the student and the topic. To take the latter, historical topics mattered in that students tended to possess prior knowledge of subjects that captured public interest broadly (and thus had media exposure). Dow elicited a higher level of both curiosity and background knowledge when teaching about trench warfare, for example, than when leading a lesson on Galen and Vesalius. The former subject with its earthy and graphic appeal (replete with references to trench foot, lice, and corpses) also appeared more accessible than the philosophical positions of the Renaissance Church and medical community. Difficulty or ease of empathy on a particular topic for a particular pupil could be influenced by preconceptions related to, or arising from, the following factors:

1. Extent of prior knowledge of historical context and circumstances
2. The foreignness or familiarity of an idea with regard to the students' thinking or experience
3. The degree to which the student's personal identity was involved
4. Assumptions about past people generally
5. The existence of contending sources of authority

Table G below, illustrating each of these points, is not meant to suggest that teachers necessarily pursued topics that they believed would be easier for students to grasp given their existing conceptions. Though sometimes the case, especially for quite abstruse topics, teachers also set themselves the goal of stretching pupils to understand issues with no easy handles. Knowing about

students' prior knowledge cued teachers as to which sort of situation they faced.

TABLE G:
INFLUENCES ON THE DIFFICULTY OR EASE OF EMPATHISING

Influence	Examples from Transcripts (paraphrased and followed by teacher's initial)
Extent of prior knowledge or ignorance of historical context and circumstances	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - They think Henry VIII's motives were strictly lust and a male heir (D) - WWII easier because pupils have seen films and TV and read novels (H) - Easier to grasp 20th-century history – greater awareness of its reality (H) - Think not having mobile phone in trench would be difficult (H) - Their vision of Holy Land is what's in the news today (H) - Easier to grasp events from place where they happened (I) - Battles are pretty straightforward, they know all about fighting (I) - Hard to understand appeasement, given hindsight (J)
Foreignness or familiarity vis à vis students' thinking and experience (including subcategory of moral repugnance)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Hard to grasp depth of WWI patriotism and obedience to authority (D, H) - Hard to grasp full scale of horror of battle (D) - Familiarity of kamikaze idea post-September 11 and suicide bombings (H) - Prejudice, racism from Nazi point of view more than they can understand (H) - Hard to understand fear of war with Russians when didn't grow up with it (H) - Hard to grasp why women accepted Nazi roles for women (H) - Japanese no-surrender policy difficult (H) - More difficult the further back in time you go (H) - They think of poverty as something remote (H) - Things experienced out of class easier, like castles (H) - Hard for boys to empathise with medieval women (I) - Easy to relate gladiators to football (I) - Thinking about kingship or power generally is very alien at 15 (J) - Hard for them to empathise with <i>intensity</i> of [Reformation] religiosity (J)
Involvement of students' identity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Closer an event is (where issues to do with it are still around, and at stake), the harder it is to take a detached view (I) - So much xenophobia towards Germans (I) - Russian or Polish girl may have had experience that helps her to be more in tune with anti-WWI materials (J) - Class has strong politically correct views about homelessness (J)
Assumptions about past people (frequently stereotypes and simplifications)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - All Germans were Nazis (H) - All American Indians were warlike (I) - People in past were stupid or mad (I, J)
Contending sources of authority	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Relatives' views about WWII may carry more weight than teacher's words (I) - Pupils attached to views of American Indians gleaned from book at home (I)

Teachers at times appeared surprised or baffled by the ways that students brought their prior knowledge into play – often keen to contribute it, but other times holding it back. Sometimes pupils relied on their own conceptions to the exclusion of ideas suggested by historical evidence, as when Ingram's Year 8 pupils persisted in making up their own reasons that beggars were punished in Elizabethan times. Other times they entirely “forgot” what

most of them already knew, as when his students gasped in genuine shock at Queen Elizabeth I's decision to behead Mary Stuart. Having been caught up in an exercise requiring them to act as advisors to Elizabeth, they were brought up short to hear of her actual ruthlessness historically – even though many had learned this outcome before. Still, at other times they refused to suspend their prior knowledge for the sake of an exercise. When Dow asked his students to arrange themselves as human “tableaux” expressing the feelings of soldiers in WWI, some pupils interpreting their classmates' efforts became fixated on historical inaccuracies in the “sculptures” themselves instead of the feelings that were meant to be the focus. Yet on other occasions they failed to apply background knowledge they possessed to make sense of a situation; Joslin struggled to get her pupils to make links between their knowledge of Reformation-era religious and social changes (a major theme in the previous year's study) and the rise of witchcraft. It was as if they held their knowledge in a decontextualised and disembodied way and could not relate it to other contemporary events. Finally, the power and persistence of students' preconceptions sometimes came as a surprise. For example, Ingram knew that Year 7 boys viewed American Indians as headdress-wearing warriors who lived in teepees on the Plains, so he spent a whole lesson trying to break this stereotype down by emphasising differences between tribes. However, he had still underestimated the power of the preconception; when in the next lesson he asked them to role-play a native, the students required heavy-handed direction to prevent them from ignoring evidence of the peaceful, farming ways of the Algonquin and reverting to old stereotypes.

Despite these challenges, all of the teachers in the study took a positive and constructive view toward students' preconceptions, regarding them as resources they could (and must) work with – in Denis Shemilt's words, valuing misconceptions as “the stock from which new understandings will grow” (1983: 17). Despite the risks and likely compromises with accuracy, three of the four teachers actively urged students to build their historical knowledge outside of class, for instance by suggesting additional reading or websites they could explore. When in the Final Interview teachers were asked their opinions

on a more negatively phrased notion, that it was important to confront pupils “with the limitations and absurdities of [their] own ideas” (Shemilt, 1984: 79), every teacher bristled at the language. Dow explained,

There *are* limitations on what you can do because you’ve grown up in your own environment and you’re encased in that environment in lots of ways. Obviously you’ve got to try and overcome them, but I would never present them as an absurdity or as a limitation. I would try and say, ‘Think positively about this situation. What do we need to know to understand where they are coming from?’ (T65: 540-545).

One question that has been raised in the empathy teaching literature concerns how much familiarity with or experience of an analogous situation students need in order to understand a past event. Peter Lee asked,

Have children got to have met similar beliefs and goals, and similar situations? How deep must the similarities be? Will a broad grasp of kinds of motives do? Is it enough to know *that* people have, as a matter of fact, often acted out of fear or envy, or must the child have felt fear and envy? Fear of similar events, or simply some childish fear?... Must a child have religious beliefs or is it enough to know that some people have such beliefs? (1984a: 110-111).

Though teachers seldom articulated it this way, implicitly they seemed to share Lee’s concern, wondering whether the comparisons they drew in the flurry of a moment were sufficiently apt or evocative. In practice, they sought whatever degree of resonance with students’ lives they could find. When Dow told his students to “Imagine the kind of fear that is so agonising it just twists your stomach up” (T29: 463-464), he obviously didn’t think students had felt the same fear of a soldier, but perhaps they *had* experienced fear with a powerful physiological effect. This was useful; the possibilities were real enough to merit a mention. Hayes was aware of the problems of using students’ experiences as a tool. One day she elaborated thus:

I do think the way in with the kids is often ‘How would you feel?’ and particularly...getting a handle on it by saying ‘How would someone your age in Nazi Germany feel?’ is easier than saying ‘How would a 60-year old Jewish professor feel at losing his job?’ That is really much harder than how would a Jewish child in school feel at being ostracised, which is something they can relate to because it might happen to them... It gives them the handle because they know how children feel at their age, but it confuses it because they then relate to the child in Nazi Germany as being very similar to them (T63: 77-87).

She addressed the situation by highlighting the differences then and now, but continuing to suggest such points of commonality as she could find, however imperfect or crude. And like the other teachers, though to a greater extent, she recognised and solicited students' prior knowledge from many sources: former lessons, old schools, other teachers, travel experiences, family discussions and resources, current events, outside-of-school experiences, television and films, print journalism and books, and museums.

Knowledge of How Students React to Historical Topics

- ◆ Knowing typical student responses to a topic helped teachers to gauge which ones were more likely to produce empathetic responses.
- ◆ All of the teachers felt that students' interest in particular topics affected their motivation to empathise, but Dow also pointed out that interest alone did not ensure empathetic reactions, which had much to do with skills and how the teachers presented issues.
- ◆ Some of teachers' ideas about students' reactions reflected their own beliefs rather than ideas that they or others around them had tested. Similarly, their beliefs conditioned which student reactions they took into account in their pedagogical approaches.

Knowledge of students' responses to historical topics was no exact science, since pupils differed; the most a teacher could know was the typical spectrum of reactions a subject might elicit. Predicting responses and remembering how pupils had reacted in the past was integral to teachers' thinking about empathetic effectiveness; it helped in tailoring strategies to produce deeper empathy. For example, Joslin decided to have her Year 9 class write women's suffrage role-plays between a woman and either her husband or daughter. Knowing that they would have trouble getting started, she had them colour-code a sheet with possible arguments for each side in advance, and structured the role-plays as arguments with a family member so they could identify with the scenarios and perceive the exercise as motivating and realistic(!). She also assumed roles herself as she moved around assisting the groups, often playing devil's advocate. By modeling responses, she cued students to the pitch of feelings that debates about suffrage engendered.

Issues that teachers felt particularly interested students included matters involving family, friends, and the ethics of human relationships generally; homelessness; religion; current events; fair and unfair treatment; money matters; sex roles; gory, sensational, or bizarre details; and chances to work out how they would act in a given situation. This last point was evident in the way that pupils seemed to feel a need to state their personal moral position on topics where present and past mores differed (such as attitudes toward beggars), before moving forward with an empathetic attempt. These trends reflected those mentioned in the research literature about topics that students asserted they cared about. According to findings from two of Barton and Levstik's studies (in press: Ch. 12), students at age eleven were interested in speculating about their own ability to handle dilemmas faced by those in the past; emotional relevance to their own lives was a criterion of interest. Students a year or two younger liked learning about topics with personal connections to themselves or people they knew, as well as family relations, everyday life, and how people experienced dramatic events like wars, violence, and punishments. These results map closely onto the sort of topics that teachers in my study suggested were particularly engaging. While Dow noted that interest did not guarantee better empathy – which required *skills* developed through the teacher's input, explanations, and provision of stimulating sources – all of the teachers felt topic choice related to students' motivation to empathise. Table H indicates the sorts of knowledge that teachers possessed about students' reactions.

TABLE H: EXAMPLES OF STUDENTS' REACTIONS TO TOPICS

Teacher	Statements from transcripts (paraphrased when necessary for space)
Joslin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - They're much more curious about the macabre part of witchcraft than why incidences rose. - With anything religious, their first inclination is to think "boring." - I start with a gory paragraph about Franz Ferdinand's assassination to get their attention. - Maybe the girls don't like the Tolpuddle topic or think it's "serious" history, like wars. - I thought the nineteenth-century idea that having a perfect home was more important than going out to work would bore them.
Ingram	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - They really get into the story of who's going to win at Hastings. - Being a boys' school, they are interested in WWI, Hitler's rise, WWII, the Cold War, Vietnam – those sorts of things. - Boys are hooked by factual things – a hundred people died, or you did this and died. - The development of the American nation is way above their [Year 9] heads.
Hayes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Kids' gut reaction is to wonder why so few people protested the Nazi regime. - They are often quite shocked that Romans could do anything they wanted to their slaves. - Kids are taken up with the idea that the people who shot the WWI deserters were from their own unit. - They find the Norman Conquest an interesting and exciting story – though possibly on the level of myth. - Some have a "Here we go, the Holocaust again" attitude when they've studied it in R.S. - They think hanging, drawing, and quartering is brilliant. - Our political history can be a bit boring.
Dow	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - They'll be cocky about beating the WWI generals [in a computer simulation]. - They'll go on talking about current news forever - Henry VIII and Anne Boleyn is a fascinating story. - They are learning more about how humans generally react to incredibly difficult situations. "If I was in that situation, how would I feel? What would I do?"

Teachers seemed to be on firmest ground with their ideas when recalling how students had reacted in the past; one of the issues with this category of teacher cognition was that topics perceived to be boring, overly complex or otherwise unappealing did not necessarily make it into the classroom to be tested. As such, some ideas are more fittingly characterised as beliefs than knowledge. So for example, Ingram's notion that the development of the American nation was over his pupils' heads prevented him from actually trying to teach the topic.

In making pedagogical decisions, teachers sometimes only factored in students' reactions if they accorded with their own existing beliefs about what was appropriate in the classroom. Joslin made this clear in reporting a conversation with a former student:

She was saying something that lots of students have said to me over the years, and that is 'Do you know, one of the best bits of the course

was...,' and they almost invariably quote what I was telling them about trying to buy cat food during the Cuban Missile Crisis, or when I was – you know. And you worry about this because the last thing you need is a history teacher who is constantly talking about themselves or whatever, but they absolutely love it when you have a first-hand experience or when you can bring in some first-hand experience, even to vagabonds in the sixteenth century... I don't think I do it very much, probably, because I guess I must be aware that, technically speaking, you shouldn't do it (T64: 647-656).

When I commented that she did it very seldom as far as I could see, she mentioned that she brought in her personal experience more when it was relevant in the GCSE Modern History course, but expressed mystification about its appeal overall:

That's what they always seem to really like and remember, strangely enough (T65: 779-780).

Joslin's ideas about professionalism and her role generally prevented her from adopting the implicit suggestion in students' consistent feedback and reactions for a measure of personal connection to the topic.

Knowledge of General Student Factors

◆ For Dow, Hayes, and Ingram, the general student factor that most constrained their empathy work was behavioural disruptions; for Joslin, it was a class with a resistant and negative attitude. A variety of other factors also helped or hindered the learning environment for empathy at various times.

As noted in Chapter 4, the teaching of empathy is sensitive to the social dynamics in a classroom; these form part of the ecological balance that supports empathetic learning. This means that teachers must enlist students' cooperation in creating an atmosphere conducive to empathy. Labaree has described this as the problem of client cooperation:

[Teachers] must devote enormous amounts of skill and effort to the task of motivating the client to cooperate, and still the outcome is far from certain. The client may choose to spurn the practitioner's offer of improvement out of apathy, habit, principle, spite, inattention, or whim. In such a field, success rates are likely to be low, and the connection between a practitioner's action and a client's outcome is likely to be, at best, indirect. Therefore, the effectiveness of the practitioner becomes difficult to establish (2000: 228-229).

Teachers mentioned a number of factors concerning students' behaviours and how they influenced progress toward empathetic goals. Judging by the number of times the transcripts showed teachers explicitly switching into behavioural management language, and some of the comments in post-lesson interviews, the constraining student factor that most deeply affected the work of Ingram, Hayes, and Dow was disruptions for discipline; each had to address such issues multiple times in many lessons. Regarding the problem of a lot of "low-level disruption" in a lesson on the Crusades (T39: 799), Hayes commented, "[I]t's difficult when you start to explain something and you've got to say 'Don't do that. *Are you listening? Put your pen down!*' I feel it's a bit too broken really, that you can't quite get the atmosphere the way you want it" (T39: 803-805). Joslin mentioned, "I can't always find the language when I'm thinking on my feet to make it really clear...I lose my ability to get just the right language when I start having also to do classroom management things" (T9: 677-680). And Ingram noted ways that poor behaviour was affecting his use of strategies in two classes, remarking that with one Year 9 group, "I couldn't do a certain exercise, a really good detailed empathy exercise, because the management issue was greater than the actual – the learning environment perhaps isn't appropriate enough" (T62: 587-589). With his Year 10 class,

You need to keep a very very tight reign on them. If you give them too much freedom they will lose it, and so in an empathy exercise with them, you can't really give them a lot of freedom with what they're doing. It just has to be very tightly controlled empathy questions: what do you think of this?... You can't say 'Ten minutes, go and work out what these soldiers would say,' because they don't have the ability and also they wouldn't concentrate. So it's a major constraint (T22: 507-513).

For Joslin, the more problematic issue was not management per se but the attitude of some girls in her Year 10 class, who on some days acted sullen, arrogant or subtly resistant to her efforts to engage them. Joslin understood the possible implications if their attitude got out of hand:

[I]f kids are afraid of being laughed at or even being given a look across the room when they test out an idea, if they have that feeling then they can't learn. But that would apply to almost anything, not just empathy.

But empathy being the open-mindedness not to laugh at the past but to try and understand it would also mean that you have to create a culture in the classroom where the scoffers don't get any hold on things, because they ruin the atmosphere (T64: 954-961).

Finally, there were a host of issues constraining empathy with particular classes or even individuals. Maturity could be a factor – Ingram, for example, had to deal with a Year 7 boy who refused to take the role of a medieval *woman*. Other issues included fear of taking risks with ideas, poor concentration or attention, excessive liveliness or excitement, lack of motivation, silly or thoughtless answers, flights of fancy, pupils' not attending to the instructions for a task, an unappreciative attitude toward trips, and perfunctory engagement like participating in role-plays in a plodding and completely unenthused fashion. For example, one of Ingram's students announced, in flat and emotionless tones, "I think the Treaty [of Versailles] is a very bad idea. I am a very important, high-class businessman and I have no say in the future of this country. I find that very disgusting" (T15: 223-224). The attitude was credible, but the affect was not. Of course, most of these constraints also had a flip side: students could dramatically facilitate empathy work by being settled and focused, showing interest and enthusiasm, and thinking for themselves. An inquisitive spirit on the part of only two or three students sometimes had the effect of enlivening a whole group.

Structural Factors

◆ The most significant structural conditions that influenced teachers' empathetic efforts were curricular time, the availability and quality of resources, and curricular and examination specifications.

Curricular Time

◆ Time constraints affected teacher's choice of topics, teaching strategies, ability to create momentum, the pace of lessons and topic changes, and teachers' preparation.

◆ Lack of resources to send home with pupils for homework meant that much class time had to be devoted to establishing students' basic knowledge of a period or event.

“Time is so short, it’s criminal” Dow (T41: 573-574).

“I know I keep saying it, but it’s the time constraint and not being able to spend enough time thinking about, well, what was society really like?” Hayes (T43: 757-758).

“We have to drag them kicking and screaming on one lesson a week through all this content” Joslin (T64: 627-628).

“That’s rubbish as well, you can’t get any depth of understanding in an hour a week” Ingram (T62: 399-400).

As the comments above reveal, teachers felt that restrictions on curricular time for history severely constrained their teaching for empathy. Because History is not a Core Subject in the National Curriculum, they typically saw their Key Stage 3 pupils only once or twice a week for an hour and their GCSE students for about two hours a week.

Lack of time affected the sort of topics they chose. As Dow said,

I think you’ve got to make them aware of the strangeness of it...you should be emphasising the differences of the past... You’ve only got a certain amount of time to teach these students, so you can’t start immersing them in the nineteenth century for eight weeks and then get them to get really developed understanding. So you’ve got to go for things that grab them. If you start trying to be too sophisticated and too subtle then you’re going to lose them (T65: 567-577).

All of the teachers lamented the lack of time to explore and enjoy topics – they spoke of racing the students through, marching on, ticking off one topic and moving on to the next, and feeling pressured all the while. Nor were these abstract complaints – time to discuss and “process” ideas was clearly quite limited once the factual background had been established, and “discussion” usually resembled more a rehearsal of key points than a probing and development of ideas. Even right after September 11th, there was little divergence from set lesson plans to help students make sense of world events. Teachers believed that in an hour a week with examinations or fresh topics to cover looming, real discussion was a luxury they could seldom afford. And it was hard enough establishing understanding of the basic events, never mind the sort of depth needed to support the more sophisticated forms of empathy.

As Hayes stated the relation, “The more depth we can actually do in a topic, the more they can empathise with it (T63: 205-206). Teachers sometimes lacked time to test pupils’ understanding at the end of a lesson (Ingram), or even to establish secure contextual knowledge along the way (Hayes) – particularly for pupils who did not pick up concepts quickly.

Compounding the time squeeze was the fact that departments rarely had the textual resources (books or handouts) to send home with pupils prior to Sixth Form. While all the teachers did occasionally pass out photocopies that students could keep, Ingram and Hayes appeared to be under particular budgetary pressures to keep this to a minimum. Therefore, much of the background knowledge drawn upon in empathetic work had to be gained and reinforced during class time, typically through reading aloud, watching videos, using other sources or listening, and then reviewing ideas or creating notes for exercise books, which did go home with students. But since pupils – especially younger ones – were often not adding substantially to their knowledge outside of their infrequent lessons, teachers had to backtrack and spend time re-generating the knowledge resonance they would need for the lesson. During a study of King John, Joslin commented that she hadn’t really set them up to write the “very best empathy” due to lack of time (T40: 635). But there was a “*lovely* chapter on life in a medieval village” in their textbook, “and I could save time if they had textbooks by getting them to actually read it, just maybe answer a few questions about it or whatever, rather than having to use the *lesson* to do that...it would be a great homework” (T40: 636-640). Dow thought wistfully of the former year when he had seen pupils three times a week, and outlined several time-related liabilities:

Those three lessons a week you get *such* an intensity of experience... *really* really deep experience, you can really get into it. So it’s, ‘Remember what we were doing yesterday,’ rather than ‘Remember what we were doing last week.’ You get momentum going – which I’m *not* with this class. A lot of time is spent on recapping and I think the links are less for them, and the *value* of the subject maybe is less, just being one lesson a week. They don’t see it as being their *major* subject. This is getting into another issue here, but they used to have more Humanities than any other subject – but now they just have one History, one R.S. and one Geography with a different teacher. I just feel it’s just plummeting in quality... (T4: 477-485).

When he pondered at the end of the school year why his Year 9 class this year seemed less interested and motivated than last year's, he concluded,

I think empathy relies on a rolling motion, you go from this thing in this lesson to the central lesson to the final written response. If you go through it slowly over three weeks, then each time you're trying to recreate the momentum you had in the previous lesson, whereas if you have three lessons in a week you can achieve more effective things. So the scheduling of lessons is important (T65: 440-444).

Finally, Ingram and Joslin raised the matter of constraints on preparation time outside of class. In one role-play exercise, Ingram had intended to include more characters, but lacked the time to produce the materials (T34). When asked how he would ideally change things, he did not hesitate before saying,

I just need more time. I haven't had enough time to produce resources. I teach eight or nine different classes in a week, and you don't even mark all the stuff. To have empathy underpinning all of it, and to create this idea of historical understanding, the textbooks just aren't good enough, they are just not good enough – but they are the only resource we have. They need to be supplemented by all sorts of different things to get kids thinking. Q: Such as? A: Card sorts, other different exercises to get them thinking. There's these Lifelines. I've seen a lot of stuff this year about the thinking skills. All of those kinds of exercises, but they need time to produce, and that is without doubt – It doesn't matter about the ability, that's the A1 thing, resource production...So, those two things: time to produce resources and more curriculum time (T62: 373-385, 400-401).

Joslin, meanwhile, with only one free period once a fortnight, considered "prime time" for resource production sharply limited. She made the best of the situation by collaborating with other teachers in her department and with student teachers, and used ideas from prepared materials when they were appropriate. She noted,

Probably to get that one exercise that's really good would have taken several days with three people fine-tuning it. What teacher could ever do that? You have a flash, a brain-wave, but you can't often follow it through because you don't have anything like the time it takes to do that even if you're quite a fast thinker (T56: 748-752).

She expressed faith that when dedicated teachers were freed up to reflect, they could teach well (T28); all too often they attempted to do so under conditions of temporal scarcity and stress.

Resource Quality and Availability

- ◆ The quality and availability of accessible, age-appropriate resources was perceived by all of the teachers as a major factor affecting their efforts to cultivate empathy.
- ◆ Because good resources were often time-consuming to create, adapt, or locate, the teachers sometimes used prepared materials and collaborated with other teachers on resource-production.
- ◆ In selecting resources, teachers drew upon their knowledge of students generally, as well as their capacities, preconceptions, and likely reactions to materials.
- ◆ The teachers recognised that the sources they used carried with them various affordances and constraints in terms of empathy.
- ◆ Teachers spoke both about deficiencies in their textbooks (Ingram) and in improvements they had seen over the years in terms of the cultivation of empathy (Joslin). However, the number of empathetically supportive features in most textbooks was small by comparison to an A-Level text co-authored by Dow.

The fact that materials circulated only within the school department for many year-groups meant that discussion or thinking time was reduced or crowded out at the end of the lesson – a threat to empathy since deeper empathy work typically *followed* basic context-building. Also, in completing homework assignments, student often had to rely primarily on their notes and memories as sources of information. Only in their A-Level and sometimes GCSE groups could teachers regularly assign reading and expect students to possess some knowledge at the start of class, preserving time to delve into empathetic questions.

The quality and availability of accessible, age-appropriate resources were perceived by all teachers as major factors affecting their efforts to cultivate empathy. Probably not coincidentally, the lessons of those who had been teaching the longest, Joslin and Dow, were richer in the use of resources

beyond the textbook. Some of their lessons, such as those on witchcraft and Henry VIII, were feats of resource-gathering, thought and preparation time; it took many hours to put them together. In light of such efforts, certain researcher remarks advising teachers how to cultivate empathy seem insensitive:

It would be an easy matter to construct a board and dice game about the Black Death and its effects on one village – a game of interest to the children, yet historically accurate. For example, what is the probability of survival? Were there ‘miracle cures’? How long did the plague last in the village? I do not claim that this suggestion is shatteringly original, but it continues to amaze me that the use of these aids is still so limited in the classroom, or that they are used purely as an end-in-themselves, uninformed by broader conceptual considerations (Stockley, 1983: 65).

But constructing a board and dice game of any sophistication is not an “easy matter” when one has eight or nine classes for whom to plan lessons in a week. It may be conceptually within reach, but personally sacrificial, and teachers have to balance the value of creating such a resource against other demands.

Teachers used a variety of strategies to cope. They all occasionally (from one to five times in the lessons I witnessed) utilised prepared materials – resources where the empathetic strategy was pre-conceived, and teachers simply selected it as helpful and appropriate.⁶⁸ This needed not imply a compromise with quality; a broad variety of materials was available in texts and on the internet, and teachers selected those they believed advanced their goals. Wholesale adoption of a prepared strategy was most common with Ingram, partly because of time constraints and partly because of concerns about confusing his mostly lower-band pupils: he found that using a resource as it was laid out in a book or handout tended to work better than adapting it creatively.

The teachers also collaborated with their colleagues to find and prepare materials. Joslin worked closely with colleagues and student teachers to develop new lessons, for example for their newly adopted Crime and Punishment GCSE course, and to find and present sources, which she customised according to the level of her own pupils. Hayes and Dow both

⁶⁸ This does not refer to informational reading from a textbook or watching of videos.

mentioned teaching with some materials located by department members. Ingram alone did not mention sharing resources with other history teachers in his school, because his department was small and scattered in terms of responsibilities and subject areas. However, he, like Joslin, benefited from discussions with other teachers through university course meetings.

Resources – specifically source availability – also affected the character of empathy pursued. Teachers more often employed the strategy of having students create *representative* characters when compact and accessible primary sources from *actual* historical figures representing a certain viewpoint were lacking, unknown, or there wasn't time to do the source interpretation necessary for understanding. This was the approach, for example, in Ingram's Medieval Life lesson (T7) where accessible sources left behind by villeins or villagers were not available, as well as his lesson on illiterate Roman gladiators (T45), but when good materials on a real person representing a *type* were available, as with Hayes' lesson focused on Corporal Goggins – a twentieth-century “ordinary person” and hapless WWI “deserter” (T19), teachers generally incorporated them or used them exclusively. They appeared to prefer to have historical sources grounding an empathetic sequence when possible; Hayes noted, “The Weimar side is quite complicated and we haven't got much time to teach it. I'm constantly looking for resources that will succinctly get it across, which is a problem really. But...it's quite good fun looking for things” (T55: 27-30). Teachers such as Dow and Joslin mixed the historical and invented perspectives in their WWI units, with the culminating performance involving an invented “ordinary” character based on readings of actual sources.

Teachers' thinking about the ways that sources might support empathy, often while also contributing to other learning goals, drew heavily upon their “knowledge packages” – knowledge of students' thinking about the past, of the sources available, of pupils' capacities to comprehend them, of their reactions, and of the background knowledge they needed as preparation for future learning. For example, Hayes began her lower-band Year 9 lesson about the concentration camp Theresienstadt by using postcards of drawings by children there who were about the same age as her pupils. Dow started his WWI unit by

presenting students with several types of “emotive data,” images and words to give them a feeling for trench life and warfare, before moving on to the conduct of the war.

The teachers recognised that the sources they used carried with them various assets and constraints. For example, Hayes used the Bayeux Tapestry because it was “*great*” for illustrating the Battle of Hastings, all the while knowing that it reinforced a notion of the warriors as “almost like Lowry’s matchstick men, these chain-stitched people” (Hayes, T23: 600) – a notable liability since teachers all commented on the need to emphasise the very *reality* of past people so they could be taken seriously. Joslin employed a textbook’s anachronistic suggestion to have students write a radio programme about attitudes toward sixteenth-century vagabonds (T6), because it was helpfully laid out with supporting sources, and because the format served the vital purpose of motivating students. (She pointed out the anachronism to her students and explained it was just a vehicle to get them thinking.) While all of the teachers recognised that textbooks needed supplementing from other sources, they also praised certain features of the books: the value of the visuals, and of “interviews” or dialogues between historical figures which

- personalised their viewpoints. Joslin believed that textbooks had improved in the last few years, giving teachers the tools to present lots of points of view. One actually provided exercises on how to link context with action – the sort of useful resource that saved her a lot of time.

Years ago, Peter Lee wrote a brief critique of school history textbooks (1978). Because they too briefly characterised agents’ situations, he claimed, and made assumptions about students’ knowledge about how people in the past might view their circumstances, they generated considerable confusion rather than empathy. One limitation of the present study is that I did not systematically probe teachers’ views about all aspects of their textbooks’ supportiveness from an empathetic point of view. However, we did discuss the books a number of times, and I also examined the textbooks passages they relied on in light of their ultimate empathetic goals. Naturally, authors had to reconcile competing goals, and empathy may not have been a priority in each

case, but given its centrality to the discipline it is nonetheless an important dimension to evaluate. On the whole, the main body of the texts (as opposed to the added excerpts from documents) focused on events and trends, and provided little information on attitudes, thoughts, feelings, or significance. Some of them had other drawbacks: they presented scant context for events, used primary sources that represented only certain sides of contemporary debates (while asking students to consider multiple points of view), and used passive voice instead of active voice in ways that stripped historical actors of their agency. Arguably, some texts for GCSE pupils over-used juvenile sketches and cartoons that counteracted the notion of the past as real and meant to be taken seriously. However, they were usually quite strong on presentation of visual materials and facsimiles of historical documents, as well as typed excerpts from primary sources.

Of course, the quality for different texts and topics varied. The text Ingram used to teach Year 7 about the encounter between the English and Native Americans was more visually helpful than informative in terms of the outlooks of both parties. The entire account given of the breakdown of the relationship between the English and the Algonquin in *Indians of North America* read as follows:

The first trouble

The Indians were friendly. Then there was trouble. An Indian was accused of stealing a silver cup. Grenville ordered the Indian's village and fields to be burnt.

The next trouble

Grenville, the settlers and soldiers built a fort at Roanoke. They treated the Indians badly and often took their crops. Things went from bad to worse.

The English leave

The English settlers became more and more fed up. When Sir Francis Drake called at Roanoke the settlers went on board his ship and left with him (Reynoldson, 1997: 18).

Not surprisingly, given that the text contains the barest of descriptive outlines rather than comprehensible explanations, the students had trouble in their own subsequent role-plays reconstructing *why* the settlers and natives

suddenly changed their attitudes; their understanding was hindered by *too little* rather than *too much* information. As passively presented here, events mostly just happened – all rather swiftly. On the other hand, the *Medicine and Healing through Time* textbook (as well as the video) that Dow had available for teaching Year 10 about Galen and Vesalius' medical ideas was rich in contextual information. It used a helpful interview format to make Vesalius' breakthroughs accessible and show their significance (while explaining that people were not interviewed in this way in the 1500s; his "answers" were based on sources from the time). Facts about Vesalius' personality, childhood curiosity, changes in universities, and the availability of corpses to dissect at Padua were all noted to explain how man and circumstances came together to challenge longstanding shibboleths about the human body.

The more common deficiencies of textbooks in empathetic terms were thrown into relief by comparison with a text co-authored by Dow. As co-creator of an A-Level textbook on a period of pre-modern English history, he had included a number of empathetically supportive features. Along with the relatively standard reproductions of actual historical documents, visuals and excerpts of primary sources, ample information in the main text on attitudes, thoughts, and feelings was provided, as well as historians' interpretations, suggested empathy-related activities, and personalisation of historical figures through authorial role-taking in the main text. Dow and his co-authors also presented dilemmas faced by historical actors, along with the options available at the time, and encouraged pupils to choose one and explain and defend their choice, providing information elsewhere as to which course was actually followed. They asked questions about the significance of various happenings and challenged students to arrive at their own conclusions supported by concrete evidence. They also identified "learning trouble spots" – areas of likely confusion for students – and offered explanations and vocabulary support. The contrast between this text and the majority of school textbooks in use for younger pupils was remarkable in terms of the added features enhancing the possibilities for empathy.

Curricular and Examination Specifications

◆ The teachers all expressed frustration with the time pressures created by the GCSE and A-Level examination mandates, and felt these interfered to some extent with their ability to cultivate empathy. However, they expressed positive sentiments about the National Curriculum 2000 and the possibilities it opened up for treating a greater variety of topics in more depth.

Behind all of teachers' pedagogical decisions lay an awareness of their ultimate responsibilities to prepare their pupils for their examinations, and to teach them the skills and concepts presented by the National Curriculum requirements for History.⁶⁹ As Hayes expressed,

At the end of the day, I feel we owe it to the kids for them to get the best grade possible. I am totally focused on what the curriculum dictates and I don't really step much outside it. It's nice to have the odd discussion in class, but I try to make sure we cover as much of the syllabus as we possibly can, and then go back and revise it. As regards Lower School, the Key Stage 3 people, there isn't a lot of freedom, to be honest. We do occasionally manage to divert slightly, but again because there is such a lot to cover – and we do as a department try to keep roughly in pace with each other...because we have set assessments that we do (T55: 125-134).

Teachers felt most pressured with their GCSE and A-Level classes because those were the ones being examined. Ingram registered disgust with the situation:

For GCSE, AS, and A2, it's *no* longer about history. It's *purely* about preparing students for exams... From Year 10 on, I think I cease to be a history teacher, and I am an examination teacher. I really really do feel that strongly (T54: 148-149, 155-157).

Joslin also noted that the examinations took place under “completely false conditions for a historian, in the sense of having to draw from memorised knowledge and write to time. I just think that part is so wrong” (T56: 269-270). She regretted the time spent on strategic aspects of exam preparation:

I'm having to spend time teaching my Year 10 and 11 present class exactly how many words they're likely to be able to write in 20 minutes, what they're going to have to leave out of an essay in order to get down the things that the examiner will give them credit for, and I don't want to have to do that. I do want them to write concisely and to the point, I

⁶⁹ Indeed, the ways they sometimes conceptualised empathy as a discrete concept were shaped by its presentation in old curricular and exam specifications, as noted in the preceding chapter.

want it to be focused and well-argued, I want them to have that skill, but I don't want to have to spend time practising over and over how they can condense that into 20 minutes... I could be using that time for more productive things (T56: 280-287).

Such choices compounded time pressures and reduced the amount of class time dedicated to fostering empathy, as well as other learning. Ingram and Dow also both mentioned not discussing empathy that much with their departments because it was not a formal curricular target, though Joslin felt she had integrated it to the point where she would not do it more if it were specified in the documents.

The teachers appeared to feel less constrained by the requirements of the 2000 version of the National Curriculum for Key Stage 3, in which they felt the former version's prescriptiveness had been reduced and the flexibility to do in-depth studies provided. Dow said, "I'm feeling pretty positive about the National Curriculum, and I think so long as people don't get skewed into an Anglocentric history then it's a positive thing" (T57: 35-36). He also liked the variety and flavour of topics in Edexcel's GCSE course, as well as the emphasis on enquiry-based learning, sources, and student-centredness. Ingram seconded the approval of the new National Curriculum, because it gave teachers a lot of freedom and they could "get away from kings and queens and all that sort of stuff" (T54: 62-63).⁷⁰ Joslin liked the way the Crime and Punishment GCSE drew on empathy skills by encouraging the exploration of changing attitudes. When at the end of the year I asked teachers about their "dream" teaching conditions, Hayes, Joslin, and Ingram all spoke about wanting to do fewer topics in greater depth, and in fact appeared to be planning possibilities aloud as I listened. They seemed to be entertaining the notion that some of their ideas, in the new Key Stage 3 environment, might be feasible – though of course I was not around the following year to learn whether they implemented any of them.

⁷⁰ The Year 8 history course that I observed still had a strong focus on Tudor and Stuart monarchs, however.

Other Structural Constraining or Facilitating Factors

Individual teachers mentioned a few other constraining influences on their work. Pleased as he was with the take-up of History at his school, Dow noted that the subject had “almost become too popular. My A-Level cohort is 150 students, and it’s just destroying us in terms of resources and trying to cover this. It’s really stretching me to the limit, and the department to the limit” (T57: 102-104). Hayes had a couple of occasions when equipment problems caused disruptions, with the VCR not working or needing to be shared with another teacher. Ingram and Hayes both mentioned that their schools discouraged taking the students out of class for field trips, which they felt were empathetically valuable. Ingram also had homework restrictions for when he could assign work to his Year 7 group.

Facilitating factors they mentioned included enthusiastic parents who cultivated a mindset of curiosity in their children (Joslin and Hayes), other classes like Religious Studies where topics were debated and empathy cultivated (Hayes), and a general department ethos of high expectations (Joslin).

Teacher Factors

This section of the chapter examines the ways that teachers themselves influenced the advancement of empathy, not in terms of the strategies they used, but of their perceptions of their own knowledge, interest and skills, and how they had learned what they knew. The conclusions presented here diverge from those of the sections above in that they contain interpretations on the part of the researcher. These involve aspects of their thinking and practice that teachers did not report, but that appeared on the basis of transcript analysis to be having an impact on the teaching of empathy. Indeed, some of these trends, such as classroom discourse patterns, would be hard to detect without the benefit of a transcript, since they happened in fleeting fashion during a lesson, and perhaps below the level of teachers’ consciousness.

Sources of Teachers' Knowledge and Skill

- ◆ The teachers believed that reflecting about their experience in trying ideas in the classroom and observing pupils' learning was the primary source of their growth in teaching empathy.
- ◆ Opportunities for structured reflection – including teachers' own research and participation in this research – could function as spurs to development.

Experience and Reflection

“Experience, at least reflected on experience, is a great teacher,” according to several scholars of expertise in teaching (Sabers, Cushing, & Berliner, 1991: 84). Certainly, when asked about the engines of their own development in the teaching of empathy, the most common response for all teachers was experience or reflection upon it. As Dow said,

Essentially it's a process of trial and error, and practice...I don't write evaluations down, but I think a good teacher should be always thinking about the lessons and how effective they are and whether it went well. I think you naturally get into a spin of doing that and then you think, 'Last time I did this I wasn't quite happy with that. I'll do it this way' (T65: 349, 354-357).

Dow was happy to try a number of approaches until he found what worked. He claimed that during his PGCE year he had tried out “some fairly wacky ideas” (T57: 350), and he continued to note what produced the outcomes he was after. So, for example, when students did not generate the standard of WWI letters from the trenches that he wanted, he reformulated the instructions to force them to confront what, from a modern point of view, seemed paradoxical: “Even though it is so awful out here in the trenches, we stay here and fight because...” was the required opening line of each student's letter. He also taught them about levels of empathy so they could refine the quality of their work.

Joslin was also articulate about her learning process. She claimed that watching students was an influence:

[T]he more I am able to perceive how they learn and what their misconceptions are and how they gain understanding – not that I'm an expert at that – it makes you adapt your methods all the time, but that entirely depends on how astute you are at being able to unpick the

processes of learning and the things that work and don't work (T56: 480-484).

Outside of class, she also attended to their written work, and what it was telling her about how she had taught (though she didn't always hold herself responsible for the quality). She said, "Maybe as you're marking something you think, 'Oh, I didn't do this well. I didn't give them enough of a context'" (T64: 209-210). Even when she didn't have a chance to act on her impressions with that group, she could often adapt her approach for another if she was alert enough and had time.

All of the teachers were engaged in this process of observing, diagnosing, reflecting, refining, practicing, and experimenting anew. This seemed like a natural and spontaneous cycle for them – Joslin mentioned that having done it once, next year she'd get the timing to the Black Country Museum right, and Hayes knew from experience which videos and examples fascinated students. Teachers also developed more general principles from their work, like Joslin's saying that experience told her she would confuse the bottom bands with too much differentiation of viewpoints.

The teachers also mentioned that having a structured chance to reflect on their lessons as a part of this research influenced their thinking about empathy; Hayes claimed it got her thinking and logically articulating her ideas and sometimes shared with me ideas about empathy she'd had while reflecting on her own.⁷¹ Ingram expressed the way his participation in this research and his own study of students' "interpretations" (which he clarified to mean preconceptions) came together to change his thinking. He commented, for instance, that he wanted to teach students a greater awareness of their own thinking:

In future I think, in order to understand how they have empathised, I need to go in and ask them about the process of their own thoughts, 'Why did you think they were going to do this? What made you think that? What did you think of first, and then what other knowledge did you add to come up to that? Did you ever consider doing this? If not, why not?' I think for them to be able to empathise I need to show them

⁷¹ Her interest in the subject was also mirrored in her decision to conduct research the following year examining her own empathy practice.

how to think in that way...they need to be led very heavily. On reflection I realise now that they need to be very heavily led by the teacher through that process I just described about the questioning of their thinking (T62: 296-302, 327-329).

Post hoc reflections when lessons were fresh in teachers' minds seemed to serve as prompts for them to consider how they would tinker with them in the future. Naturally they wouldn't pursue all of the brainstorming that surfaced during this process. Joslin was quite prone to thinking of pedagogical adjustments, but knew the limits. "Every week you decide, in fact every month you decide, what you're going to focus on, and everything else runs on and you spend the little bit of extra planning time that you have trying to make one or two things really very much better" (T64: 240-242). She and Hayes, the teachers who, due to time constraints on the day, later had the opportunity to read a transcript of their lesson to stimulate recall, were both intrigued by what they saw. Joslin realised how much talking and explaining she was doing, and worried that this "could be detrimental and frustrating for pupils if I am filling in too much without letting them figure it out for themselves" (T64: 307-309). Hayes identified questioning strategies as an issue in her Castles lesson:

I think reading that I could see where I was jumping in and answering the questions for them, and I was also doing closed questions... that is something that I personally should be very aware of, particularly with Year 7s when you think 'Oh gosh, you haven't given me the answer I wanted and we're going off somewhere else here,' and so you start answering the question yourself: 'Now, do you think this castle was *good*?' (T63: 367-374).

The Department and Wider Profession

◆ Three of the teachers collaborated with department members in sharing insights and resources for empathy teaching. Beyond that circle, *Teaching History* magazine was a key source of ideas.

Except for Ingram's school, where there was "no departmental ethos" or coherence – though he was working on gradually changing this – the other teachers appeared to converse and collaborate extensively with their colleagues, particularly on an informal basis. The ways they pooled resources and bounced ideas off one another have been discussed above, so I will focus

here upon the teachers' participation in the broader history education community. All of them were engaged in attending in-service training, conferences, or courses, and remarked on the value mainly of hearing new ideas and talking to colleagues. All of them had also benefited from reading *Teaching History*, the professional journal in the field; Hayes appeared to be the only one not subscribing during the year of this research, though she had in the past. Joslin read it cover to cover, and its impact was apparent. One week both she and Ingram talked about "little stories" and "big pictures," which, it emerged, had been the theme of a recent, eponymous issue (June 2002). Ingram also noted that there had been a whole issue on empathy (August 2000). In fact, except for Dow, who occasionally also read other history education books and Historical Association booklets, *Teaching History* seemed to be *the* written source they consulted, and they valued it for its practical rather than theoretical focus.

Life Experiences

◆ To varying degrees, the teachers used their own empathetic reactions and learning processes as sources of potential ideas about how to help students empathise.

While teachers mentioned learning from inspirational teachers they had had in the past, these individuals were spoken of generally rather than in the context of empathy work. More useful was analysis of their personal learning processes and current empathetic reactions. Teachers considered this a resource to varying degrees. Ingram did not rely on it:

I'm not very good at remembering my own learning process, it's really strange, but I'm hopeless at remembering how I learnt things, or what processes I've gone through. I seem to arrive at a point, and then forget the build-up. I just remember the conclusion (T54: 483-486).

On the other hand, Joslin used a lot of primary sources, which in reflecting on her own learning she credited with helping her to immerse herself in past ways of thinking, and Hayes frequently used whole-class discussion and personal illustrations, a method of learning she clearly favoured. She also commented that from her experience, there was nothing

like travel for getting a sense of historical place. Even though she did not assume students would find the same things powerful that she did – for example, she rejected a Crusades video featuring an Oxford professor as inappropriate for Year 7 though she found it interesting – she used her own responses as guidelines to what *might* work. Similarly, Dow gauged the value of a photo of a soldier at Normandy in WWII partly by his own reaction to it: “I couldn’t read much into that face – which is part of the reason I chose it. It wasn’t an ‘Oh my god, I’m terrified’ picture. It’s ‘What is this guy feeling?’ It’s really difficult to read” (T33: 632-634). Intrigued by the ambiguity and child-like quality of the expression, he hoped pupils would be too.

Dominant Influences

◆ After experience, the most significant contributing factors to teachers’ empathetic learning varied with the individual.

After classroom experience and reflection, different influences affected different teachers most overall. Dow’s ideas about empathy seemed to be principally shaped by his own reading and research, both of history and history education literature, as well as his own creativity and experimental spirit. Hayes often framed her learning in social terms: talking to other teachers and family members, and listening to people’s experiences and commentary (including historians’). She learned from watching colleagues teach, watching pupils react, and drawing analogies and lessons from her own life – for example, she mentioned that as a child she liked to daydream little fantasies about history and wanted her own students to treat the past with more respect. Personal connections were a major enabler of empathetic connections for her. She noted,

I suppose we do put so much of our experiences in life into how we deliver something. When we do the Medicine course, my daughter is at medical school and so she comes home and talks about things she does, and I find that that makes me think about the past and the way doctors were trained and how things were developed, and that has made it more interesting for me... We just put in so much of our own experience, consciously or unconsciously (T55: 356-361).

Though Ingram claimed that he had not thought a great deal about empathy teaching prior to this research – and speculated that the reason was that he was playing to an audience of boys for whom feelings might not be all that gripping – he had picked up many ideas from watching or reading about other teachers at work. He claimed,

I have no new ideas of my own. They've all been nicked from other people. So everything I do I've obviously seen at some point. Either on my PGCE, or I've read about in *Teaching History*, or our student teachers have done. I see what works, and if it works, I use it, and if it doesn't, I ditch it (T54: 489-493).

His own research contributed to his exposure to history education literature and profoundly affected his goals and decisions about implementing them. He was also influenced by QCA schemes of work, and cited television documentaries as a key source of historical information.

Over the course of her career, Joslin had drawn on a broad mix of sources. Colleagues and student teachers had given her ideas and resources, though she often adapted them. On the basis of her experience, she could also see where various ideas put forth in *Teaching History* might go wrong, and need altering. She had participated in many courses, as well as conducted action research on her own practice – she was finishing this during the year I spent with her. Her lessons were the products of much reading and searching for apt materials to use, and she mentioned that she found it exciting to work up lessons on new topics.

Teacher Control of Classroom Discourse

◆ Consciously or not, all of the teachers accepted or actively shaped patterns of discourse during whole-class teaching that rendered deep development of empathy uncommon. These patterns included teachers' offering answers to their own questions, an orientation toward recitation rather than discussion (as technically defined), and the brevity of students' comments. The level of clarity of teachers' questions could also influence empathetic outcomes positively or negatively.

As the individuals presiding over the flow of talk in the classroom, teachers exerted considerable influence over the forms it took, which could in turn affect the possibilities for empathy. One teacher factor that constrained

students' *display* of empathy, if not the empathy itself, was the occasional tendency to answer their own questions instead of letting pupils puzzle out reasons and motivations; empathetic effort was rendered unnecessary. Instances of "spoon-feeding" could occur with regard to points of fact or interpretation, though sometimes teachers were simply modeling how to think about a task. Three of the teachers – Hayes, Ingram, and Joslin – mentioned that they were feeding answers, especially when time was short and they were trying to get certain points across. They were self-critical about the tendency; after going from group to group to help her Year 7 class write stories about the Black Death, Joslin remarked,

And then I butted in as I always do too much...rather than trying to get *her* to figure that out [laughs]. I always do that. I know it when I'm doing it, and then I forget for the next time because I'm trying to get as much – oh, I don't know, when I talk to them one-to-one I'm so aware that I've got another twenty-eight that might need me (T40: 602-606).

Every teacher commented at least once that he or she wished not to have to *pull out* ideas or *steer* students so much, though they also remarked on times when ideas flowed from students without leading. Two basic trends of classroom discourse emerged from the fine-grained analysis. With the notable exception of group work, when students were interacting mainly with each other, talk was virtually always brisk and teacher-student-teacher (T-S-T-S-etc.), or what Wilen and White (1991) term "recitation" as opposed to discussion. The latter, according to sociolinguists, looks and sounds different from recitation: "The pace slows. Both teacher and student utterances become longer. The intonation and pitch drop to a quieter, more intimate tone and there are more pauses" (Cazden: 1988; Farrar: 1988, cited in Wilen and White, 1991: 489). Interactions resembling this description happened in a full-fledged sense only once or twice across all the lessons, but events with some features of discussion occurred more regularly. For example, Joslin and Dow sometimes turned pupil questions back at the class to puzzle out, rather than answering outright. Hayes was particularly open to students' shifts of the direction of the curriculum and would allow brief or even sometimes extensive pursuits of relevant tangents.

The second major feature of classroom talk in the lessons of all teachers examined for the fine-grained analysis was the striking brevity of students' comments: most were a single word, a phrase, or a sentence, and remarks of three or more sentences were rare. Table I below shows the number of instances of each type of student utterance, summed across the three finely-analysed lessons for each teacher.

TABLE I: NUMBER OF STUDENT COMMENTS OF VARIOUS LENGTHS IN THREE LESSONS

Comment length	Dow	Hayes	Ingram	Joslin
Word or phrase	99	94	95	67
1 sentence	124	150	166	116
2 sentences	17	8	7	13
3+ sentences	3	3	5	6
Total	243	255	273	202

These patterns show that development of ideas by students, particularly during whole-class teaching arrangements or when the teacher was interacting with a smaller group, was quite cursory overall. Brief comments may have posed a challenge to teachers' cultivation of empathy in that they revealed few diagnostic clues as to what sort of understanding, if any, was actually taking place in students' minds; the window only opened a crack. Pupils appeared to believe that little development or *defense* of ideas was necessary; just offering a thought was usually sufficient. It was probably not coincidental that in these twelve transcripts, longer comments (of more than one sentence, and especially three sentences or more) usually signified thoughtfulness on the student's part, an effort to make sense of an event, support it with evidence, or reach some sort of interpretation.

Why did all of the teachers structure classroom discourse in this way, except during group work (which in Hayes' lessons was rare)? I did not pose this question, since I was not thinking about how patterns of classroom talk and control might matter at the time. So I can only speculate. Given the constraints of time, resources, student behaviour, and real or perceived necessities for coverage, the teachers (except possibly with their A-Level

groups, who were not the focus of this study beyond one lesson) appeared not to consider building a culture of sustained enquiry a realistic possibility. They encouraged empathy in many ways, as the next chapter will show, but maintained very tight control over classroom events and talk, especially through their questioning, and seemed to feel a need to constantly push forward with new content instead of exploring ideas in depth. Probably, the fact that they *had* to make sure pupils understood certain things before they departed to complete homework assignments added to the sense of urgency. As it was, teachers often did not quite finish what they had hoped in a given lesson; a cushion of time was almost nonexistent. Based on their comments, these circumstances clearly were not ones any of the teachers would have chosen from limitless options.

An additional teacher factor relating to classroom discourse that appeared to be important for empathy was the clarity of teachers' questions and instructions. Generally they took care with their formulation; Joslin, for example, often had questions laid out in worksheets, and Ingram put key questions on the board at the beginning of each lesson. Dow had given thought to the framing of questions, as seen with the WWI assignment, and he also reflected in an ongoing way about whether his question as to whether Haig was a "hero" or "villain" was phrased in the most constructive way (T5).

The stakes were quite high in terms of impact when questions or instructions were not clear, however, as Chapter 5 began to show. Ingram's task definition in his lesson on the English and American Indians was also confusing: in the plays they were to create about the encounter, he variously instructed them to "*talk about* the differences between your cultures...*explain* the reasons why there's a disagreement" (T48: 438-440, emphasis added), which implied a report-like, third-person stance, or to "*show* in your play reasons for the disagreements" (440-441), which suggested acting out ideas, not saying them outright, or to "*describe* what your life is like" (527), which returned to the first idea. The result was a sort of stilted conversation (with prompting from the teacher) that was description but in the guise of interaction:

S: We live in huts.
 S: We dance around a *fire*.
 T: Where do you get your food from, Indians?
 S: We grow crops.
 S: Do you believe in God?
 S: [chorus] No. We believe in our own god.
 T: How do you English feel about that?
 S: [pause] We are very angry.
 S: What will you do?
 S: We'll burn your crops (T48: 715-733).

Joslin ran into difficulties one day in questioning students about nineteenth-century attitudes toward women. In formulating questions off the cuff, she wanted students to think about attitudes then and now, about the thoughts of men and women and young and old people then and now, and about differential attitudes and treatments by class. The number of variables and switches in focus became bewildering for the students on a couple of occasions. In wanting to introduce both relevance and differentiation, she sacrificed her characteristic degree of clarity. A poorly conceived question also came to bedevil Ingram in the form of pupil quandaries. He asked his Year 7 students to “Imagine you are yourself a thousand years ago – you’re a villein in medieval times” and to consider “how you feel about your life” and “what would you want to ask yourself to find out more about your life?” (T7: 395, 415). A student soon wondered, “Sir, wouldn’t you *know* about yourself?” (T7: 399).

Teacher Content Knowledge

- ◆ Teachers used their knowledge of content, in conjunction with factors above like curricular specifications and what was easy, difficult, or interesting for pupils, to identify topics and points for which it was important that students reach some measure of empathetic understanding.
- ◆ As Table J shows, few trends in the characteristics of the subjects chosen for empathetic understanding hold for all teachers. Generally, these *particular* lessons showed a weighting toward subjects who were male, groups, adults, and experiencing extreme circumstances. The numbers of subjects who possessed and lacked power were roughly equal.
- ◆ Teachers valued and strove to build their own knowledge of subject matter. While the exact ways knowledge of history interacted with the cultivation of

empathy require more study, three explanations are proposed to account for differences within teachers' practices:

- ✧ Where teachers possessed deep knowledge and confidence about the content, they easily added to or developed points made by students, or provided answers to questions that went beyond the information available in the textbook or other resources.
- ✧ Strong content knowledge enabled teachers to challenge anachronisms and inaccuracies, rather than reinforce them.
- ✧ Teachers' standards of historical rigour sometimes appeared lower when their content knowledge was thinner; they permitted a more creative approach to understanding the past.

Teachers marshaled their knowledge of the significance of historical topics, together with curricular requirements and students' needs, to reach decisions about what to teach. Joslin, for example, added study of WWI to her Year 9 curriculum in 2001, believing it would engage pupils and was fundamental for understanding British twentieth-century attitudes toward war and peace. Across fifty-three lessons in total, the teachers ultimately tried to cultivate understanding of 108 distinct groups or individuals (normally the spotlight shifted to more than one group or person per lesson). Table J below characterises each of these 108 empathetic subjects according to aspects identified by one or more teachers as potentially affecting the level of empathetic challenge or interest for pupils. These results should not be taken as representative of the teachers' complete history curricula, of which they comprise a mere fraction; a different selection of lessons would have given a very different snapshot of each teacher. Nor do they reveal anything about the amount of time spent on each subject in a lesson, or the depth with which it was explored. What this table shows is a characterisation of *these particular* lessons along these dimensions; it is meant to illuminate where the factors described in this chapter led in terms of topic choice, and to contextualise and complement the teachers' selections of strategy discussed in Chapter 7.

TABLE J: CHARACTERISTICS OF THE EMPATHETIC SUBJECTS,
IN TERMS OF INSTANCES OF OCCURRENCE

SUBJECT CHARACTERISTIC	DOW (9 lessons)	HAYES (15 lessons)	INGRAM (13 lessons)	JOSLIN (14 lessons)	TOTAL
Pre-20 th century	5	13	16	12	46
20 th century	16	31	6	9	62
British	15	18	11	21	65
Non-British	8	28	13	2	51
Man/men	21	17	15	10	63
Woman/women	3	14	4	8	29
Adult	14	29	20	16	79
Child(ren)	0	8	3	1	12
Young adult(s)*	8	6	1	5	20
In extreme/unusual circumstances	15	30	12	6	63
In ordinary circumstances	6	15	11	16	48
Individual(s)	10	13	8	9	40
Group or nation	13	35	18	17	83
Actor(s)	11	20	15	10	56
Acted upon(s)	11	26	15	11	63

Note: Subjects for whom it was not possible to distinguish a characteristic were omitted from that particular count. Quite a few subjects included attention to both categories of a pair above, so were counted as both.

* Soldiers in WWI and WWII, many of whom were not much older than these students

As may be seen, few trends emerged across all four teachers. A greater number of empathetic subjects were men, a function mainly of much teaching about warfare. Topics more often involved groups (such as “witch accusers” or “Roman schoolchildren”) than individuals, such as Kennedy. Teachers encouraged empathy about equally as often with subjects who caused events, or acted, as with those who experienced the consequences, or were largely “acted upon.” Extreme and unusual circumstances predominated in three teachers’ work – these included topics where people experienced strong degrees of fear, threat, danger, or excitement. Non-British subjects were mostly German, Roman, or American. Notable, too (though unsurprising) was the weighting toward the experiences and ideas of adults; Hayes was an exception as she made a conscious effort to build children’s experiences into the curriculum.

Having chosen subjects to focus upon, how did teachers’ knowledge of historical content shape their empathetic work? Studies of classroom teaching have suggested that subject matter knowledge profoundly influences emergent

curricula (Ball & McDiarmid, 1990; Brophy, 1991; Cunningham, 1995; Grossman et al., 1989; Wilson & Wineburg, 1988). To take one example, Hashweh (1987) found that knowledgeable teachers of biology and physics were more likely than those with low content knowledge to modify textbook activities, detect student preconceptions, employ more examples and analogies, manage class activities effectively, interpret students' insights correctly, and utilise opportunities for "digressions" along relevant lines.

The history teachers in this study clearly valued content knowledge highly, as shown by their efforts and excitement about new learning through books, films, and television documentaries. While it is in some ways obvious that the level of content knowledge will affect how a history teacher operates, whether and how it might influence *empathy* teaching is a more open question. Because teachers were candid about areas where they knew more and less history, I could begin to make some connections as to how content and empathy teaching might relate.

To take their areas of expertise first, Dow had years of experience teaching all of the topics that I saw him teach, as well as having conducted research for his textbook that involved reading up-to-date scholarship. He had also done his own research so he could narrate class trips to the WWI battlefields. Joslin had a master's degree in medieval history, which she joked sometimes complicated matters since she always wanted to qualify everything for Year 7 (though she forbore in practice). Despite her considerable experience, this year she was teaching Crime and Punishment and a WWI unit for the first time, and these comprised more than half the lessons I saw her teach. Ingram's specialties were social history, particularly of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, and Scottish and American history; I did not get to observe him teaching to his strengths, as his courses were on Roman, medieval, sixteenth-century British, and twentieth-century European history. He said, "I still don't know a lot about the Roman Empire. But obviously you can get away with it Year 7. I did very little medieval history at university. I did one topic on the growth of medieval towns, but that's it" (T54: 50-53). Hayes had done research in economic history, and stated,

My own learning experience has been more towards modern history, so I've not done depth work on medieval times or anything like that. I've only done work on that to teach it, and I've been teaching it to Year 7. I have to say that in some respects it's not a period that excites me as much as other periods, and I feel I've only done enough to be able to teach Year 7. If I read history books, it tends to be more on stuff that I'm doing for A-Level (T55: 765-770).

These predilections and specialties should be borne in mind in considering the trends described below. These trends are presented not as definitive statements about content knowledge and empathy – something a case study of four teachers could not offer – but as suggested ways of accounting for clear differences in how teachers approached topics at different times. They require more investigation.

Trend 1: Where teachers possessed deep knowledge of content, they easily added to or developed points made by students, or provided answers to questions that went beyond the information available in the textbook or other resources. For example, nearly every comment by Dow in his trench warfare lesson enriched and illustrated what his slides and video already offered – often with colourful and telling anecdotes. In his Henry VIII lesson, he also linked events and context in new ways, inserting ten contextual reminders at points in the lesson. Similarly, Ingram developed the ramifications of different political ideologies on reactions to Versailles, easily managing questions about why groups felt as they did, and Hayes was able, on the basis of recent reading, to answer a students' question about Japan's no-surrender policies in WWII by delving into the Japanese code of honour and cultural concerns with "losing face."

The corollary of teachers' ease and security in adding information they knew was that they did not do so when they lacked such background – though it is equally possible they may have kept matters simple for other reasons, such as student capacities. The analysis of transcript data showed that in areas where teachers claimed to know less, they also added fewer fresh details or illustrations, and used more tentative language like "might," "could," "possibly," and "probably" to a greater extent. For example, Hayes' comments added little to what her handouts already said about education in Roman

times, nor did she explore ideas raised by pupils much. The same was true of Ingram's lesson on the meeting of the American Indians and the English.

Trend 2: High content knowledge enabled teachers to challenge anachronisms and inaccuracies, rather than reinforce them. Dow with his expertise was sensitive to the ways his students imported modern concepts into their writing, for example by focusing on soldiers' "rights" over "duties" or the idea of "being stressed" during battle. Ingram and Hayes similarly corrected students when their ideas about German young people joining the Hitler Youth assumed a wealth of opportunities for club participation not available then. However, whereas Joslin's lesson on medieval women was structured to *break down* overly limiting stereotypes held today, Ingram's reinforced some of those same stereotypes by approving of the ways his students role-played women's feelings about their lives:

S: It's not really fair. Women should have the same rights as men. I've already tried to kill myself.

T: [laughs] Okay. Lots of suicide attempts going on now. Okay, so yes, you might feel that – excellent – life was *unfair* for women as well.

John?

S: I put, I hate the king and the lord of the manor, honestly.

T: Again, a lot of *hatred* about because of your lack of equality. Charlie.

S: I dislike my life, and I want more out of it than being my husband's slave all the time.

T: Okay. Very good. So again, you're wanting more out of life. You feel very restricted. *Excellent* (T7: 480-492).

It seemed unfortunate that the younger year-groups, who were also the most prone to fantastical, anachronistic or silly answers, were also studying content that teachers, at least in the case of Hayes and Ingram, had devoted least time to mastering – it sometimes meant that anachronisms like the nonexistence of velvet in medieval times (because it was "man-made" and required "factories and machines") floated through the classroom unscathed (T7: 274-275).

Trend 3: Teachers' standards of historical rigour sometimes appeared to be less robust when their content knowledge was thinner; they permitted a more creative approach to understanding the past. After watching Ingram's students run across a field simulating a battle charge of the Britons, and then

the Romans, I asked him about a matter he had insisted that pupils get right: the idea that the Romans charged in silence. As it turned out, he had invented this detail to emphasise the legendary Roman discipline to the boys – he knew it would be challenging for them to maintain, and thus convey how controlled the legionnaires were. Effectively, the students were learning a *metaphor* for discipline in a Roman battle charge! Along similar lines, Hayes in the course of a lesson on medieval cures assigned students to either find an “old wife’s tale” or design their own “fairly logical” cure (T39: 921). Despite her intentions, the completed assignments appeared to have reinforced an image of medieval medicine as based upon caprice, since students could and did throw whatever ingredients into the brew that they pleased.

Teacher Approaches to Controversial Topics

◆ Teachers sometimes raised controversial issues in the classroom, but usually in ways that avoided challenging students’ personal identities or embarking on sensitive issues. Their curricula (which as noted above were not entirely within their control) emphasised perspective taking at relatively safe distance in place and time.

Teachers’ conceptions of their roles in the classroom – and whether or not these involved addressing subjects they claimed were provocative and touchy – affected the ways they taught for empathetic understanding. History teaching has long been a politically hot topic for precisely the reason that its subject matter is contested and that it raises ongoing issues of human behaviour and ethics. As mentioned earlier, such topics are often precisely the ones that most interest pupils, but they are correspondingly difficult to teach. As VanSledright has noted,

Many teachers see themselves as public servants, charged to educate a community’s children. They feel a need to be responsive to that public. The fear that creating controversy in the classroom may spill over into the home has caused many teachers to back away, to find safer courses of action (1996: 287).

It makes it no easier that with certain highly charged topics, students themselves begin to feel uncomfortable. As Linda Levstik has written on the

basis of her study of New Zealand adolescents' understanding of national history,

[L]earning about people in other parts of the world is a bit like watching a soap opera, or, perhaps, reading a novel. In the context of a distant place and past, students contemplate other perspectives with relative safety. Investigating the perspective of people in Ancient Egypt or India, for instance, does not necessarily challenge students to reconsider the perspectives of their own local communities of identification...[Whereas] membership in local communities of identification makes it difficult for these students to take the perspective of local "others" (2001: 88).

A similar comment was made by Ingram in reflecting on topics that are difficult to teach.

I think the closer an event is, the more difficult it is for people to deal with...if you look at medieval times, it's a lot easier to say, 'Well, these people were massacred,' 'cause it seems so *distant*... Certainly you can take a more detached view of things a long time ago. I think, yeah, there is more at stake, and the fact that the twentieth-century issues are still alive today...I mean, the danger if you're trying to empathise with somebody who took part in the Holocaust, my worry would be, am I giving a license to somebody to believe that those views are acceptable? And so I wouldn't do it. Then, this year and for the *first* time, I've done an empathy exercise on slavery in which I tried to not only get them to imagine the view from a slave, but also from a *slaveowner*...that was the first time I've given license to the idea that racist beliefs are acceptable within this framework, because I thought it would be challenging. But maybe it was because it was further away, I don't know. Or maybe I'm just becoming braver... And maybe at some point I will be able to do the Nazi thing. So maybe it's not only the fact that it's...quite close, but maybe it's also I get confidence in my own teaching, and also what I'm trying to get *across* (T54: 575-578, 597-614).

There was evidence from the transcripts that teachers *did* see it as their role to introduce some difficult and controversial contemporary issues into the curriculum. Dow raised issues about the ethics of war (allowing brief discussion of the Afghanistan situation), Hayes brought up poverty, attitudes toward women, anti-semitism and the treatment of WWI deserters, Joslin discussed homelessness, attitudes toward women, and the treatment of Conscientious Objectors, and Ingram raised issues concerning racism and attitudes toward the poor. These are all potentially controversial if not

necessarily incendiary topics. Many of them, however, were introduced by way of analogy to study of a more remote past that did not seem to challenge students' identifications or cause them to review their beliefs much. Topics like working mothers, illegitimate children, aspects of poverty, religion or politics were deemed either too sensitive or too time-consuming to address – teachers gave both reasons – and were simply avoided. Thus did many of teachers' decisions, either pragmatic or principled, emphasise perspective taking from a relatively safe standpoint. Whether or not the empathetic habits they cultivated in security had the sort of social transfer value to present-day understanding and tolerance that they all expressed hopes for in their Initial Interviews is an open question. Labaree reminds us that it is exceptionally difficult to answer:

The most important outcomes that we want education to make possible, the preparation of competent, productive, and socially responsible adults, are removed from any particular classroom interaction between teacher and student by many years and many other intervening factors (2000: 231).

Teacher State

◆ Teachers' own emotions, dispositions, or physical states on the day could influence shifts in the empathy curriculum.

The final teacher factor influencing the teaching of empathy concerned teachers' states or moods during the lesson. Like students, they sometimes felt energised, pleased or inspired, or alternatively tired, stressed or frustrated. Events transpiring during the day might prevent a teacher from finishing plans for the empathy lesson and therefore having to improvise elements. As Ingram mentioned above, teacher confidence might even affect the topics attempted; a teachers' perceptions of his or her own skills or ambition on the day mattered.

“Packaging” the Factors for Pedagogical Reasoning

◆ Teachers used “packages” of knowledge about the multiple factors discussed above to reach pedagogical decisions about teaching for empathy. Which types of knowledge most influenced their choices at a given time were highly

variable, a fact not acknowledged in some of the educational literature that privileges the importance of content knowledge.

The fundamental purpose of this chapter has been to show how a diverse mix of factors concerning students, teachers, and the structural conditions of their environments came together to shape the ways that teachers implemented their conceptions of empathy. In the following chapter, the missing factor, teachers' knowledge of strategies and resources, will be added to the package. Any one of these factors – perhaps preparing for an exam, perhaps listening to a pupils' anecdote – could upstage others to become the central determining influence on the curriculum at a particular time. How teachers used their knowledge of influential factors to make appropriate pedagogical choices in the circumstances was at the heart of professional judgment in this arena.

To take some actual examples, how did one teacher select a wartime document with the optimal combination of emotional power, startling content and accessibility? How did another know that on a Friday before half-term his eleven-year-olds would focus better if they began by drawing a picture of the medieval character whose role they would later take? And how did another know that in using a video with oral histories about poverty, a compromise had to be struck between the need to stop the film to ensure comprehension and processing of the information, and the need to let the tape flow so the listeners could become immersed in the story? How much of the tape should be used in order to leave time to expand upon it, assign the homework and collect the textbooks? These were the sort of nuanced calculations in the minds of teachers when they thought about prompting empathy. They drew on packages of knowledge elements – about preconceptions, capacities, resources, time, moods, subject matter – all conditioned in their turn by what the teacher conceived the nature and standard of empathy to be for a particular case.

I have outlined these factors in some detail here partly because of a concern that the literature about teachers' pedagogical reasoning has in recent years favoured content knowledge while downplaying other aspects of teachers' expertise. While at first glance the obvious answer to "What do

history teachers teach?” may be “history,” further thought suggests equally plausible responses, such as “students,” or “how to perform competently on a history exam,” or “the history they have time and resources for.” In 1987, a group of Stanford researchers proposed a model of pedagogical reasoning “with transformation [of subject matter knowledge] at its heart” (Wilson et al., 1987: 118). Their model *began* with comprehension of content, and moved next to its transformation into “representations” of that subject matter including how to adapt it for the particular students, progressing through the actual instruction, then evaluation and reflection, arriving full circle at new comprehension of the original subject matter. This view placing content at the hub of all teaching decisions has caught on in the educational literature, so for example Ball writes critically of teachers who “substitute student interest for content integrity in making choices about subject matter. Knowing subject matter and being able to use it is at the heart of teaching all students” (2000: 243). And Wineburg and Wilson give it primacy of order, noting that “Teachers must first turn inward to comprehend and ponder the key ideas, events, concepts, and interpretations of their discipline” (1991: 332). Sometimes key historical interpretations *did* structure a lesson, as when Dow led his pupils to consider the view that General Haig was a “butcher and bungler” (T5: 533), but many times a teacher’s starting point concerned students’ needs and ideas. Perhaps they were due for a lighter, more enjoyable activity such as a showing of *Blackadder* (T52), perhaps the teacher began by thinking about how to tackle their preconceptions about Henry VIII’s motives (T17). Maybe the teacher began with a promising resource, as when Ingram claimed,

I just think that this [Hastings] is a particular thing that lends itself very well to storytelling, principally because of the video resource that we have got – so it does link to the resources that we have to be able to tell the story... It started off with having the resource of the video (T18: 498-500, 507-508).

And sometimes the pedagogical reason for changing tactics mid-lesson related to a teachers’ mood, as when Ingram cast aside sourcework plans:

Because it’s half term, Friday, I’m tired, and I can’t deal with them being needy. And they weren’t switched on at all... [I thought], I can ditch the comprehension element and the greater depth of it... And that was

quite a change. And it's principally because it was driving me crazy (T3: 776-777, 793-795).

Fortunately, some recent research is beginning to question the privileging of content knowledge to the sidelining of much else in teachers' reasoning processes. One empirically-based paper presented a beginning social studies teacher who possessed content knowledge, a "big idea" for teaching, and a variety of strategies, but whose lessons' "fatal flaw" was "missing information about what the students knew and did not know" (White, 2003: 17). The author concluded that much more emphasis on this aspect of teachers' knowledge was needed to avoid similar disappointments. Likewise, a study of civics teaching concluded, unjudgmentally, that "Teachers' knowledge of pupils' needs sometimes leads them to modify the substantive content of the lesson, even to the extent of jeopardising the validity of concepts communicated" (Dunkin et al, 1998: 148). These sorts of observations help to re-balance the pedagogical reasoning claims, and they accord with my findings from this study. When I opened teachers' knowledge packages for empathy, any one of several components might appear on top.

Taken together, these components and composites of knowledge formed the largely unseen contexts within which teachers acted, selecting strategies and resources that they felt would assist in cultivating historical empathy. The next chapter explores in greater depth what they – and students – opted to *do* in the classroom; it describes the curriculum that ultimately emerged.

Chapter 7 (Findings III)

Constructing the Empathy Curriculum

Introduction

Having taken into consideration teachers' empathetic aims and the factors influencing their work, this chapter explores the strategies they used in the classroom, and what they thought about their efforts. However, to focus solely upon teachers' actions would be to misconstrue the determinants of classroom events; many students also actively shaped what transpired. Calling pupils "co-authors" of the curriculum would overstate their role in classrooms where teachers retained a high degree of control over content, activities and resources, but "contributing authors" aptly recognises their sometimes subtle, sometimes pivotal influence on the outcome. Thus while this chapter seeks to display teachers' work and ideas, it also shows how they collaborated with students to advance learning, and describes what pupils did with their opportunities.

For their part, teachers prepared students to empathise in two major ways: they strove to motivate them and to build their knowledge of historical context. They also continued to add to these foundations while promoting empathy directly through major organising *activities* and through *discourse strategies*. After examining their activity choices, rationales, and self-assessments (in light of students' achievements, when possible), I relate these to pertinent claims made about empathy strategies and resources in the history education literature. I then elaborate on three types of discourse strategies detected in the transcripts but only spottily and unsystematically noted in research: those used to nurture empathetic thought processes, to establish relevance, and to dramatise or enliven history.

Preparing to Empathise

Building the Requisite Motivation and Knowledge Base

- ◆ The teachers prepared students to empathise by taking steps to motivate them and build a secure foundation of knowledge about a topic; both of these considerations affected their choices of empathetic strategies and resources.
- ◆ They worked to cultivate eight types of knowledge, which they described as supporting empathetic understanding in various ways: knowledge
 - of historical conditions
 - of past thoughts, beliefs, or logic
 - of feelings
 - of the narrative, chronology, or facts of an event
 - of people and their general or particular psychology and tendencies
 - of the world today and how things work
 - of previous or other contemporary history
 - of the significance or meaning of an event.
 Part of this cultivation involved debunking students' anachronistic or otherwise inaccurate ideas.
- ◆ All of the teachers focused most on developing students' knowledge of past thoughts and beliefs, and secondly on their grasp of the basic events, but what they spent time on also reflected their personal convictions.
- ◆ The teachers noticed that empathetic difficulties arose when knowledge was insufficiently resonant (at students' fingertips) or the structure of the task "allowed" it to be ignored by pupils, who did not automatically use what they knew or once knew.
- ◆ Students contributed significantly to building their own knowledge through asking questions relating to all of the knowledge types, and particularly through trying to build mental pictures of what existed and was known at the time.
- ◆ The way empathy was conceptualised – and in particular when empathetic efforts as such *began* – affected how the strategies used to engender it were discussed.

In their recent book titled *Understanding History Teaching*, Chris Husbands, Alison Kitson, and Anna Pendry (2003) related that teachers in their study typically considered it part of their job (particularly at the beginning of a lesson) to create feelings of motivation and engagement in their pupils, as well as contextual knowledge of a period, as these were fundamental conditions for their understanding. The teachers in my study similarly took

responsibility for trying to implant curiosity and enthusiasm if they were not already there, and their choices of strategies for empathy were informed by what they knew would excite students. For this goal, Dow was willing to sacrifice the orderliness of whole-class teaching for the chaos and liveliness of pupils' re-enacting a scene (T37: 584-591). After the first lesson of his WWI study he explained the importance of both motivation and background knowledge, noting the lesson offered

loads of images, loads of ideas of what it was like [to fight and live in trenches]...It was just about resource and data-gathering, *emotive* data really. And also factual data about what the conditions were like. Just to get them started, get them stirred up about the issue, and then we'll go into it in more detail (T13: 509-510, 569-572).

All of the teachers commonly justified their selection of teaching methods partly in terms of students' heightened willingness to try hard, their keenness to perform, their enjoyment, and their emotional investment in understanding. Ingram videotaped his students role-playing simply because it motivated them to take the exercise more seriously, and Dow favoured certain types of exercises that generated electricity:

I find often that the lessons that are the most memorable – and that the kids have got the most from and been most motivated by and performed the best from – have been the ones where empathy is a vital component, like the big role plays or the trials or the simulations. Big discussions or debates from a certain point of view. The sort of things which get a buzz up in the classroom, get both the teacher and the class going (T65: 429-434).

Establishing a solid base of knowledge to support empathy was equally vital, though the amount needed could be difficult to estimate. When teachers felt lessons fell short of their expectations, they often identified insufficient prior knowledge and resonance as the culprit. Joslin, for example, believed that pupils had problems making deductions from sources in her Year 10 witchcraft and Year 7 Black Death lessons because they lacked the contextual scaffolding to make the sources fully comprehensible. Toward the end of the year, Ingram reached the conclusion that knowledge accumulation needed to be quite extensive to avoid shortchanging the empathetic outcome:

I am coming more to the understanding that you need *a lot* more knowledge to be already *there* before you can start to step outside your own boundaries, your own life, to try and empathise, to try and understand somebody else's point of view. So I've been doing a lot more of this preparing the groundwork, and giving a lot more information before asking them to 'Imagine you are' I've realised that that is an absolutely essential thing, to give them a very *secure* factual grounding before moving on to doing anything else (T48: 844-849).

There was no recipe for how much time the teachers deemed enough for establishing the crucial facts, though; preparation for a major empathetic activity might take several lessons, while questions requiring empathetic thinking to answer might be introduced almost from the start of studying a subject. It depended on the type of empathy aimed for, the topic, the pupils, and what was believed to constitute the background and foreground for empathy.

In laying the foundation for empathy, teachers strove to develop eight kinds of knowledge in pupils: of historical conditions; of thoughts, beliefs, or logic; of feelings; of the narrative, chronology, or facts of an event; of people and their general or particular psychology and tendencies; of the world today and how things work; of previous or other contemporary history, and of the significance or meaning of an event (for detailed descriptions of matters included in each type, see Appendix C). All of the teachers spent the most time trying to expand pupils' knowledge of past thoughts and beliefs, and secondly their grasp of basic events, while least attention was devoted to other previous and contemporary history.⁷² The only other clear trends in the data were that Hayes mentioned conditions almost twice as often as the others, and also discussed both feelings and the human significance of events more on average than the others. Ingram was relatively low on comments about significance, and Joslin mentioned feelings about half as often as the others. While these differences may partly be accounted for by preferred teaching styles – Hayes' whole-class plenary style increased the amount that she spoke overall – they

⁷² One probable reason was that knowledge of previous history was built up (and thus assumed) in lessons prior to those I was invited in to see, though this could not have always been the case since units of study were not always arranged by historical chronology or without large gaps between periods.

also reflect emphases noted by the teachers themselves: Joslin's reluctance to delve into empathy as feelings, and Hayes' concern with the effects of events at an individual level (so students could relate), and her tendency to create a vivid picture of circumstances in terms of details and comparisons they could grasp. Dow's and Hayes' higher counts on knowledge of people and their psychology appeared to be related to the greater depth at which they explored people's motives and reactions with their older A-Level groups.

Students' possession of contextual knowledge was only as helpful as their savviness in actually applying it. To do so, it seemed that they needed it near the forefront of their mind, not "gathering dust" as part of previous years' learning. Teachers employed various means for making knowledge readily available; they often spent time recapping the ideas of former lessons, and Joslin once gave her students five minutes at the start of class to review their textbooks and notes before they began a written project using the information. In teaching a lesson on sixteenth-century witchcraft for the first time, she discovered that the sources she provided to students (full of clues as to broader social, political, and religious context) were not sparking memories of their study of the Reformation two years earlier, or of their general review of the early modern period weeks before:

[T]hey don't seem to have internalised that very much. And their notions of the effect that religious changes of this degree could have on people whose lives were dominated by religion is completely lost on them – even though they're bright, even though they've studied this. And I had to – I had to almost *tell* them these things, really, in order to even get them anywhere *near* to understanding how the attitudes – how these strong religious beliefs and the worries that arose from change could then link to accusations of witchcraft... If I used that next year, I would definitely have an introductory lesson check before I do it, with a timeline which actually *reminds* them when Henry the Eighth did this, and *ask* them, you know, how would people have felt. I would revise the Reformation course in twenty minutes with them. Just to bring it familiar in their minds. Because I was taking that for granted and I obviously shouldn't have (T16: 947-953, 1075-1079).

Joslin's assumption during her first time teaching this lesson stood out because she was normally adept at getting pupils to make links to their knowledge base and to use the clues in sources to substantiate their points. In

response to her questions, they learned to speak the language of evidence, beginning many comments with, “One [source] said,” or “There was a song that said,” or “The diary said” and the like (T32, T44, T52). However, when teachers built comprehension of events from sources but then set up exercises not requiring students to reference those sources directly in reaching conclusions, pupils showed a tendency to rapidly abandon them and rely on their own ideas. This observation has been made in research looking at students’ empathetic learning (Dickinson & Lee, 1978), and it proved true, for example, in Ingram’s Year 8 lesson when students learned of Mary Stuart’s rebellion and imprisonment from primary sources, then advised Elizabeth I on various courses of action for handling Mary based on their own conceptions of how a monarch should behave. The result was their feeling shocked to learn of Elizabeth’s execution verdict; as Ingram put it, “I think at that point they’d gone back into being themselves, in spite of them looking at what they’d learnt from what Elizabeth had done before” (T3: 844-846). Apparently cultivating knowledge was not necessarily enough; for the best results, teachers also had to ensure it was recent and to structure tasks so students followed through in applying it to new situations.

Many pupils also took some responsibility for the growth of their own knowledge by asking questions. These addressed many types of context, for example one of Hayes’ students wondered, “In Germany, were they religious [in the 1930s and 1940s]? Was it a religious country?” (T43: 132), while one of Ingram’s asked, “Sir, was there actually a medieval Oxford?” (T7: 616). Often students appeared to be trying to create a mental picture of material realities, or of particular circumstances, so they could envision events in a reasonably authentic way. Teachers recognised this need and helped them to build what psychologists call “situation models” (van Dijk & Kintsch, 1983, cited in Wineburg, 1994: 88). Dow mapped out the various battle fronts in Europe via overhead transparency before asking students to propose a location for a new offensive, and Ingram took time to have students draw the geographic positions and challenges facing each army at Hastings, and to chart

each wave of attack, before showing a video or encouraging empathy with the soldiers. As he said,

The scenes keep on changing, and so you can't keep a model in mind... That's why I do this [map] first, so they get a very *clear* picture of the battle in their mind so that when they're watching the video they can concentrate a lot more on what it must have been like, what they are using, and things like that. They can get more of the things that lead to an empathetic understanding of the battle (T18: 471-477).

In developing students' background knowledge, teachers maintained their standards in part by the ways they reacted to anachronistic and inaccurate comments. In general, they achieved this rather gently, by questioning the basis of an idea or shifting the gist of the comment when responding, but they were more blunt when students were supposed to have mastered material and had not (especially in upper year-groups). They drew attention to anachronisms in the form of advance warnings and subsequent debriefings on errors. After validating students' efforts in a role-play, for example, Ingram had students dissect "What was *unrealistic* about that play? What wouldn't have happened at the time?" (T48: 756-757). Students also assisted teachers' efforts by displaying awareness of time differences, as when one Year 7 pupil asked Hayes, "What was the Battle of Hastings called then, because they might have called it a different name?" (T49: 233-234). Finally, teachers – in contrast to recommendations made in the empathy literature (see Chapter 1) – tried to prevent students' hindsight from distorting their empathetic insights. Joslin set up a lesson on sixteenth-century vagabonds as a contemporary role-play so students would keep separate their own strong opinions about homelessness, and she urged a student to regard enlisting for WWI with the innocence of one who knew nothing of the slaughter to come:

Don't use your *own* knowledge of what might happen to him. Just try to put yourself in the situation of someone who has gone to the cinema and seen this film. They live in 1914. Are they terribly worried – on the basis of these films? (T28: 316-318)

In fact, the only occasion where a teacher encouraged the use of hindsight while simultaneously cultivating empathy was an exceptional circumstance: Dow's computer simulation exercise of General Haig's decisions at the Somme

in WWI. After watching students fall into the same traps in launching their attack as Haig had done, Dow suggested that pupils *learn* from the example of his mistakes and try a new approach. This allowed the full complexity of the problem Haig faced to be revealed, as the computer generated dismal death and casualty statistics for nearly every pattern of advance attempted. It wasn't so simple to beat his record after all.

In their efforts to equip students with background knowledge, help them avoid anachronisms, and instill the habit of forging links between broad contexts and local actions, teachers laid the groundwork for empathy. However, presenting their advance-work in this way fails to acknowledge the dilemma of identifying when empathetic work as such began. Was teachers' fostering of contextual knowledge part of their repertoire of teaching for empathy? At what point did the background for empathising become the foreground? It was not always easy to see the transition point, if there was one, and studies of teaching for empathy may miss much of the action by attending only to the culminating activity and display of understanding. In some lessons efforts to cultivate knowledge of thoughts or feelings *were* the empathetic content, or attention to facts about conditions wove in and out with efforts to imagine what they would be like to experience firsthand. In other lessons, teachers decided at a clear moment to change the focus from a knowledge-acquisition or drilling activity into one explicitly centred on empathetic understanding and sense-making. Thus the way empathy was conceptualised affected how the strategies that succeeded it were framed and discussed.

Promoting Empathy

Classroom Activities

Classifying Empathy Strategies: Updating the Shemilt Typology

◆ The teachers encouraged empathy through the use of both discrete activities and through fine-grained, often unplanned discourse strategies. This latter

category has rarely been the focus in academic or professional history education literature.

◆ Teachers' repertoires of *activities* they used ranged from 13 to 21 different strategies, presented in Table K below.

What constitutes a strategy for teaching empathy? In Britain, the dialogue on this point has traditionally focused mostly on discrete exercises or activities – a view reflected both in the academic and professional literature and in some of the teachers' comments (especially initial ones) about what cultivating empathy involved.⁷³ This conception derived largely from how outside agencies such as examination boards defined empathy and its assessment; teachers responded in kind and researchers noted what they did. Denis Shemilt, author of the *History 13-16 Evaluation Study*, encapsulated a view of empathy as exercises in a seminal article (1984); he created a typology of methods which, in his words,

may be classified according to the nature of the empathy demanded (descriptive or explanatory), the nature of the activity required (enactive or reactive) and the logical structure of the task (synthesizing particulars, projecting personal responses, forging connections, disconfirming expectations, adducing alternatives or resolving incongruities...)(66).

His categories were, in the descriptive realm, biographies, drama, projective exercises, on-site re-enactments, and imaginative (re)constructions, and in the explanatory domain, games and simulations, decision-making approaches, exercises linking culture and economy, experimental re-enactments, exercises disconfirming expectations, empathetic dilemmas, and structured contrasts between past and present.

The Shemilt article was, in my view, an important contribution to empirical empathy studies. As the first and only research study I could find that attempted to categorise the range of practice seen in British classrooms, it provided useful concepts with illustrative examples and created a reference point for my own research, allowing me to witness how much has changed in

⁷³ The same bias toward empathy as distinct exercises exists in the English-language literature on empathy broadly, though it is more pronounced in the research literature than in writings by teachers for teachers.

nearly twenty years and to evaluate which distinctions remain helpful. Some of his conclusions accord with what teachers in my own study suggested, for example that strategies requiring explanation tend to be more powerful and effective than those requiring only description.

However, the findings from my research suggest that this early work is limited in certain respects. While a detailed examination of four teachers' work does not constitute a representative or comprehensive picture of British empathy-teaching, and therefore does not refute Shemilt's more broadly based claims, the fact that much of what I observed finds no place in his typology poses a problem, hinting that his work needs updating now that exam boards have left teachers to their own devices with empathy. Taken on their own terms, some of his categories overlap considerably with others. What, for example, is the critical difference between simulations where students have to solve some problem, and decision-making approaches, where they likewise have to solve a problem in light of possible alternatives? Experimental re-enactment is perilously similar in structure, since it involves doing the same, just with the actual tools available to solve it at the time – it could easily be viewed as a variety of simulation. More importantly, fine-grained analysis of lesson transcripts indicated that in many lessons, it was next to impossible to separate descriptive and explanatory empathy (as discussed in Chapter 5).

Furthermore, the Shemilt evaluation project conceived of empathy itself in a constricted fashion. On the one hand, all of his categories contained examples in my own study (although "games" were only mentioned, not actually used in the lessons I witnessed). However, many activity-scale strategies from the present research did not fit into the Shemilt typology. These included use of videos,⁷⁴ slides, artwork and other visuals; audiotaped oral histories; reading historical fiction and poetry; class discussion; guest speakers; trips to historical sites or museums; categorising arguments and attitudes by matching them with their plausible proponents; drawing;

⁷⁴ VCRs were seldom used by teachers in British schools in the late 1970s when data collection for this study was done, so it is no surprise that he did not include videos in his categorisation system.

storytelling; research or argumentation from sources; hot-seating; and true/false exercises designed solely to explore preconceptions.

Finally, Shemilt attended to certain large-scale activities but left out the entire range of discourse strategies that teachers employed. If a teacher in the course of discussion made an analogy that helped students grasp just how a past group regarded their plight, this should count as a small-scale method of encouraging empathetic thinking. Shemilt only considers situations where a student is *producing* or *doing* something, but less assessably, an empathetic activity may simply involve listening, thinking, or discussing. Empathy is notoriously difficult to evaluate since it happens within the minds of students; even if its presence is hinted at through comments or questions, the degree to which it is taking place is hard to measure – moreso during a lesson with many people and factors needing a teacher's attention. But my asking teachers to reflect on particular moments in a session allowed them to ponder indicators of empathy at a more relaxed pace and to suggest how they tweaked their discourse strategies, such as questioning, to get more from pupils. These strategies are examined in greater depth later in this chapter.

Teachers seemed have no shortage of means of promoting empathy in their students; the number of organising activities they used ranged from 13 to 21. The full panoply is presented in Table K, with strategies they described but did not actually employ in the lessons that I saw added in parentheses.

TABLE K: INSTANCES OF USE OF PARTICULAR EMPATHY ACTIVITIES

ACTIVITY	DOW (9 lessons)	HAYES (15 lessons)	INGRAM (13 lessons)	JOSLIN (14 lessons)
Knowledge-building, interpretation from written primary sources	1 (+1)	1	6	8
Knowledge-building, interpretation from written secondary sources	5	10	9	4
Teacher narrative presentation or storytelling	4	6	2	4
Question and answer session	6	13	7	8
Discussion	4	4	0	1
Video (documentary or fiction)	7 (+ 1)	7 (+ 1)	1 (+ 1)	2 (+ 1)
Interpretation of other visual source (e.g. slides, painting, cartoon, drawing, photograph)	4	3	2	5 (+ 1)
Disconfirmation exercise (debunking preconceptions)	2	2	0	2 (+1)
Simulation/problem-solving/decision-making exercise	3 (+3)	0	1	0
Written role-taking exercise (e.g. letter, diary, story, dialogue)	5	2	14	3
Acted role-taking exercise (e.g. re-enactments, hot-seating, drama, debates, 'historical' chat shows)	6 (+1)	(3)	7	3 (+1)
Independent historical research	0	2	0	(1)
Structured past/present contrasts (extended exploration, not brief)	1	3	3	2
Trips to historical sites, museums	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
'Talking heads'-type categorisation exercise (matching person and views or motives)	1	0	0	3
Listening to oral histories (live or audiotaped; not video)	1	(1)	0	1
Written analytical essays or explanations	2	0	0	2
Drawing of historical person, scene	1	(1)	3	1 (+1)
Written personal opinion on events	1	3	0	1
Guided imagination exercise (richly descriptive scene-setting)	1	1	2 (+1)	0
Creative-interpretive activities*	1	2 (+1)	0	0
Historical fiction (book or story)	0	(1)	0	(1)
Guest speakers (non-oral history)	(1)	(1)	0	0
TOTAL REPERTOIRE OF ACTIVITIES USED OR MENTIONED**	21	20	13	19
TOTAL INSTANCES OF ANY ACTIVITY USED IN LESSONS OBSERVED ONLY	56	59	57	50

* Examples included students forming themselves into WWI memorial sculptures, or designing a Crusades recruiting poster

** Teachers' repertoires may well have included other strategies; this table represents only those they associated with cultivating empathy without prompting or suggestion in questions by the researcher.

Influences on Strategy Choice

◆ Teachers had preferred strategies, though the most popular in general were question and answer sessions, videos, and role-taking. Different degrees of variety existed in terms of the number of ways teachers used these basic formats, and in the nuances of supporting pedagogical knowledge surrounding the activities.

◆ The teachers selected strategies not on the basis of empathetic promise alone, but through the filter of their general pedagogical beliefs and a multitude of factors of the sort outlined in the previous chapter. Activities tended to be viewed as helpful or not in terms of a particular topic and particular group, though some evaluations of strategies were expressed in the form of more broadly applicable principles.

As the table shows, teachers favoured different strategies, but overall the tactics used most were question and answer sessions (sometimes verging into more open discussions), videos, and a variety of forms of role-taking. All of the teachers placed a high value on visual resources in general. Videos⁷⁵ especially performed a number of empathetically helpful functions at once: they stirred pupils with their oral histories or gripping reconstructions of events (actors were considered no liability because they gave pupils a sense of real people to latch onto), offered startling, poignant, or moving quotations, gave a graphic and powerful sense of conditions, and personalised larger events. Dow used fictional but realistic excerpts from films such as *All Quiet on the Western Front*, *Gallipoli*, *Saving Private Ryan* and *Amistad*, and remarked on aspects such as their transporting camera angles, their evocative music⁷⁶ and their “really well-chosen stills [with] deep feeling in those eyes” (T5: 649-650), which prompted students to think “Oh [breathy] God, that individual went through that, look at the state of him. Yeah, no wonder he’s feeling that” (653-654). While videos didn’t *guarantee* empathy, teachers rated them highly overall for provoking empathetic reactions.

⁷⁵ A thoughtful treatment of both the advantages and drawbacks of films for empathy is provided in Robert A. Rosenstone’s article “The historical film: Looking at the past in a postliterate age” (1994).

⁷⁶ While music has been promoted both as an empathetic resource for creating period atmosphere and for analysis of the messages of its lyrics, it was the one source commonly mentioned in the literature (Epstein, 1994; Mastin, 2002; Thompson, 1983) that none of the teachers in this study mentioned using as a source independently of videos. However, Joslin used analysis of song lyrics in one exercise.

Also high-ranking were strategies involving role-play in some form – though as noted, Hayes did not fully endorse the acted varieties. Here, teachers could see pupils “willingly and naturally” slide into role (T65: 83) and sometimes get quite passionate about their character’s perspectives. Ingram felt that the hot-seating type of role-play worked well, and when asked why, he theorised,

it seems to force people to think through the process of change in a way that they might not otherwise do because they’ve got to think of a *question*. I think maybe because they’ve got an overarching question to answer, they’ve got to discover their own little questions to *get there*. They know there must be a process of cause and effect because their little question can’t answer the over-riding question [about what caused religious change] (T34: 845-848).

When teachers did not rank role-play activities as successful, it generally related to pupils’ having insufficient control of the historical facts. Preparing the groundwork in knowledge terms seemed very important, particularly as some of the less scripted forms of role-play, like hot-seating, required certain students to answer *any question* as though they were living at the time. Those who had a firmer grasp of facts handled these high demands with fewer hints from the teacher about what to say.

Simulations and decision-making exercises where pupils were forced to decide courses of action in light of constraints at the time were rarely used except by Dow, but he regarded them as particularly helpful. He said,

I have created quite a lot of them because essentially what you are trying to do is to make them *think*. It’s a bit of a cliché, but it’s the ‘a thinking student is a learning student’ kind of idea. I think you’ve got to *make* them think. We could have done this [exercise on where to launch the D-Day invasion] different ways, there is stuff in the book that says what the Allies did when they planned the attacks on D-Day. I could have just stood at the front and explained it to them, but at some point you want to get them to think (T33: 544-549).

Ingram also noted that an advice-giving situation he constructed caused his lower band pupils to come up with more sophisticated ways of thinking about problems.

Guest speakers and site visits were credited with having a big empathetic impact, as explained in the next section, and some primary sources,

such as poems and visual propaganda, were highlighted as producing strong reactions and insights in students. While the teachers all felt that questioning pupils was crucial – Joslin thought it was probably the most important strategy she used to draw out empathy – in the aftermath of lessons they did not tend to rate question and answer sessions as highly as the strategies mentioned above. Though penetrating comments by individual students sometimes emerged from questioning, on the whole the responses this activity produced gained lukewarm assessments from teachers like “reasonably good,” “fairly good,” and “some considered views there.” Their reviews also had a positive slant in that the individual pupils’ comments that they usually brought up were the ones they were most pleased with. However, the range of teacher evaluations of this strategy was considerable: they were delighted with the empathetic quality of some discussions and felt that others fell completely flat.

Every teacher’s repertoire contained a number of approaches. However, the presentation of them in Table K obscures the more subtle variations between different activities *within* each category; Ingram, for example, employed chat-shows, hot-seating, and written diary-type role-taking activities fairly frequently, while Joslin never (in lessons I witnessed) set up a role-taking activity in quite the same way twice. This was partly due to teachers’ ideas about the amount of freshness of format that students could productively handle. In general, however, experience also appeared to play a role in the more nuanced aspects of strategy-use: not in the choice of activities broadly, but in the finer points of enacting them. Hayes expressed frustration with students’ tendencies to focus on everyday rather than historically specific concerns in their “letter from the WWI trenches” coursework, but apart from warning them repeatedly not to do so seemed uncertain how to address this. Dow, a few years further along in his experience with this assignment, had discovered he could tackle the same problem by reframing the question to force pupils to grapple with historically different attitudes toward authority. He also explained particular standards of empathetic quality to students and used formative assessment to uphold them.

Similarly, Joslin's expertise shone through in many of the details *surrounding* the basic strategy itself. In teaching a lesson on the roles of medieval women, she did not simply allow students to go straight to the computer database with documents showcasing womens' various roles. She first taught them how to search a database, then in the next lesson sat them down as a class and explained a preliminary exercise. In partners or three-somes, she asked students to complete a true/false exercise involving their opinions on statements about what women did in the Middle Ages. Only then did she remind them how to use the database and let them start exploring it. When they later debriefed as to what they had found out about the original statements, she got them to come off the computers to prevent distractedness. What sorts of demands did this exercise make upon her as a teacher? She displayed (and in some cases later commented upon) the necessity of developing their database skills, the ways she simplified and addressed language problems in the documents, her attendance to the *appearance* of handouts and the sources (which she felt mattered a great deal to students), the various warnings and hints she gave before and during the database searching, her ways of ensuring that each pupil in a group used the database, the questions she asked on the sheets and afterward (drawing upon her knowledge of pupils' preconceptions), her means of controlling students' physical locations in the classroom and ensuring they were listening when she gave directions, and her follow-up in the next lesson through references to documents in this one. There was no point at which pupils were off task or confused in the lesson except when one of the computers crashed. Clearly, the "use of written primary sources" category included a series of micro-components that made it work smoothly. Generally speaking, experienced teachers tended to structure away potential problems by both predicting them and knowing a tremendous amount about how to counteract them – knowledge gained largely from trying different solutions and refining the whole cluster of events around the basic activity.

Teachers' conceptions of empathy also conditioned their strategy choices, as relayed in Chapter 5, as did their beliefs about pedagogy generally.

To take the latter, Dow for instance subscribed to the idea that students thought and understood most not by listening or watching, but by *doing*, and his activities – like those of Ingram’s and Joslin’s – tended to involve small-group, active learning where the maximum number of students had a participatory role. Hayes believed in structure and control, and generally chose whole-class activities; so where Ingram might have pupils examine a source in pairs, she would read and discuss it plenary-style. Matters of personality also affected choices of strategy, as teachers made use of their different strengths. Hayes, for instance, leveraged her charisma and stockpile of anecdotes to keep students engaged through lessons dominated by teaching “from the front.”

Factors mentioned in the previous chapter naturally also played a role in strategy choice. While Dow preferred the big role plays, trials or simulations mentioned above, he found he lacked time to do those as much as he formerly had done. While a recent article in *Teaching History* has made the claim that major role-play exercises ultimately *save* time by accelerating learning in the early stages of a unit of work (Dawson & Banham, 2002), they undeniably require several sessions to set up and conduct; one model exercise that produced sophisticated empathetic outcomes involved four lessons devoted to research, three for the debate itself, and a follow-up essay afterward (Wineburg & Wilson, 1988). What teachers believed they and the students could manage also mattered; Ingram was pleased when his Year 10 group handled an exercise competently involving production of a chat show about German reactions to the Treaty of Versailles:

They can be quite a difficult group, but I’ve now got to the point with them where I’m fairly confident that I can manage them in any situation now. And that confirmed it today, that I can do certain things with them and they will respond positively. I also wasn’t sure how they would react to a reasonably free-flowing exercise, because some of them are quite weak and if you don’t give them sharp guidelines they can’t do that. I wasn’t sure how they would work without particular boundaries, and going off to find things by themselves, but obviously as long as there is somebody in that group who can lead it and shape it then it seems to work (T15: 417-424).

Time of day could also influence choices; before a lesson, Hayes commented that she planned to show a video and wanted them to reflect in preparation for

their writing assignment. She said, “I’m thinking about having them close their eyes for a minute afterwards and envision being there [in the trenches]. I may or may not do this – sometimes it doesn’t work well on a Friday afternoon. I’ll have to hoof it, see what the group is like” (T53: 15-18).

Because teachers were usually asked to comment about activities they had chosen, the majority of data I gathered addressed the assets, not limitations, of various strategies and resources for a particular group. However, occasionally teachers had qualms about certain strategies as a whole – for example, Hayes was uncomfortable with the “pretend” aspect of role-play and the ways that pupils often got carried away with props and costumes rather than historical content; the message got lost in the medium. Ingram was wary of historical fiction films because he felt they did not represent true history, and chose to show only documentaries. More often, teachers spoke about an activity’s appropriateness for a given purpose, its goodness of fit. So Joslin typically shunned the approach of writing historical diaries because “they are awful forms of English to write” (T60: 52-53) – girls produced more everyday empathy (treating them as they would their private diaries) and got bogged down in dates. However, she once selected this very strategy for individual Year 7 students who were weak in writing because they would be easier to manage than stories where the format introduced extra variables to consider.

Historical Integrity and Verisimilitude

- ◆ The teachers were willing to compromise to different extents in the standards of historicity they upheld. Certain kinds of anachronistic formats or questions were acceptable to them, as well as contrived comparisons that served the purpose of giving students a handle on past thought and experience.
- ◆ The teachers valued highly strategies that confronted pupils with the actuality of the past; they spoke in superlative terms about exposing them to authentic or authentic-feeling reconstructions of historical artifacts and places.

Teachers seemed to possess different thresholds for how much historical accuracy they upheld, and when they would compromise to accommodate

other goals. As the previous examples suggest, anachronistic formats for activities were not uncommon: Joslin used a radio programme on sixteenth-century vagabonds, Ingram a newspaper report on Roman gladiatorial combat as well as early twentieth-century chat shows, and Hayes a recruiting poster for the Crusades. These methods were normally though not always accompanied by mention of their modernity. Anachronistic questions were also not automatically reviled, though rare in practice. When asked what they thought of the using the question “Were the Victorians racist?” in the classroom, as one current textbook does (Shepard, Reid, & Shepherd, 1993: 70), the responses ranged from wanting to avoid it entirely to regarding it as a positive opportunity to unpick differences in ideas about race – hopefully without actually *planting* a conception of racist Victorians through power of suggestion. One teacher took a pragmatic view, saying,

[I]t’s an easy question and perhaps a too-easy question to ask. But then you’ve got to have something to stimulate the students into some response. Okay, it might be a glib thing but if it makes them start thinking about the views, the racial views of the Victorians, then it’s doing its job. I’m quite happy giving a provocative and un-sound question if it’s doing the job of provoking thought...In an ideal world you don’t want to ask that kind of thing, but you’ve got to grab these students... You can be overly subtle, I think (T65: 587-595).

Similarly, teachers recognised that historical purity was an impossible standard in empathetic efforts. Not even the most powerful empathetic experiences could actually *recreate* the perspectives of the past; even for the most perceptive and source-saturated historians, its worldviews and emotions remained asymptotically out of reach. The teachers accepted this good-naturedly. Ingram said of a trip to the WWI battlefields in France,

There is some kind of empathy there when you go to the trenches and you see how close the enemy is. There is something, but it’s a bit distorted I think...because it’s really sunny [laughs], you’re with your friends, it’s dry, you’re not under any immediate threat. It’s like that programme ‘Recreating the Trench.’ Well, you *can’t* recreate the trench. You can help – go *some* way towards creating empathetic understanding because you can *explain* things, but you can’t really truly put somebody in that position (T38: 651-661).

In light of this barrier across the years and circumstances, teachers tried to establish such understanding as they could. At times they used rather crude or contrived examples and simulations if they served to provide even a hint of the feelings actually experienced historically. Dow explained,

[I]n something like the Slave Trade course I'll start with a lesson about a slave's journey. I get all the students outside the classroom before the lesson, put the blinds down in the room, get all the tables in a big block in the middle so there are no gaps between them and put all the chairs to the side, and then I build it up a bit outside, bring them in and get them crammed underneath the tables. They're all sitting there, and they're crowded and it's dark. They've been there five minutes and it starts to get hot and it starts to get a bit sweaty down there. I get someone on top of the table with a belt, slapping the top of the table. It's really effective, and they come out and I ask how they felt. It's not very developed empathy at all, it's just giving them an impression of what the situation would be like, and then from there you can go on to more defined judgments about why people might be opposed to slavery and what a slave might feel in that situation (T57: 419-430).

The simulation did not capture the reality of the Middle Passage, but – crucially – it moved away from the norms of the classroom and offered an imaginative window into discomfort, dark, and lack of control. Likewise, by setting up a framework in which pupils were gaining then losing money in a Wall Street Crash simulation, he led them to feel anxious about the same kinds of things their character worried about, and by ranting at some of them in a dictatorship and democracy simulation – which they did not expect from their even-keeled teacher – he frightened them to the point where only one student in eight years dared to speak out against such treatment.

The element of surprise, of jolting pupils into an awareness of the reality of past differences, seemed to be of prime value in cultivating empathy – it threaded through teachers' comments not just on simulations but on many activities. One way to achieve this was to confront them with evidence of past events directly. When asked if taking the students to WWI graveyards stimulated empathy, Dow responded, “massively, massively” (T41: 604).

Hayes said,

What I would probably quite like to do is try and push for more opportunities to take the kids out and experience things...If you think about a castle, if you've never actually seen a castle then you've either

got a two-dimensional photograph image or you're thinking of something like a Lego castle or like Cinderella's castle – unless you go and look at it and think 'Gosh, these walls really are thick, and this must have been pretty cold' (T63: 235-236, 246-250).

Removing kids from the classroom – literally or figuratively – helped. Joslin commented that her class trip to the Black Country Museum, with its recreation of an industrial town and re-enactment of how to mine, was like a flashback in time; without being accurate in every detail, it provided a strong sense of pastness. Likewise, the Nottingham Galleries of the Museum of Justice had been a “*fabulous* source for empathy” with its “nasty man” acting the part of a jailbird and other authentic touches:

And the whole site was a genuine artifact, if you like, because it *really was* the old prison and courtrooms that were in use up until the 1980s, and that had started to be used in the 1600s...It had an enormous feeling of truth about it...the way it was presented, they were able to empathise all the time. For example, they went into the Victorian courtroom and there was a magistrate there, with his long wig, and he gave them roles and they actually recreated a Victorian trial in which a particular person was being tried for rioting, for protesting for the vote. And the magistrate behaved *exactly* as the magistrate is described as behaving in the Tolpuddle Martyr case where he actually did not *listen* to the evidence or completely *denigrates* the evidence of the defense, and denigrates the witnesses themselves as being stupid and poor and everything else, as well as instructing the jury on what *his* opinion is and pressurising the jury into thinking what he thinks... [B]ecause these girls in this class were actually able to play *roles* in that recreation, they came back with a much better understanding of how the Tolpuddle Martyrs trial was rigged, *but* more importantly, of the kind of power wielded by the land-owning classes of that time, and therefore a basis for the understanding of why they had the attitudes that they had at that time (T37: 733-754).

In a documentary video on Hastings, Ingram explained that he valued the narrator's re-treading of the actual slope of the battlefield, the demonstration of weapons and how they were used, and the show of actual axe-battered skulls – the sorts of relics which were very effective and would be great to have available for teaching. Echoing the sentiment about relics and sites, David Lowenthal wrote,

[T]he feeling of immediacy endures... The shiver of contact with ancient sites brings to life their lingering barbarity or sanctity, and

merely touching original documents vivifies the thoughts and events they described (1985: 245).

Such authenticity could be recaptured in other ways, as for instance Dow's inviting as guest speakers a WWII veteran and his wife or a Holocaust survivor – people whose experiences commanded attention and who could help students imagine what their dramatic histories were like. Joslin spoke also of the power of primary evidence to make the past seem more real, and three of the teachers encouraged pupils to wrinkle, burn, or otherwise “age” letters they wrote as past figures, suggesting that there was value in simulating the antiquity of old documents (or at least getting away from the sterile A4 norm). Apart from being fun, these efforts were seen as helping to jar students out of day-to-day classroom existence and heightening the sense of immediacy and foreignness of the past.

Sequence and Variety

◆ The teachers felt that both within and across lessons, the sequencing and variety of activities mattered for empathy.

Relations between strategies also concerned teachers; they attended not simply to matters of workability, but also to sequencing and variety. Because empathy of any sophistication was rarely an instant response, teachers had to think about steps that progressively led to it, either by building knowledge gradually or setting up a dilemma to solve at the outset that addressed preconceptions. Ingram spoke of a lesson on religious changes under the Tudors as a “staging lesson” for another on Elizabeth's handling of rebellions in the name of Mary Queen of Scots. In discussing a lesson on German groups' reactions to the war's end in 1918, he talked about how he would overwhelm students if he attempted too great a multiplicity of perspectives all at once:

I don't think they completely understand the complexity of why an industrial worker from Hamburg may well be a right-wing fascist, but we're going to move on to that later. As long as I've got the caveat in at the moment, I can work on that later. At the moment it's just trying to get basic, general political understandings of groups. It's empathy, but only in a very general scale. They can all understand that an industrial worker would identify with left-wing groups because they don't have much, and that was the principal aim of it (T22: 484-490).

He also described the series of activities he used to help student reconstruct a sense of medieval living conditions for a lord, a tradesman, a woman, and a villein.

Start off with drawing [the character], then you start thinking about and writing, and then you try to put that image you've created, or the one you've drawn and the one written about, into a scene inside your head. So it's just building up layers of understanding for them (T7: 807-810).

Dow also kept in mind a sequence of how to teach the First World War. This involved an inundation of images to attract pupils' interest and set an accurate picture of the situation, then an exploration of the British public's and soldiers' feelings and attitudes, then investigation of the general's logic in conducting the war and its consequences for soldiers, followed by added depth and more detail from a reading of primary sources, and then a culmination in the form of students' writing a letter from the trenches. Judgments on events also had its place, Dow believed, but should follow the acquisition of knowledge.

Within lessons, teachers also patterned events to maximise the possibilities for understanding. Ingram, for example, used writing in exercise books as a way of preserving ideas for later use in launching empathetic efforts. He said it was

just a thing for topping something off and getting them to process their thoughts before we go into the recap, so that they're tuned into what we've done in the lesson...it's just part of a general sort of thing so that they can understand to think empathetically and then when we do a set piece on it, you know, they can get into it that way (T10: 463-466).

Hayes, too, structured events within the lesson for optimal empathetic understanding. Though video problems caused some reshuffling of her lesson on the Crusades, her preferred approach was to begin with a gruesome film scene of a crusading prisoner's hand being chopped off.

I have used *Robin Hood: Prince of Thieves* before, more as a shock tactic which, had it worked, is really what I intended to do. 'Let's think about why people go on Crusades. This is what happens to you when you go on Crusades. *Why* then is it [people wanted to go] – ?' instead of having to look at the book first... [W]e've built it up from there, which works quite well (T39: 845-853).

Teachers also justified using particular activities for the sake of variety. Ingram thought some of his classes lost concentration when he did not switch the tasks fairly regularly. Hayes worried about over-using video as a resource, though she felt that equally good sources were hard to find, and Joslin chided herself for letting a discussion go on too long so pupils lost interest. On the other hand, lessons that were too ambitious in terms of numbers of activities raised their own problems. Dow thought his Gallipoli (T4) and WWI and Empathy (T29) lessons lacked a central focus and were too rushed (in the former, he had to edit out some scenes and cut the subsequent discussion), and that depth of learning was affected when this happened. Ingram found himself jettisoning source work mid-stream when pupils' comprehension difficulties consumed more time than he had anticipated. All of the teachers made strong efforts to keep the curriculum varied while also choosing strategies that communicated the zeitgeist of a period,⁷⁷ and the lessons I observed showed a range of one to seven activity switches per lesson, with three to five as the most common counts. As Wineburg and Wilson concluded in their study of two history teachers,

[They] are not one-dimensional pedagogues who do only one thing well... [but] possess...the ability to draw from a broad range of possibilities. Indeed, it may be their very ability to alternate between different modes of teaching that earns each of them the designation "wise practitioner" (1988: 58).

The same might be said of teachers' work in cultivating empathy.

Considering activities in the ways detailed above – their choice, use, and evaluation – explains much about teachers' ways of cultivating empathy. Indeed, when teachers were asked what they did to encourage understanding, they usually spoke at the level of activities that organised the lesson. However, they also guided pupils toward empathy by what they *said*: their language in the classroom and how they used it. Though often arising spontaneously and organically from interactions, and less often recognised or discussed as

⁷⁷ Along these lines, Howard Gardner has noted that one of the areas in which a "multiple intelligences" approach to the curriculum seems to him most fruitful is creating a sense of the culture and mentalité of a society (2003).

strategic by the teachers, their talk contained a mix of verbal devices that assisted the empathetic cause. These are explored in the sections that follow.

Discourse Strategies

◆ The teachers cultivated empathy through ways of speaking that they employed for three complementary goals: to encourage empathetic thought processes, to establish relevance, and to dramatise or enliven history.

Unlike empathy activities, which teachers spoke about regularly and fluidly, they only occasionally drew attention to their toolkit of discourse strategies – things like analogies, prompts for logical reasoning, or past/present comparisons. This probably relates to the fact that they rarely have cause or opportunity to analyse their own speech at this level of detail, and most likely would not be aware of some patterns without a transcript to examine. So how do I know these conversational events related to empathy at all? Occasionally, teachers did reflect about reasons they used them and made it clear they were deliberate choices. Other times (upon questioning) they identified them as automatic and unplanned and explained their relation to empathy. In many cases I have interpreted that a certain discourse strategy contributed because it was a component of a larger aim that they related to empathy.

The strategies divide into three categories, as shown in Table L: cultivating empathetic thought processes, establishing relevance, and dramatising or enlivening history. These are examined in turn below.

TABLE L: DISCOURSE STRATEGIES USED TO FOSTER EMPATHY

CULTIVATING EMPATHETIC THOUGHT PROCESSES	ESTABLISHING RELEVANCE	DRAMATISING HISTORY
Encouraging humility, respect toward past people	Analogies	Priming or salience comments
Explicit (meta-level) talk about empathy issues		
Encouraging differentiation between past viewpoints	Relating historical topics to students' lives	Role-taking (including devil's advocacy)
Encouraging link-making, use of contextual knowledge		
Encouraging logical reasoning	Personal illustrations	Language effects
Exploring alternative courses of action, thoughts		
Exploring paradoxes	Then/now comparisons (similarities and differences)	Teachers' expression of empathy or wonder
Deducing or interpreting perspectives		
Cultivating sensitivity to language, esp. historical		
Adapting questioning styles		

Cultivating an Empathetic Thought Process

◆ In teaching pupils to think empathetically, the teachers all used a number of methods, though sometimes in different ways and to different extents. These strategies were:

- encouraging humility and respect toward past people;
- explicitly talking about empathy or issues in its use;
- encouraging differentiation or consideration of alternative views;
- encouraging pupils to make links and use contextual knowledge;
- encouraging logical reasoning and its subcategories of exploring alternatives, exploring paradoxes and deducing or interpreting perspectives;
- cultivating sensitivity to language; and
- questioning in a variety of styles.

◆ Students also shaped the curriculum through both their spontaneous and elicited uses of these strategies (some of which they employed more than others).

The teachers in this study felt it was important to nurture the development of an empathetic disposition in students – a way of approaching that task with a mindset of openness, respect, and desire for understanding – and then to guide students in the practice of historical empathy. They achieved this in part by *encouraging humility and respect* toward people of the past. While all of the teachers spoke of the importance of this goal in interviews,

Dow and Hayes did this most during lessons. They achieved it in a number of ways:

- a) by noting impressive achievements or the virtues of people in past (such as the building of cathedrals or the ingenuity of the D-Day attack);
- b) by accenting the difficulty and constraints people were operating under, and often the scarcity of alternatives;
- c) by reminding pupils of the ease of criticising decisions in hindsight;
- d) by encouraging them to think of large numbers of people in terms of real and unique individuals;
- e) by pointing out the logic of past actions according to assumptions then;
- f) by urging respectful treatment of memorials;
- g) by challenging interpretations of past people as stupid; and
- h) by noting what people in past ages did better than we do today (for example, medieval observance of changes in the sky).

To varying degrees, all of the teachers used *explicit talk about empathy or empathy-related issues*. Their rationales were explored in Chapter 5, so it remains here to simply elaborate on what they did. This category of strategies involved raising awareness about how we do, and should, think about the past – historical meta-cognition. Examples included introducing pupils to the concept and levels of empathy, of reminding them that we cannot see their lives as people in the past saw them (so our accounts are always constructions), of using signals like “put your sixteenth-century head on” to trigger students to re-orient their thinking, of discussing the problems of anachronism or of what we must know in order to start reconstructing past mentalities. Pupils too initiated discussion of these issues, for instance by injecting reminders about things known or not known at the time, or talking about ways that the times shaped the people.

A theme running through all of the teachers’ classrooms was *differentiation or encouraging consideration of alternative views* held in the past. Joslin, Dow and especially Ingram all discussed this as an important criteria in empathetic coursework, and all teachers seasoned their descriptions

of thoughts and feelings with language like “some,” “many,” “most” and “exception.” Sometimes getting a handle on multiple perspectives was an overarching point of the lesson, as when teachers structured attention to different societal groups. Other times, in line with a GCSE focus on change over time, they looked at a culture’s shifts in perspective over a given period. When asked the reason for his attentiveness to differentiation, Ingram cited exam specifications, though his alertness to the issue extended to his Key Stage 3 year-groups as well.

The dimensions of difference that teachers spotlighted tended to reflect their school populations and to an extent, their own values. For example, Ingram spoke much about how class, position, and hierarchies in society affected views (a matter of personal interest to him as well as historical salience), whereas Joslin more than other teachers had her female students look at differential perspectives and treatment by sex. Sometimes the prerogatives of engaging students’ interests worked against representing the complexities of history. In teaching about Roman slavery, Hayes remarked,

The danger, of course, is that to gain their attention you’ve got to go for the *bad* things, and it tends to downplay the fact that some slaves were well treated. I mentioned it, but I am sort of a bit conscious that they probably go away thinking that all slaves were killed. The book makes the point that a slave sometimes had a better life than he would have done otherwise, but you are not actually getting the impact of slavery, so it has to be more – well, I feel anyway you’ve got to put more emphasis on the bad (T11: 592-597).

While divergent views in the past were an area susceptible to pupils’ picking up and parroting formulations without much understanding – “everybody apart from some people would be gutted that Charles was beheaded” (T26: 451-454) – pupils often raised their own astute ideas about other points of view, overtly resisted stereotypical language, and in the case of Joslin’s top band Year 10 class, showed themselves capable of giving subtle weight in their role-plays to majority opinions while recognising others held in the past. Age was often no deterrent to sophistication of this type. One Year 7 student, for example, announced

I'd just like to say that villains – like people thought that Germans [in WWII] were villains, but they were standing up for what they believed so they would be *heroes* in other people's eyes (T37: 36-37).

Teachers *encouraged link-making and the use of contextual knowledge* to varying degrees. In these lessons, Joslin called upon students to bring in contextual knowledge gleaned in earlier years a fair amount: three to six times more frequently than the others. Teachers used several approaches: they modelled links at timely points in the lesson – “You have to remember that in the early part of the nineteenth century there was a terrific reforming zeal among these increasing numbers of educated middle class people” (T47: 300-301) – showed how one source connected to another, and exhorted pupils to “think back” or “bear in mind” various facts. They checked in coursework for integration of attitudes and context, and developed themes across more than one unit of study, such as education systems across cultures or the notion that change involved regression as well as progression.

Joslin often reflected about the matter of contextual linkages. She thought about providing literary models to show pupils how to draw in relevant contextual points, walked them through inferences from primary sources, tried to teach them to search for contextual clues in documents, showed them where in a structured essay they should start drawing upon their own knowledge, and praised exercises in the textbook relating context and action. Teachers tended to be on their own in facilitating links; students rarely took the initiative to do so (at least out loud), and many seemed to struggle to recall and apply relevant contextual points even when urged to do so and given clues.

Teachers frequently asked students to *logically reason* about what people in the past felt or thought; here students were supposed to be using their knowledge and experience of the world to analogise to a situation they had probably or certainly never encountered. Quite often these took the form of open questions, such as “If he [Henry VIII] really did see it as a confrontation between himself and an angry God, what does that tell us about how he has then got to act?” (T17: 377-379) or “Why would they want to

teach Domestic Science to girls?” (T30: 612). Hayes used this approach twice as much as the others, a reflection mainly of her whole-class teaching style.

Students started processes of logical reasoning as well, which even when their conceptions were off (or logical according to a wholly different set of standards) often indicated an empathetic attempt. They tended to show the most *historically* sensible thinking when dealing with material realities, like “Do you suppose if somebody threw something...[at the] flat shield that would just stick right into it, and possibly even straight through it?” (T10: 251-252), or relative constants like parental feelings – “Wouldn’t it [Nazi pressure to procreate] change how the parents felt about their children? ‘Well, it’s got to be the next kid,’ ” (T1: 675-676). Less straightforward, though useful for revealing student’s conceptions, were reasoning attempts when past and current norms clashed, as in this exchange between Joslin and a pupil.

S: [reading from her role-play script] ‘Why is it that every woman should do a woman’s job? Men should do it [housework] as well.’

T: Well, do you think in the Victorian times they would have gone as far as to think that men should do housework?

S: I don’t know. But if you were a woman, you’d think things like that anyway. I mean, you *always* think things –

T: You *do* say things that are a bit far-fetched, I know. But I think we need to keep within Victorian ideas, and this is very modern, this is very 1990s when we think that men should do that (T24: 367-379).

This snippet of dialogue is intriguing for the tensions it contains: the clash between the student’s sense of what a woman would “naturally” think and what mores in the 1800s were, but also between the teacher’s commitment to getting conventional attitudes correct and between admitting the possibility of a multiplicity of perspectives despite the strictures of Victorian gender roles.

The strategy of encouraging logical reasoning contained several subcategories, the first of which involved urging pupils to *explore alternatives* available historically. All of the teachers did this at times, and all but Hayes also structured whole activities around it (see decision-making or advice-giving exercises). Joslin and Dow spoke of the importance of this process for empathy, with the latter commenting, for example, that “We’ve got to come up with strong reasons why we can criticise him [General Haig], so we look at the situation he was in and say ‘He should have done this.’ If we can’t find an

alternative then it's difficult to criticise" (T25: 77-79). Pupils appeared to relish opportunities to speculate, with younger ones more prone to fantastical or intentionally amusing solutions, like solving monarchical conflicts through a tug of war pull (T3). Often students raised points that teachers considered worthy of taking time to address; in this sense, their ideas had a strong shaping influence on the curriculum (particularly in Hayes' class). Students asked, for example,

- Do you think anyone [in WWI] would like *joke* about retreating? (T19: 384)
- What if the Jews revoked their religion? (T43: 373)
- Couldn't they [the Japanese] have surrendered on different terms? (46: 676)

Less frequently and not every lesson, teachers or students identified and *explored paradoxes*, another subcategory of logical reasoning. They queried, "Why didn't X happen?" or "Why would they want to do this?" Commenting on her students' reactions to the British political system before the First Reform Act, Hayes said, "They think it was rubbish and, yes, it was rubbish, but people at the time accepted it. So why did they accept it?" (T55: 514-515). Dow and Joslin also scaled this principled up to craft whole exercises based around paradoxes – disconfirmation exercises, checking preconceptions against a source database, or explaining paradoxes through coursework. Interestingly, in every class students tended to highlight paradoxes more often than teachers, at times immediately followed by attempts to resolve them. For instance, in thinking about Andreas Vesalius' contribution to sixteenth-century anatomical knowledge, one asked,

Wouldn't a lot of people probably know about the [differences between the human and ape] jawbone, though, wouldn't they? Because there were probably loads of skulls being seen. They must have realised that, and they were probably just too scared to [say] – (T21: 574-576).

Or they wondered,

- How could they [nineteenth-century women] be teachers if they couldn't get any education themselves? (T24: 102)
- Was Hitler planning for the very long term then? Because encouraging them to have kids so that they can be soldiers is like stupid, it's waiting a long time (T1: 283-284).

Pondering matters of opacity in history, the scholar Robert Darnton wrote,

When we run into something that seems unthinkable to us, we may have hit upon a valid point of entry into an alien mentality. And once we have puzzled through to the native's point of view, we should be able to roam about in his symbolic world (1984: 262).

Nearly every example of paradox-pondering by students showed precisely that: an effort to enter into another context and world of rules. In this sense, the questions formed a potential diagnostic tool for teachers as to pupils' thinking; indeed, they often homed in on these conceptions and commented about their implications in post-lesson interviews.

The reasoning subcategory of *deducing or interpreting perspectives* generally involved prompts or offerings by teachers; they were rarely given or requested by students independently. Teachers asked or examined how people thought or felt *as evidenced by* some source; in this sense they were grounded historically in ways that other logical reasoning efforts weren't necessarily. Depending on the capacities of the class, teachers sometimes also encouraged students to explore *historians'* deductions and interpretations of events; this was more common with older and more advanced groups. Dow claimed that trying to teach interpretations to Lower School students was a misplaced attainment target (T57).

In a nod to the complexity of deducing past perspectives, all teachers sometimes used means of constraining the number of possibilities students were choosing between – so for instance Joslin structured her worksheet on interpreting a Wilfred Owen poem as multiple choice so as not to overwhelm pupils, and created a handout requiring students to colour-code ideas for and against women's suffrage before crafting arguments on the subject. For difficult interpretive questions, Dow made the complexity manageable by shifting his questioning style from “why” or “what” questions to choices between dualities: “Was X or Y more important?” Along similar lines he pared down Henry VIII's motives to certain key points for his Year 12 pupils. This allowed them, using empathy, to reach nuanced interpretations of historical motives by focusing on when and why the king's ideas shifted.

S: Isn't it like Henry couldn't have a son, so he was looking for what could be the problem. It couldn't be him that was the problem, so what could it have been? So he thought, 'Well, hang on now, I could have done something wrong here.' So it might be his ego, then his faith, and then coming back to his ego again.

T: What do people reckon? So Sarah's argument: his ego is hurt because he hasn't got an heir, then his religious faith is touched by the guilt feelings, and that drives him to have a divorce. [He draws flowchart of her ideas on board: ego – heir – guilt – faith – divorce – break with Rome.] Do people accept that, or have people got an alternative slant on that? (T17: 509-518)

Cultivating sensitivity to language in their students was important to the teachers. While general language allowed students to show subtleties of thought, historical diction enabled them to talk and begin to conceptualise the world as people in the past did – or minimally to understand their speech. The following conversation about a student's written work revealed the value of language skills:

Dow: This person's obviously really thought a lot about the language, both the specialist language and also the general language. I think that really does help empathy...Talking about apprehension, solitude, growing feelings of pain, dread, fear: it makes it more effective because it's more powerful, because of the range. I don't know if I'm on shaky ground there, but it does seem a more effective piece because of it.

Interviewer: When you say 'specialist language' do you mean language like No-Man's Land, terms they used then, or do you mean wider vocabulary, more expressive in general?

Dow: By specialist language I mean historical terms, like those. But this person also uses more effective adjectives, more effective adverbs. Their use of English is more advanced, and I think that does help raise the performance – more than it would in an essay on causation, I think (T61: 129-144).

Ingram also considered higher literacy levels helpful for history. After a lesson on the Roman army in which he insisted upon the pupils' use of terms like "centurion" and "legionary" and weaponry names like "gladius" and "scutum," I asked him whether this vocabulary-building bore any relation to empathy.

I hadn't thought of that...But I suppose in some ways it is, because you're getting foreign words, so you're going back into that foreign

land... So I suppose it helps you displace yourself slightly, because you start using words like the spear and the sword, they have very many different connotations... But certainly I wasn't consciously doing it. But thinking about, yeah, if you use the *exact* words, then they know that those are Roman words. A 'gladius' is a Roman word, you cannot place that anywhere else. So perhaps it does help with empathy 'cause it helps with *precision* and it *clarifies* the thought and the experience (T10: 437-448).

While the connection he made between empathy and language was clearly a research effect in this instance, he ultimately decided that he had inadvertently been building a sense of Romanness as well as literacy.

Teachers also tried to increase pupils' sensitivity to language by drawing their attention to the terms in sources and or praising their felicitous choices of words. Joslin for example highlighted the power and horror of Wilfred Owens' description of soldiers' feet as "blood-shod" (T52) and had pupils spend most of a lesson working out the meanings and connotations of the other lines of the poem. Teachers also sometimes modelled their sensitivity to body language in visual sources, and in Dow's case challenged students to communicate in this fashion by forming themselves into human sculptures or memorials of WWI.

Questioning styles also constituted small-scale strategies for evoking empathy, and teachers used a wide battery of them. Issues concerning the framing of questions in "your thoughts"/"their thoughts" terms, which often affected the resulting nature of the empathy, were addressed in Chapter 5, along with some of the difficulties arising from attempts to probe feelings without eliciting simplistic back-projections. Although no teacher made this observation, fine-grained analysis of twelve transcripts showed that teachers' basing 'How did they feel?' questions on sources, especially ones that expressed emotion in a relatively accessible way, generally correlated with more accurate, considered, and historical interpretations than asking 'How would you feel?' without reference to a source or without the purpose of constructing a defensible *argument*. Equally the analysis revealed that empathetically perceptive responses by students more often arose following teachers' questions concerning paradoxes, alternatives, problem-solving or deduction from sources than from those focused upon feelings.

Establishing Relevance

- ◆ The teachers used analogies, links to students' lives, personal illustrations, and then/now comparisons to help students grasp both their kinship to and distance from people of the past – and to imbue a desire to understand them.
- ◆ To varying degrees, the teachers discussed their awareness of the affordances and limitations of focusing upon similarities or differences.
- ◆ In practice, teachers employed both “developmental” and “deficit” orientations in speaking about the past. Neither their levels of consciousness about doing so nor their precise rationales were probed in this study.

Teachers *demonstrated* more than discussed their belief that pupils needed to see why the past mattered enough to try to understand. They also knew that this required them to be able to situate themselves with regard to both its familiar and accessible or foreign and exotic aspects. So they worked to show both similarities and differences from today, knowing that these contributed in their own ways to motivation and to the empathetic process, and placed different degrees of emphasis on each depending on the topic and students. All of the teachers were quite concerned that pupils be able to relate to the subject matter and *cared* enough to try to understand it, but they devoted quite different amounts of class time to this cause. Hayes used all of the “relevance” strategies to a greater extent than the others, and also talked about them *as* strategies more in interviews. The discourse strategies they employed included analogies, links to students' lives, personal illustrations, and then/now comparisons.

Both teachers and students used *analogies* to provide a “handle” on new topics by connecting them to ones already understood, such as other historical events and current news. The helpfulness of analogies for empathy was chiefly in providing access to past mindsets – students for example could grasp the behaviour of the flying kamikazes of WWII more easily in light of the September 11th suicide bombers. However, in certain cases teachers also steered clear of a sense of false proximity by addressing how the terms or parties of the analogy *differed*. They also fended off inappropriate comparisons by pointing out what things were *not* like – e.g. Ingram reminded his students

that “Warfare is not anything like you see in the movies” (T18: 345-346). Hayes, Dow, and their students used analogies roughly four times as often as Joslin and Ingram and their pupils. All of the teachers except Joslin also used extended analogies to structure longer segments of the lesson: for example, Dow compared the moves made during Henry VIII’s divorce and break with the Church to a chess game (and actually had pupils play a game while reviewing historical actions), and Hayes opened a lesson by relating her powers as a teacher to those of a Roman slave master(!).

In a similar vein, teachers frequently tried to show how historical matters *related to students’ lives*, though as noted earlier they drew lines with how personal they wanted to get. To give students a route into a topic, Dow compared students’ heights to children’s heights at the beginning of the twentieth century, and Hayes explained how close together enemy trenches could be in terms of the distance from the school tennis courts to the hedge. Relating matters to students’ lives often meant personalising a topic, such as when Hayes explained the impact of the Norman invasion in terms of a local Norman-settled village named after a French town, where the manor still belonged to descendants of the original family. Joslin began her Year 7 lesson on the medieval church by having pupils contribute their knowledge about the role of churches today, and Ingram started a session on Elizabethan views toward the poor with a discussion of present attitudes toward beggars in the local area. He explained this approach in terms of a principle supported by his recent reading:

[I]t appears, you know, if History is related to an individual’s own *life*, they find it *very easy* to understand and get involved. As soon as you remove it from some kind of personal connection, whether it’s local or family or – they find it virtually impossible (T30: 818-821).

While many times these comparisons arose spontaneously during teaching, teachers also sometimes thought them through in advance. Joslin, for example, worried about asking pupils to reconstruct the views of a woman graduating from university in the nineteenth century since “a lot of kids from this class would feel, even in the twentieth century, ‘Well we’re not talking about anybody that *I* know’” (T24: 582-584).

The discourse strategy of *personal illustrations* – wherein teachers offered anecdotes from their own lives to make a historical point – revealed marked differences in teachers’ practices and philosophies. Hayes sprinkled her lessons with personal and family stories; she used them at least twenty-three times as often as the other teachers, whose use was negligible. What accounts for the difference? One of the key factors here seemed to be a belief about whether bringing such stories and illustrations into the classrooms was professionally appropriate; Joslin and Ingram generally shied away from it. Hayes, on the other hand, thought it enhanced students’ learning: “I think they like to think that you’ve *seen* it, or you’ve *been* there, or you’ve *done* it. I like to use that sort of thing as much as possible, really, to try and pull people in” (T27: 722-732). Rather than being indulgent or confessional, however, these tales almost always clearly related to the history being studied. Effectively, she was using her own life as a vehicle for their understanding – she taught the significance of events through personalisation. As she related with regard to teaching about Cold War fears,

[I]n some ways, because I grew up with it I take it for granted and keep having to remind myself ‘You’ve got to *explain* this.’ To them it’s so past. Last week we were talking about the Berlin Wall coming down, and they were aware that the Berlin Wall came down when it did, but didn’t in any way appreciate the significance of it. I remember even when I first got married we lived not far from an oil terminal, and people were discussing that if the Russians decided to bomb the oil terminal we would all be wiped out in the fireball that would follow. We used to discuss things like that, not get all hyper about it but it was there (T51: 715-722).

Use of personal illustrations also seemed to relate to teachers’ personalities and levels of comfort in sharing information with particular groups, and possibly to a desire to establish some formal boundaries and distance in the classroom. It probably also related to teachers’ age and personal store of anecdotes applicable to a particular subject; in Hayes’ lessons, we see the union of a family history full of rich connections to the twentieth-century subject matter, a teacher at ease sharing personal information, a whole-class teaching style that afforded her extra opportunity to tell stories, and a conviction that it was pedagogically helpful to do so. Students also used

personal illustrations occasionally, most often in Hayes' classes – she validated this, and it was part of the classroom culture.

One of teachers' most well-worn tools for cultivating understanding, though in some respects one of the most hazardous, was *then/now comparisons*. These emerged both as activities structuring segments of a lesson, and as briefer discourse strategies. Teachers felt that it was important to note both contrasts and continuities between the past and present, though in practice they all noted contrasts at least four times as often in their teaching.

At first glance, it is not at all clear what past/present comparisons have to do with *empathetic*, as opposed to *broader* historical understanding. If empathy involves entertaining perspectives of the past, or some evidence-based approximation of them, the present appears to have no place in the calculus whatsoever – it merely exists to be held in suspension. But since we inevitably look back at history from the standpoint of the present, we must possess the awareness of self and of difference to know what exactly to try to suspend. While we need not know the immediate or even long-term outcomes of a decision in order to empathise with the decision-makers at a particular juncture in time (and indeed this sort of hindsight may cripple empathy), we do need to know where we as twenty-first-century individuals have arrived here and now. We need to see the contextual canyon separating us and our predecessors. In this sense, teachers emphasised differences *as part of* cultivating empathy. As Hayes said after a lesson about Roman feasts,

It's very much about differences, but I think if you look at similarities and differences that is a route into empathy. How much of this is in your experience, how much of this can you *recognise*, how much of this is alien to you? What would the experience of these people be like, in that it was so different to yours, or in that there were similarities? (T11: 625-628).

Similarities contributed to empathy in quite a different way than differences, by pointing out areas of kinship and serving to promote humility and respect. Taking up both aspects, Joslin explained why she chose a *then/now* approach for Victorian attitudes toward women:

I thought that strategy would mean that they would *have* to be confronted with the idea that it wasn't the same then as it is now. At the

same time, because there are threads that go through and there are similarities, I couldn't resist the temptation to approach sort of *reality*... I think it reinforces the notion that it was different, people thought differently about things. And *hopefully* the 'then and now' by pointing out that certain attitudes are still the same among certain people, it avoids this business of thinking that if you lived 150 years ago you were just stupid and ignorant (T9: 631-640).

Here, Joslin showed how she balanced historical prerogatives and students' tendencies. Elsewhere she did the same in ordering her approach: because at age eleven pupils tended to think anachronistically and in terms of similarities between the past and present, she opted for stressing differences first.

"[C]ontrasting is quite a good way to do it. I think you need to start with that to remind them," she claimed (T20: 585-586).

Reflecting out loud, Hayes outlined some affordances and constraints of both the similarity and difference angles in terms of sequence for proceeding, and of accessibility.

[I]t's hard to understand what life is like for other people unless you can relate to it in some way, and in a way that something about it is similar to what you do..., *or* in that it is so different that it is completely outside your understanding. And in a way maybe that actually makes you try to empathise *more*. Because there is a danger that if it is similar that you're thinking, 'Oh, yes, well, the way I feel about this,' and you're putting too much of yourself in it. I don't know, it's difficult...in some ways it's probably more successful looking at the differences, but easier looking at the similarities. So I think that's the problem, to be honest. And I think the difficulty with younger children is, it's probably safer to go in on similarities, because the differences can throw the ones who aren't very bright at all, in that they do see it as something totally alien and there is no point in getting their heads 'round it all (T11: 654-660, 665-669).

Research-minded, Hayes ultimately concluded that she would like to run an experiment with two groups to see which generated the most empathy – the question remained open.

In addition to holding all of the above-noted factors in mind, Hayes showed an awareness that then/now comparisons tended not to result in value-neutral thinking. Asked how she thought examining differences between Roman education and the type featured at her school contributed to empathy, she said

I think it's leading to it. It's more the differences really, because if they look at something and think 'That's different,' then the logical lead on from that is 'Is that an improvement, or is it something we don't like, or is it just something that's different that I've never really thought about?' (T8: 613-616).

Differences, in other words, were as likely to get students judging as understanding. While this is to be expected, and for teachers to completely ignore such intuitive reactions would probably only communicate to students that they were artificially impartial, it has distinct dangers where the enterprise of empathy is concerned. Lee and Ashby have argued that teachers need to think hard about whether some messages they are sending undermine their other empathetic efforts, for "the algorithmic collection of similarities and differences may proceed apace, at the expense of the wider issues at stake" (2001: 45). They criticised a primary school textbook for framing almost every aspect of life in the 1920s in terms of the absence of modern features, invigorating existing prejudices about the backwardness of other eras. Most of all they took issue with the book's causal language like "There were no washing machines, so Ada scrubbed the clothes with a bar of soap on a washboard," claiming that a more appropriate and less condescending phrasing would indicate that this happened "*because in the 1920s people had equipment that allowed them to wash clothes at home,*' not by rubbing them with stones at the riverside" (*Ibid*: 46).

Essentially, they were talking about whether the past should be framed in *deficit* or *developmental* terms. Was empathy (and historical thinking generally) better served by taking the present or the more distant past as the point of reference? Or could the two approaches both enhance empathy, but in different ways? I did not pose this question to the teachers (having not yet formulated it this way in my mind at the time), but I did review the transcripts to see how they treated comparisons in practice.

Several points emerged. In some lessons, there was a development orientation to the past (a then-then comparison) guiding the whole lesson. This was particularly the case when teachers were focusing on change over time, such as how attitudes toward medieval medicine, WWI, sixteenth-century

religion, witchcraft, castle construction, vagabonds, or Conscientious Objectors developed. These investigations sometimes called into question the view commonly held by students that change meant progress; Dow noted,

this whole medicine course is looking at change over time and also we keep trying to introduce the idea of regression, that things actually got worse. And so we've got to try to understand which of those factors are the ones which are holding them back, and then which are the ones pushing them forward (T21: 734-738).

Teachers also supported this past-referencing approach through the introduction of timely reminders about what came before, or how former or contemporary people dealt with issues.

Other lessons had no clear dominating orientation. For many topics, the two types of comparisons were too tightly intertwined to be unravelled; teachers just factually said that people were this, and weren't that, or had this, and didn't have that. The language of contrast ("but now," "whereas then"), not causation, characterised these statements. Teachers often used deficit and developmental framings adjacently, and as if in furtherance of the same goal. Perhaps this should come as no surprise, since it would be difficult and unsustainable to speak in developmental terms (*historical* thinking par excellence) all the time.

Finally, there were some lessons where the primary orientation was toward deficits of the past vis à vis the present. The most extreme example was Ingram's lesson on medieval life, where he reinforced a picture of benightedness: uncomfortable clothing, hard lives (except for lords), harsh justice, dangerous medicine, oppressed women, flying sewage, and wide-scale inferiority to the present in terms of science, technology, buildings and the availability of television. After having pointed out that his students were "*gifted, lucky* people to be living in this [modern] time because about a thousand years ago, we'd all have been *peasants*," (T7: 84-85), he instructed,

Having thought about that, and imagined what it would be like in medieval times, can you put your hands up, anyone who would prefer to live in the medieval period from now.

When no hands were raised, he laughed, saying, "That doesn't surprise me at all" (*Ibid*: 672-675).

Hayes also slipped into a kind of deficiency tone about the past in some lessons. Rather than starting her Roman education lesson by exploring what the Romans valued, and therefore what they were trying to achieve through their education system, she spent the majority of the lesson looking at how it was different and often frankly unappealing or unfair by modern standards, only reaching more historical views in the last few minutes. She wanted pupils to grasp the difference of Nazi German policies, so she “tried to make them see the frustration of women by comparing it to the opportunities open to women today” (T1: 817-822), a comparison the women could not have made. And she helped them to understand the attraction of signing up to fight in WWI by explaining,

Ordinary working people didn't have that much excitement in their lives at all. Okay, the rich people had cars and they went on holidays and all the rest of it, but ordinary working people, which most people living in the country were, didn't have all this extra excitement. They still fell in love, they still got married, they still had families and celebrated Christmas, and did the best they could with their lives (T53: 134-138).

Regardless of the accuracy level of these claims, the tone of the language suggests that people were unfortunate and a bit pathetic, particularly as claims about past shortcomings or discomforts tended not to be accompanied by contextualising reminders that *they* didn't necessarily see their situation in these terms. For their part, students were equally variable in the tone and assumptions of their remarks, and teachers tended to accept their comments graciously as long as they seemed to be trying in some sense to understand. For example, in discussing medieval doctors' evidence-defying commitment to Galen's ideas, Dow responded to the Year 10 question “Why didn't they just wake up? *Really*,” by saying, “Well, yeah, exactly the point. That's the crucial thing, why didn't they wake up?” (T21: 147-151). When a Year 7 pupil articulated his theory of relentless progress in history during a comment about Roman views of their own education system –

So they would think that it's quite good, 'cause it seems that if things were good then, they're going to be even more. And they've got better. They think theirs is good, because before then, things would have been even worse (T8: 554-557) –

Hayes greeted the comment by saying only, “Well done.”

Why did teachers who much of the time went to great efforts to nurture historical thinking seem to undermine their work with comparisons in which the past came up so short and history’s trajectory was a beeline toward betterment? I did not ask, and can only hypothesise a few possibilities:

1. In these instances, teachers considered the promotion of certain values the more important agenda (moral/civic purposes were prioritised);
2. In the midst of classroom teaching, and speaking extemporaneously, teachers were unaware that comments sounded demeaning;
3. Teachers were intentionally supporting a view of history as progress⁷⁸;
4. Teachers felt this approach would garner more interest and attention from pupils, or students’ age and maturity levels demanded a more graphic, exotic or judgmental (less explanatory) approach;
5. Teachers were acknowledging the sorts of reactions that pupils were probably having anyway, or perhaps getting these aired and out of the way so they could eventually move to more historical considerations;
6. Teachers’ subject matter knowledge of the periods in question was relatively weak, and thus they lacked a sense of how people at the time viewed their situations (lack of sources from some groups in some periods possibly compounding the difficulty);
7. Teachers did not feel (or would not agree) that these statements implied past backwardness;
8. Teachers felt the strong sense of difference students gained from these comparisons more than compensated (empathetically-speaking) for the subtle sacrifices of historicity.

Or multiple factors, included ones not named here, may have set the teaching orientation at a given time. Until further research, their logic about these aspects of then/now comparisons must remain an open question.

Dramatising or Enlivening History

◆ Teachers strove to “bring history to life” through a variety of approaches: seeding students’ interest and awe by communicating a subject’s intrinsic excitement (“priming”), speaking in role (a device also adopted by students), expressing their own empathy and wonder, and using language for dramatic effect.

⁷⁸ The card-sort data presented in Appendix F shows Ingram to be the only teacher who explicitly embraced this view.

A third group of discourse strategies involved teachers' efforts to bring history alive for students and capture their attention through such means as priming students' expectations or sense of awe, role-taking, expressing their own empathy and wonder, and using their language and tone to dramatise events (or encouraging students to do the same). Students also collaborated in vivifying history through unsolicited role-taking.

One strategy that teachers used in connection with empathy was *priming or marking salience*, which involved attempting to build their class's interest, excitement or care about a topic by expressing their own enthusiasm for the subject matter or stressing its importance, value, or exceptionalism. As a lead-in to new information, teachers employed superlative language or otherwise hinted at revelations to come, justifying why they were bothering with a topic in terms intrinsic to history (as opposed to exam needs, for example). Dow and Ingram both commented about the need to do this – “You've got to try and get them into it” (T65: 416), or “I'm playing more to an audience where ‘Look at this. Wasn't this interesting and exciting? This led to this, so let's go and look at this’” (T62: 744-745). Teachers used language like “really good topic,” “fantastic film,” “the stories will blow your mind,” “I'll let you into a secret,” “seriously impressive,” “very, very famous,” “really important” and “This is probably one of the *worst* battles you could have been in from the beginning of time” to win attention. These were bids to make students *want* to understand, and wanting mattered for empathy, they believed.

Both teachers and the videos they selected to show in class often used *role-taking* (episodically, not just as an activity) to personalise a viewpoint and show the feeling behind it. It was one of the discourse strategies most frequently used by teachers, so natural to their way of talking about history that they often switched into it even in interviews. When I asked Joslin about her taking the voice of King James, she said

I do that quite often. I did that with Prohibition too, in the lesson I've just taught. I just do a bit of a role play from time to time. I'm *sure* that's because I feel it helps them to understand a particular point of

view, but I don't necessarily plan it. In fact I *never* plan it into my lesson as such (T32: 735-738).

She and Hayes both seemed to enjoy mimicking the affect that they imagined people in the past might have had, using conspiratorial, awe-struck, or horrified tones, for example, and occasionally doing an accent. Dow and Joslin also used the provocative and seemingly promising strategy of playing devil's advocate in their comments or questions – a technique that confronted pupils with the uncomfortable foreignness of past viewpoints in a way they could not dismiss. They did this very rarely, however, and Hayes and Ingram not at all.

Students occasionally took the role of a historical figure without prompting – for instance, four of them spoke in the voice of Henry VIII in trying to understand his thinking. Usually they responded in role in response to encouragement by the teacher, which resulted in a wide range of outcomes depending on how advanced their thinking was, and what historical language skills they brought to the task. Teachers urged students to dramatise roles they were *reading*, as well – for example, the roles in Ingram's pupils' re-enactment of Charles I's trial were supposed to be rendered with “authentic” emotion, passion, and style (though the dramatisations that resulted often seemed to be about entertainment at least as much as historical feeling, perhaps due in part to pupils' acting skills).

Whether they were taking historical roles, recounting narratives, or simply reacting to information, teachers often made a point of doing so with special language effects and flair. For example, when reading from the textbook, Dow did so dramatically, with emphases and pauses. When telling a story, he sometimes switched into present tense, as though events were unfolding there and then with consequences unknown. Describing trench life, he used sound effects, as of lice popping when burned. Hayes spoke with long pauses and theatrical voices (high pitched, dreamy, anguished, bored, and the like), as well as making expressive faces. She exclaimed her reaction to news of Roman slaves being beaten or killed – *killed!* – as though she were hearing it for the first time. While these were not the sort of strategies teachers tended to expand upon in interviews, it seemed clear that these were steps toward

overcoming “empathy gap,” modelling history’s life-like qualities and emotional flavour. These narratives were not just about information delivery, but about meaning for people.

Hayes and Dow also communicated the sort of impact that historical topics had on them: they *expressed their own empathy or wonder*. As Dow said, “Some of the things that we study I feel hit my emotions quite hard” (T57: 579), and he relayed this through a tone of amazement at how people reacted to various situations, or in small but heartfelt comments, like one about a veteran smelling bodies burning in concentration camps: “That must have been dreadful. They say that smell is the longest memory...so that must be quite something for him” (T33: 32-33). Hayes remarked that it was important that teachers’ expression of personal feelings about a topic be genuine, not phony; pupils could detect insincerity. This did not seem to be a problem for her. While retelling her visit to Theresien concentration camp, and to the showers for gassing in particular, she said “Can you imagine the panic in this room?” and seemed to be actively imagining it herself, truly moved by the nature of the events in a way that students respected (T27: 159-160). The other teachers communicated similar feelings in interviews only, but did not show the same sort of personal empathetic response in the classroom. It was striking, for instance, how Ingram’s lessons were devoid of the sort of gusto and personal involvement with topics that he expressed periodically in interviews:

I just can’t imagine what it would have been like – for instance, I did a lot of emigration history – to have uprooted your family and left Scotland or wherever, traveled across the sea and gone 200 miles inland into New England, the far woods, knowing you will never ever see your family again, ever. Or anybody you’ve ever known. And you’re going to move into a place where you probably won’t see anybody for months at a time, and you have to survive by yourself. I mean, how the *hell* did people do that?! I mean, that just amazes me (T54: 448-459).

Which is to say that he *did* try to imagine it, *could* sense the enormity of courage involved – but apparently did not feel that such overt sentiment belonged in the classroom.

Having now reviewed teachers' actions and thoughts about what *did* belong in the classroom over the course of four chapters, I turn from reporting my findings to considering their broader implications for history education and for scholarship in the final chapter.

Chapter 8

Conclusions and Implications

Introduction

Drawing back from the details of particular teachers' practices and perspectives in the teaching of historical empathy, this chapter considers the wider significance of the findings. What do they contribute to knowledge, or suggest about claims already made? Where do their limitations lie, and what might be productive directions for future research? And what implications do they hold for professional development and policy?

In considering these issues, it should be borne in mind that this case study focused upon only four teachers, and the generalisations it reached are thus provisional, not statistical. In offering my own theoretical categories for understanding teachers' empathetic work, I hope that this template and its associated propositions will prove helpful with regard to others' thinking and practice – indeed, I have tried to control several confounding variables to increase the likelihood of this. But caution must be exercised in making this jump; history teachers in England function in a context that differs considerably from many countries, and changes frequently. My elaboration of contextual points is meant to equip others to judge whether the realities noted for these teachers apply further afield.

I have attempted to make the full spread of teachers' empathetic practices visible – and to offer interpretations – partly so that other practitioners may reflect upon them. But scholarship, too, stands to benefit by attending to what educators are actually thinking and doing. Clifford Geertz once wrote about anthropology that it was “a science whose progress is marked less by perfection of consensus than by a refinement of debate. What gets better is the precision with which we vex each other” (1973: 29). My study indicates that costs in terms of both precision and utility arise from neglecting history teachers' perspectives.

Findings and the Literature

The overarching finding of this research is that teachers possess a tremendous amount of knowledge about how to cultivate historical empathy in their pupils – knowledge that is nuanced as well as multifaceted. Functioning in complex classroom environments with varied resources, their thinking embraces a *web* of conditions on which empathy relies and which their choices must acknowledge. One would not know this, or understand much about the nature of their thinking, from the literature to date. For this reason, this research has placed more emphasis than most on capturing both teachers' ideas and operating contexts.

As we have seen, facilitating and constraining factors in the classroom, whether objective realities or teachers' perceptions, affected the shape of the curriculum in important ways, and therefore required mapping. They included factors concerning *students* – such as their capacities, preconceptions, eagerness, ways of reacting, or general behaviour; *structures* – such as time, resources, and curricular and exam specifications; and the *teachers themselves* – their knowledge, confidence, beliefs, energy levels, and moods. Most of the time their curricular decisions stemmed not from single types of knowledge they employed, but from “knowledge packages;” what was important was how they combined various types of awareness. Indeed, the elaboration of what teachers considered in choosing and enacting their choices should give pause to anyone proposing certain approaches as “best.” There is a strong tendency to do this in academic writing. For example, one author, under the confident subheading “Historical Empathy Requires Multiple Forms of Evidence and Perspective,” writes,

Ideally, students should be encouraged to use a rich variety of sources drawn from different vantage points (e.g. the memoirs of the historical actor, critiques of historians, eye-witness accounts, primary documentation). In addition, the evidence also should include competing accounts and different perspectives on the reasons for human action. Historical empathy requires students to sort through evidence and to entertain some complex thinking in order to arrive at logical and defensible reasons for past actions (Foster, 2001: 173).

But rather than, for example, encouraging work with multiple sources as the optimal or only method for promoting high-level empathy – a favoured approach in many researchers' studies (Dickinson, 1984; Foster, 1999; Foster & Yeager, 1999; Lee & Ashby, 2001; Lee et al., 1997; VanSledright & Kelly, 1998; Wineburg & Fournier, 1994; Yeager & Doppen, 2001; Yeager et al., 1998), teachers' thinking gravitated naturally toward taking into account the realities of particular students and topics at certain times of the day and year. This resulted in a broader and more flexible repertoire. And instead of privileging teachers' content knowledge as the starting point for pedagogical reasoning (Ball, 2000; Wilson et al., 1987; Wineburg & Wilson, 1991), knowledge of many kinds and degrees of subtlety contended in the mental balancing act that resulted in curricular decisions, with teachers tuning their approaches to respond to students' contributions. The evidence suggested that it was important to keep an open view of which kind of knowledge took precedence, in terms of chronology and significance, in teachers' thinking.

Finally, this research examined the strategies and resources that teachers used in the classroom to cultivate empathy. Their approach included three overlapping aspects: preparing students to empathise by building motivation and establishing a secure knowledge base; using activities to organise the lesson; and employing numerous discourse strategies for three purposes – to cultivate empathetic thought processes, to establish relevance, and to dramatise and enliven the subject matter. Needed attention was given to the interwoven nature of these aspects, such as the manner in which building a contextual knowledge base often seamlessly shifted into an effort to foster empathetic understanding. This study also explored the wide array of activities that teachers employed. While they had preferred approaches within these (see Table K, p. 218), they had similar guiding concerns such as the sense of authenticity the strategy offered, and its relation to other activities in terms of sequence and variety. Students contributed in significant ways to the shaping of the curriculum through their participation in classroom talk, but teachers normally controlled activities and the direction of conversation except during independent or group work.

Many of the *activities* catalogued in this study have received attention in the literature, and some strategies normally part of the *discourse* category, such as “exploring paradoxes,” have also been noted when expanded to full-scale empathy activities. However, little attention has been given to the discourse strategies in their own right, as small-scale ways of prompting empathy. Yet these discourse strategies amount to a prime means of cultivating empathy when teacher talk is so prevalent. The typology presented here thus represents a considerably different and more holistic treatment of empathy than traditionally offered, as well as a provisional updating and adapting of Shemilt’s activity-focused classification system (1984) – the most that can be offered on the strength of a study of four teachers.

A review of the people or groups in history with whom teachers encouraged empathy, in terms of multiple traits such as their modernity, nationality, sex, and agency or power, suggested a rather different portrait than the typical empathy study in the literature. The latter usually involved a discrete empathy exercise structured to promote understanding of the thought process of a powerful adult, usually male, involved in a momentous decision – typical examples included Chamberlain and Truman. In the particular lessons observed for this study, the experiences of groups of people were more commonly the focus than individuals, a surprisingly high number of subjects were children or young adults, and a roughly equal number of empathetic subjects lacked power and possessed it. This limited data set supports the idea that researchers and practitioners were often construing empathetic subjects in different ways.

Reacting to this lopsidedness in the academic literature, Barton and Levstik argued that scholarship’s overwhelming emphasis on empathy as the central aspect of historical understanding led to a bias in historical study toward causes and away from consequences, and furthermore that “[T]he tool of historical empathy can be used more effectively to explain the actions of people in the past than to evaluate what happened to them” (in press: Ch. 11). This was perilous in a democracy, they reasoned, because

Issues of justice, fairness, and the common good are ruled off the table... if we see empathy as the primary tool of historical thinking,

then our analysis of the end of World War II in the Pacific is likely to focus on factors influencing the decision to drop atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki...But if our goal is to prepare students for democracy, this may not be the most significant way of understanding the topic. Students might be better served by using evidence to consider the feasibility of other options and their likely consequences – and not just what Truman thought about the alternatives and consequences (*Ibid*).

Their concern was legitimate, but required more empirical support as to who was teaching in this way. The authors appeared to generalise from *academics'* discussions of empathy, where motives rather than reactions seemed to be of chief interest, to *teachers'* practices. But the educators in this study chose the subjects for empathy more evenly; the concern looked like a red herring in terms of their practice. Nor did it follow logically that empathy was intrinsically more effective for work on causation. Because it related to understanding perspectives, it could just as easily (and why not effectively?) be applied to grasping the perspectives of those affected by events as of those driving them – not that the two were always so neatly parsed.

Lastly, though a case study of this size cannot make assertions about the practices that dominate in classrooms generally, the teachers here did not inflate the claims made for empathy, or, as scholars have been accused, “treat it as though it were synonymous with historical understanding” (Barton & Levstik, in press: Ch. 11). They valued it highly, but saw it as *integrated* with matters such as significance, evidence, cause *and* consequence and often as a precursor to moral response – not as a threat to these. Their questions often blended causal and consequential issues, such as when Dow introduced a WWI unit of work by saying that they would examine generals' slow reactions to changes in warfare, and soldiers' suffering as a result. Sometimes a lesson even started with a focus on the experience of those acted upon (or who lacked real power) – on the Jews persecuted by the Nazis, for instance – and proceeded *later* to look at where Nazis ideas came from (T43). Reviewing these teachers' work casts a cloud of doubt on the idea that empathy was leading them to privilege causes over outcomes; they were controlling its application to both.

Scholars' and teachers' thoughts about what mattered for improving empathy practice also diverged. As Chapter 1 showed, much academic writing about empathy has dwelt on defining the concept and the need for teachers to exercise philosophical rigour and clarity in handling it. These articles made an important and necessary point, especially in the 1970s and 1980s when conceptions were relatively unexamined, but they tended to view school history through the lenses of philosophy and academic history. The teachers' theories of empathy in this study showed different influences; their ways of thinking were moulded in the cauldron of everyday practice. Their conceptions about what empathy was and what empathising involved were neither parsimonious nor painstaking, though they were bounded. Sometimes teachers delimited their definitions even more than scholars; for example, none of the teachers regarded hindsight as part of empathy in the ways some authors have conceived of it (Foster, 2001; Riley, 2001; Yeager & Foster, 2001). While it appeared from my research that awareness of the debates about empathy sharpened teachers' acuity in thinking about it, at this stage further research refining and theorising the concept is unlikely to achieve much in practice; concepts already abound both in the literature and teachers' minds.

What is more disturbing in academic writing is the implication that teachers do not know what they are doing. This may be seen in researchers' taking over teachers classrooms to prove their theories of how empathy or contextualised thinking should be cultivated (Boix-Mansilla, 2000; Yeager & Doppen, 2001), telling teachers how to "fix" lessons (Stockley, 1983), or asserting without substantiation that empathy's "use in the classroom is poorly theorised and subsequently weak" (Harris, 2003: 36). The findings of this study suggested that when discrepancies and tensions arose in teachers' practice it was usually because teachers were negotiating complicated or irreconcilable goals – both within their empathetic work and in its relation to other purposes – not because they were unaware of or unreflective about the conflicts. Many dilemmas appeared unlikely to be resolved in a day, or a year; some were simply unresolvable in a final sense. I cast them *as* dilemmas here because navigating them skillfully demands much in the way of ongoing

reflection. Research cannot now (if ever) offer straightforward answers but can confirm that different courses offer assets and liabilities, and that empathetic practice seems to benefit from teachers' according these areas the careful thinking they warrant.

Ongoing Empathetic Dilemmas

This study identified four dilemmas in teacher's empathetic practice.

1. *How could imagination be harnessed to enhance rather than detract from historical empathy?*

Teachers conceived of empathy as involving some form of imagination, but the very word "imagine" was sometimes taken by students to mean creative license – a caveat commonly noted in the literature (Counsell, 2000; Davis, 2001; Jenkins & Brickley, 1989; Lee, 1984a; Shemilt, 1984). Teachers often found ways to satisfactorily resolve this dilemma by managing when they encouraged students to "imagine," how they defined their expectations, and how they built up to the endeavour. Nonetheless, using "imagine" loosely could prompt fiction from students – an effect hard to control without sacrificing mention of this seemingly critical aspect of empathising.

2. *How might the linked prerogatives of cultivating historical empathy and establishing connections and relevance to students' lives be balanced, and what types of empathy should be sought for these ends?*

A cluster of ideas arose around this issue. First, history teachers had to wrestle with the fact that framing questions in "How would *you* feel?" terms aided in establishing relevance and emotional connection, and building motivation and concern, but often meant giving up the historicity of asking "How would *they* have felt?." Everyday empathy and back-projection might result. Similarly, asking pupils to reason or imagine *feelings* promoted a sense of emotional kinship with past figures but often, especially when unattached to source interpretation, ended up ignoring the historically conditioned nature of feelings.

Finally, teachers faced the dilemma of how to build empathetic understanding regarding controversial issues in the present world, or how to deal with sensitive or contentious questions implicating students' own identities – matters safer to avoid, but vitally connected to teachers' wishes that the achievement of empathy in history would transfer to student choices and behaviours today (an issue addressed in the writings of Levstik, 2001; McCully et al., 2002).

3. *Should the past be presented in developmental or deficit terms?*

While comparing the past to both the present and more distant past could assist empathy if used sensitively, deficit-oriented language or tones might imply backwardness and reinforce easy notions of human progress (Lee & Ashby, 2001). Teachers encountered three steep challenges around this issue: that of monitoring and being attuned to the subtle messages embedded in their often unplanned remarks and questions; that of accurately representing the historical progress or regression that had occurred (matters of little consensus); and that of avoiding an unfairly deficient picture of the past while still acknowledging that much change in history was driven by *contemporary* people's viewing their lives as needing improvement (see point 4 below). At GCSE and A-Level, curricular specifications to trace "change over time" actually assisted by posing questions with a developmental cast, but this was not the case at Key Stage 3, where time pressures were also more intense.

4. *What should the relationship be between historical empathy and moral judgment?*

While these issues were linked through teachers' views of the wider purpose of empathy in creating open-minded and curious people, they appeared at first – and sometimes later – to sit at odds. One aimed for understanding from the "inside," the other evaluation from the outside and from the standpoint of another era. However, to cede the territory

of judgment completely, purportedly for empathy's sake, would be to ignore the fact that people judged and disagreed at the time – past perspectives were markedly different. If a teacher were to turn to the educational literature, contradictory ideas would only complicate the picture: while one scholar opined that “There is always time to decide if a culture's customs are wasteful, ignorant or inhuman. Such decisions should await a study of why they exist” (Postman, 1995: 161), another offered research showing pupils' pressing need to establish a personal moral stance *before* trying to explain or understand (Dulberg, 2002). How to sequence and accent these priorities – already intertwined through history teachers' sense of responsibility for promoting citizenship – was one of the most delicate issues in empathy teaching. Experienced teachers often struggled to align what Argyris and Schön (1974) called their “espoused” and “enacted” theories in this arena – an indication of the difficulty of managing these goals in practice.

Much of the brouhaha about historical empathy in the 1980s and 1990s – and the emotional pitch surrounding these dilemmas – centred upon the difficulties of assessing it in exam conditions. While none of the teachers evinced any desire to return to that system, the evaluation of empathy was something that they undertook informally and formally whether or not they considered it assessable in principle. Despite the claim that “What is lacking at the moment are clear criteria for assessing it” (Harris, 2003: 36), these four teachers showed no shortage of criteria – as relayed in the “parameters of sophistication” presented in Chapter 5, and Table F (p. 150) summarising the signs of empathy they looked for in students. However, two of the teachers had developed formal systems for assessment that appeared to prompt excellent results, while the other two maintained that empathy could not be formally assessed, and marked coursework in terms of effort or factual accuracy. Nonetheless, during interviews these latter two were able to articulate standards for empathy, evidence suggesting that their approach was based more on personal belief, or cues from curricular and exam documents, than

actual trialling of assessment systems. It appeared that all of the teachers evaluated empathy, but only the former two made it explicit to students how this was done, refined their systems, and marked and commented accordingly. It seemed not so much a question of whether to assess, but how – and how to do it transparently.

Limitations of the Study

My attempts to ensure the validity and robustness of the findings in this study related largely to the design of the research – in particular, to attempts to gain access to an authentic picture of the teachers' practice, and to honest accounts of their thinking. Three methodological issues arose concerning this goal – research effects, lesson identification, and the relationship between their ideas and actions. Two other limitations of relevance emerged, involving means of capturing development in teachers' thinking, and my adeptness at questioning.

Because this study revolved around lesson observations and interviews, reactivity was a major concern. In Chapter 2, I discussed how I attempted to minimise teachers' self-consciousness and inclinations to change their practice. All of the teachers expressed that my presence in the classroom did not worry them, and two remarked that they were accustomed to having visitors and student teachers around. Naturally the research process had affected them in ways large and small, however, and I asked them to review its impact in the Final Interview. For Ingram and Dow, being involved simply meant that they were thinking more about empathy; their awareness of how they used it and presented it was deeper. They felt they had intentionally not innovated or changed their practices, except that Ingram switched the sequence of a couple of lessons to accommodate conflicts in my scheduling.

Hayes echoed the idea of thinking about empathy much more, including ways she could improve her practice. She also felt she had tried hard not to tailor lessons, but thought that possibly the one on poverty, which was new, had more of a feelings focus because she knew I would be watching – though

she believed she would have done it similarly had I not been there since it was such an empathetic topic. Overall she felt there had probably been more “How would you feel?” questions due to thinking about the research, though she was conscious of trying not to distort the sample.

Joslin also said she had thought more about some of her methods; because I was asking her to evaluate outcomes, she had considered reasons why some strategies were not working well. Reactivity emerged across several lessons, in various ways. She claimed to have prepared for her existing lesson on the medieval church more precisely, with improved sources, knowing I would be present, and was influenced by having thought about empathy all year when she came to design her new World War One unit. She also felt she had been a bit more ambitious in a couple of lessons, knowing another history teacher was in the room in case pupils working independently needed help (though I did not actually offer much help at all, since I was focused upon listening to her). Since she had naturally planned the lesson without consulting with me, I had no opportunity to encourage her not to rely on my presence. She also drew attention to the taping of lessons in some classes, notably when students were presenting or when she wanted the noise level to be low; despite my questioning this practice, she claimed she was pleased to be able to use recording as a motivator, a sign that pupils’ ideas were valued, and a means of discouraging shouting out. How much these adaptations affected the outcomes is difficult to say. Though her own consciousness of the research probably led to slightly enhanced empathetic performances, her own or the pupils’, her knowledge of how to carry out her vision was clearly embedded already, a product of years of experimenting and honing.

Ultimately I am not sure what further action I could have taken to reduce my impact – people tend to respond consciously or unconsciously unless unaware that they are being observed. After urging teachers not to make curricular alterations or call undue attention to me, there was little I could do in the face of a teacher’s *wanting* to advertise my presence or use the taping to motivate students during class. Retrospectively, I think the research effects may have been highest with Joslin since for other reasons she was

creating a number of *new* lessons during the data collection year. It probably would have been hard to avoid factoring in my presence as a variable when planning from scratch. My options to counteract this, then, would have been either to observe only lessons she had previously taught or not to include her in the sample – a great loss in terms of the uniqueness and depth of her knowledge. It was instructive to see how a very experienced teacher applied her knowledge to entirely fresh topics, a distinct advantage of her participation. How much effect her adaptations and reminders of my presence actually had on the pupils is questionable as I sat in the back and they usually seemed oblivious to me. When asked directly about this, she did not think their reactions during the lessons were related to me or the research.

Whether teachers were selecting lessons that accurately represented the full span of their ways of cultivating empathy was also an issue. Because I explored the various methodological complexities in Chapter 2 of learning about their conceptions of empathy *through* their self-identified lessons, suffice it to note here that the strategy worked fine for three teachers, but imperfectly in the case of Dow. Partly through his own ways of thinking about empathy – as more appropriate for pupils in the Lower School, for instance – and partly through his assumptions about what I wanted to see for the research, he identified a narrower range of lessons than on later reflection he felt related to empathy. The lessons I saw tended to be *pure* empathy lessons, not empathy as one factor at play. Ways that I attempted to compensate for this when I became aware of it are noted in the methodology chapter. With hindsight, I think that were I to do the study again, I would have tried to use teachers' own statements about empathy from interviews to draw out inherent identification principles right at that moment, and recall these as necessary during the year. So if a teacher happened to discuss empathy as “understanding attitudes at the time,” I would ask him or her to think about the next lesson where this was part of the objectives. With a goal like this, it probably would not have been hard to identify a coming lesson. In cases where teachers were struggling to identify, this would help to shift the focus from big, traditional empathy

activities to lessons where *part* of their conception of empathy was expressed, if integrally.

Moving into the substance of my interactions with the teachers, one *potential* limitation that I worried about was whether the teachers felt they could speak forthrightly to me about their rationales and ideas. I had read Argyris and Schön's work saying,

When someone is asked how he would behave under certain circumstances, the answer he usually gives is his espoused theory of action for that situation. This is the theory of action to which he gives allegiance, and which, upon request, he communicates to others. However, the theory that actually governs his actions is his theory-in-use, which may or may not be compatible with his espoused theory; furthermore, the individual may or may not be aware of the incompatibility of the two theories (1974: 6-7).

Would gaps emerge between the teachers' discussing and doing?

Reflecting after our shared experience of the lesson minimised the risk, but I was nonetheless struck by how paltry a concern this turned out to be. In fact, the results reported here concerning these four teachers cast doubt on the applicability of Argyris and Schön's thesis to their case (and teachers notably were not part of the researchers' sample): it was *exceptional* when their reflections and classroom practices were not in accord. How might I account for this?

I believe the main reason for the congruity was that the content of their "professional theorising," to use Barnett and Hodson's (2001) term, grew organically from and in turn shaped their actual practice; the two were tightly bound up with each other. Where discrepancies existed – and they only diverged significantly with moral versus historical judgment issues, and with stated visions of *historical* empathy versus questions about "*your* feelings" – they pointed not so much to befuddled or wishful thinking as to a desire to reconcile conflicting obligations in a fair and sufficiently flexible way. Sometimes the two less experienced teachers had not yet worked out systems of resolution, or decided to "enforce" them, in ways that were as consistent or faithfully principled as the others. This was *not* a statement about the workability of more ad hoc approaches in context, however, and indeed every

teacher had areas of more and less developed thought. But in their speech, they generally recognised this, closing the supposed espoused/enacted fissure. The only other case when the gap opened was in Ingram's later months of intense reflection, as theory in the form of future plans outpaced what he had actually attempted (and tempered) in the classroom.

Perhaps this integration between theory and practice is a function of the teachers' considerable experience, for each of them had several years at the chalkface behind them, with all the unforgiving feedback that students could bring to an ill-conceived idea. Each of the four had also routinely worked with student teachers, so they were accustomed to talking about their own teaching and probably to thinking about the coherence between what they said and did. And the consonance between their thoughts and actions suggested a basic comfort in speaking with me about what they believed to be true, not what they perceived I wanted to hear. I have tried to include enough quotations so that the informal and open style of their responses to questions is apparent.

A shortcoming of this study is that although it captured changes in teachers' thinking, or post-lesson reflections about how they might alter an activity next year, its single-year design did not allow me to observe whether they followed through in practice. Ingram and Dow expressed shifts in their ways of thinking about empathy and its role, but too late in the data collection process for me to see how they affected their work. For example, Ingram spoke at the Final Interview of his new awareness that he needed to teach students to examine their own thought processes during empathetic work – to think about the questions they were asking of sources, for example. I did not have a chance to see him do this. A longer longitudinal design would be better suited to exploring the *consequences* of reflection, though it was not practically possible in this case.

Finally, my own limitations as a researcher influenced the questioning during interviews. Looking back now on some of the earlier interviews, I can see where germane issues arose that I did not have the presence of mind to probe, like how supportive they felt textbook passages were of empathy. As I

became more aware of the nuances of their work, I became more skilled at sparking interesting responses and exploring deeper levels of their rationales.

Future Research

The research that seems to me most promising in terms of increasing knowledge of empathy teaching continues to be intensive small-scale work; I cannot imagine reaching similar levels of insight, clarity and validity through a survey or questionnaire instrument, much as it would be useful to know what teachers were doing or thinking more broadly. It was the *combination* of watching and interviewing that made plain what teachers were talking about, what abstractions like “extensive background knowledge” actually meant to them.

Research focusing on both teachers *and* students seems to me a useful next step. I did this to an extent anyway to make sense of my data, but interviewing pupils about their understanding would have been a natural complement to the approach presented here. Factoring in more review of students’ work and looking at their perspectives would make it possible to examine, from the privileged position of research, teachers’ claims about the *effectiveness* of various strategies and resources. Then these propositions might be taken back to teachers to obtain their views and judgments upon them. Which aspects of an activity produced the most empathy could also be explored. For instance, I was struck by the way that the questions pupils wrote for hotseating exercises seemed so thoughtful and historically imaginative, but the capacity of the pupil(s) in the hotseat (acting in role) rarely seemed up to the task of answering them with historical accuracy. This sort of response required expert knowledge of a period! Evaluating the effectiveness of such exercises, both by involving students and by conducting a more finely tuned analysis of lesson discourse, might show which activities or parts of activities, and which teacher discourse strategies, were actually producing the strongest empathetic results.

I also think that more might be learned by investigating empathy lesson transcripts with full discourse analysis methods; I was fascinated by the sorts of things my targeted examination of classroom talk revealed, and suspect that more detailed propositions might emerge from a closer look than I could attempt with so much data. As a related matter, I found teachers' reactions to stimulated recall methods – when two of them read a transcript of their own teaching – to be a promising learning mechanism. Teachers do not normally have access to “frozen” portraits of their work, and seemed to enjoy and value the opportunity (though not every teacher would have necessarily reacted this way!). They also started noticing more detailed features of their own speech than they normally picked up in reflecting from memory.

Another area ripe for exploration in empathy research is what teachers do at A-Level. While teachers speak of examination pressures and time shortages, they also speak about much of history being incomprehensible without empathy. So while their cultivation of it with Sixth-Form pupils would probably look different, understanding how teachers altered their approach within these constraints would be illuminating. The one Year 12 lesson that I saw suggested the field was ripe for further research, particularly as the possibilities for more sophisticated forms of empathy seemed greater with pupils of this age, maturity, and seriousness about history.

Lastly, I feel that given the general dearth of history education research on teachers, the approach taken in this project could be fruitfully used to explore their thinking and practice with regard to other historical concepts, such as cause and consequence, enquiry, interpretations, and significance.

Implications for Teacher Education and Policy

One of the purposes of conducting this study was to inform teacher education: to gain ideas about what educators know and need to know for teaching historical empathy, and how they deploy their learning. While this project focused upon experienced teachers and can speak with greatest authority about their work, much of what they said seems digestible by

beginning teachers. The sections below suggest some tentative implications for teachers' early and ongoing professional development, respectively.

Initial Teacher Education

In approaching the topic of empathy with new teachers, it seems particularly critical that teacher educators grasp the sophistication and complexity of experienced teachers' knowledge, and convey to beginners just how much there is to know. Amongst other things, such awareness may help to stave off discouragement or premature conclusions stemming from early attempts. One potential way to achieve this is to present some of my analytical methods – the coding frameworks – to beginners to provide them with tools to conduct more fine-grained observations or reflections on their own. As these represent a map of experienced teachers' expertise, they may enable those starting out to see what exactly they have yet to learn. Of course, having stressed the complexity of the endeavour, tutors will then need to *mediate* the insights of this research for them, rather than unloading everything onto them at once. The logistics of adapting ideas for students' benefit are surely best left to tutors. What follows are key themes that may be appropriate to raise during the earlier or later stages of professional development.

1. Students may not be aware that there is more than one way of conceptualising empathy; they may possess stereotypical views of the classic role-play “empathy exercise.” Raising their awareness of the multiplicity of conceptions, and of the contested nature of the topic in the British context, may be a good way to encourage beginning teachers to reflect about what *they* believe empathy in history is and what their vision looks like for its emergent products. Taking time to explore these matters will increase the odds that their choices will be deliberate, not unconscious.
2. Providing opportunities to reflect upon beginning teachers' attempts to use various empathy strategies in the classroom, and their results, may be a good lead-in to discussion of a broader repertoire of strategies that

may not have occurred to them – a handout of possibilities with examples is likely to be gratefully received, particular by those who are not *brand* new at teaching and feel able to independently decide their merits. While the effectiveness of particular strategies remains to be rigorously studied, some initial guidance based on teachers' ideas is bound to be helpful. This research hints that strategies focusing on immersion – simulations, contact with historical sites and artefacts or documents, videos, decision-making or paradox-resolving exercises, and role-plays (all bounded by a secure contextual knowledge base) – have much to offer. On the other hand, both hotseating and contact with multiple sources at once seem difficult for many students to manage. Learning and deducing from sources, while rich in empathetic potential, seems to require careful set-up, support by the teacher, and ample time, and beginners should be aware of this.

3. Some inexperienced teachers, though presumably not all, will be ready to think about empathy strategies on the level of their own discourse: how they frame questions, prime students' curiosity, tell a story, or evocatively describe a setting. Offering models of experienced teachers doing this may be helpful.
4. Greater access to transcripts of their own work could be a tremendous source of professional development for teachers, as their occasional use in this study suggests, particularly given a chance to discuss them.⁷⁹ Excerpts from audiotapes or videotapes of experienced teachers in action may also be a promising resource for concretely illustrating the ideas above.
5. Information about students' preconceptions and typical reactions on all manner of subjects, and the ways these may block or pose challenges for empathy, may be particularly intriguing for beginning teachers. Awareness of how experienced teachers utilised or counteracted such preconceptions – and how positively they treated them – would also be

⁷⁹ A research project at Oxford by Anna Pendry, Katharine Burn, and myself is currently investigating whether and how transcript data may prove valuable for use with student teachers.

useful, especially as the present research indicates that students may be extremely reluctant to replace their misconceptions, and other studies demonstrate that the dominant narratives through which students understand history are firmly implanted (Barton, 1996; Barton & Levstik, 1998; in press: Ch. 9).

6. Provision of resources useful for empathy teaching, whether primary or secondary sources, videos, handouts, or the like, seems especially vital for beginning teachers. This is a way in which mentor teachers and other experienced members of a department can enhance starting teachers' empathy work considerably, as few will possess much in the way of resources to choose from, or the time and perhaps expertise to "hunt and gather" optimally.
7. Some awareness of the ways that a teacher's interactional style may influence empathy may be useful for tutors to communicate to beginning teachers, who no doubt possess at least a glimmer of its importance for motivation already. But rapport and supportiveness are not sufficient; lessons where management issues cause constant interruptions make empathy (like much else) difficult. An atmosphere of intellectual, not disciplinary, excitement is crucial to establish.

Experienced Teachers' Development

This research was concerned primarily with the knowledge *of* experienced teachers, not knowledge *for* teachers; thus the perennial issue arises of what value it might have for them. I would like to avoid the usual route of prescribing practices, hence what I offer here is both limited and propositional. How this sort of work could actually be of value to teachers would be a worthwhile matter to explore with them. While more experienced practitioners might benefit from some of the ideas listed above, most likely they would be prepared to grapple with a second tier of issues, the sort that seem more complicated to manage. These teachers might find it fruitful to discuss and reflect on their own practice in relation to the four empathetic

dilemmas presented earlier in this chapter. How would they structure questions and design activities in light of them?

Another consideration not noted above but highlighted by the research involved how explicit to be with pupils about empathy and its affiliated challenges. My own conclusion was that pupils were better able to reach teachers' expectations in empathetic assignments when they had a clear picture of what exactly quality meant, when they knew a fair amount about the grading standards teachers held in their own minds. Similarly, when teachers repeatedly alerted pupils to matters like anachronisms or the differentness of past people's thinking, students appropriated this language and raised similar points more often themselves. It seemed that teachers' meta-cognitive signals about the processes of historical understanding equipped pupils to carry on the dialogue. While this type of discourse might overwhelm pupils of some ages or capacities, it seemed within reach of most, especially when they were gaining vocabularies about causation and consequence, primary sources, and the provenance of sources anyway. More advanced (though not necessarily older) pupils might also be taught to think historically for themselves, to ask questions about context as a matter of course, for instance, without waiting for prompting by teachers.

A relatively straightforward finding regarding experienced teachers' development emerged from this study: having the time and incentive to reflect on their own perspectives and practice with someone who was actually present during particular lessons, as well as in less highly contextualised interview situations, served as a catalyst for fresh ideas and interest into the phenomenon of empathy teaching. In fact, above and beyond the examination of specific practices that teachers performed all year, Hayes has now undertaken a separate research project looking at aspects of her teaching of historical empathy. Thus did participation in the research spark new questions and curiosity.

Policy Implications

If there is a single factor that seems important above all in determining what teachers, beginning or experienced, might achieve empathetically in the classroom, it is unfortunately one out of their control: time. Many of the ideas teachers presented for improving their own lessons hinged on having time – to take students places, teach processes of inquiry, discuss ideas in depth, build sufficient contextual knowledge, not rush activities. What most constrains empathy in the classroom at present is not what teachers know or have skills to enact, but what they can fit in; for cultivating more sophisticated empathy, time in lessons is shockingly inadequate and time between lessons too great. If policymakers want students to achieve empathy in history – as they appear to do, albeit under another name – then they must untie this straitjacket.

Time for teachers to develop professionally is also crucial, though here teachers have at least some possibilities for responding creatively to the scarcity. As shown in Chapter 6, teachers in many departments pool ideas and resources, and relish in-service opportunities when they can talk to each other and share materials. These sorts of chances seem particularly important for more isolated teachers. In the course of reviewing literature for this study, I became aware that other departments in schools, or teachers of other subjects within the same department, are engaged with empathy teaching too: Religious Studies, Geography and English all address many parallel concerns, sometimes even with a historical dimension. These fields also have had to confront more directly the issues of students' identity-interference in empathy (see for instance Fancourt, 2003), and develop means of addressing it. None of the teachers in this study mentioned discussing empathy extra-departmentally or extra-historically; it appears that within schools, within the academic literature, and within professional teaching publications, these subjects were proceeding along completely separate paths to arrive at often-similar locations. Creating a dialogue across departments through both informal and structured contexts (such as publications) seems a prime and heretofore missed opportunity.

A final point relevant to policy concerns the fact that professional development programmes for teachers too often start from a presumption of shortcomings in their performance and understanding (as noted by Guskey, 1986; Torrance & Pryor, 2001). But programmes wishing to improve teaching ignore at their peril the finer points of knowledge and sensitivity teachers already possess. As Husbands, Kitson and Pendry (2003) argue, they fail because they cannot appreciate or build on things done skilfully, and then compound the damage by blackening by association the curriculum reforms that gave rise to them. Empathy teaching in Britain has been through this vitriolic cycle once, and weathered it less through the assistance of policymakers (who pushed teachers into some questionable practices with high stakes for students) than through the vision and self-scrutiny of teachers who regarded empathy as indispensable and resolved to bring out its validity. If reforms and programmes of development were to recognise what teachers have achieved and work from there to support fresh reflection, refinement and sharing of effective practices, even more might be attained. Teachers gave every indication in this study that they possessed a bent for improvement, and this mattered – especially when policy was not backing them up, and empathy was consigned to the anomalous position of being cherished by teachers but invisible in the official curriculum and assessment guidelines. In the current circumstances, the history teachers in this study seldom had the opportunity (one might say the luxury) to explore their own assumptions and ideas to the degree they would prefer. Offered the chance, however, they unveiled a wealth of insight, zeal, and professionalism that commanded respect.

Appendices

Appendix A: Research Ethics

The principles guiding this study are honesty and openness regarding the aims, processes, and potential uses of this research, and respect for the teachers involved and their knowledge. The intent of the study is to understand teachers' thinking and practice regarding empathy, not to evaluate or judge it.

CONFIDENTIALITY and ANONYMITY

Participants' words, spoken or written, will be treated as strictly confidential; access to raw data will be limited to the researcher and her academic supervisors. All names of individuals and schools will be changed in any written product, though participants should be aware that in such a small-scale study, identification by some people who know the schools or teachers involved may nonetheless be possible. The researcher has the right to withhold access by participants to data provided by other informants.

INFORMED CONSENT

Prior to the start of their involvement, participants will be given an explanation of the aims, requirements, and likely outcomes of the research, so that they may make an informed decision about whether they would like to take part. The researcher will answer any inquiries they have about such matters. Exactly *when* the researcher is collecting data will be made clear to them. In case-study research, the focus may develop or shift over time, and participants will be given as much information as possible about any changes. Participants have the right to withdraw from the research at any time. Because teachers are the focus of the study, consent will not be solicited from students, though they too will be informed of the general purposes of the study and the researcher's role. Pupils' anonymity will also be protected in the use of any data from class sessions.

NEGOTIATION

Participants will be given the opportunity to negotiate with the researcher about the processes of the research and the researcher's access to them and their time. All times for data collection will be mutually agreed. Throughout the research process, the researcher will solicit feedback from the teachers to ensure that their views, actions and intentions are accurately understood.

INTERPRETATION

The researcher reserves the right to interpret the results of the research using empirical evidence in support of the views expressed.

PUBLICATION

The researcher reserves the right to publish the final report or works deriving from it without the express permission of participants.

Appendix B: Interview Protocols

Initial Interview Questions

TEACHING EXPERIENCE, DEPARTMENT AND SYLLABI

1. How many years have you taught history? In this school?
2. Are the topics you are teaching to Years X, Y, and Z ones that you feel familiar with, or are some of them quite new to you?
3. a) What do you find valuable about the National Curriculum and GCSE syllabi in terms of their content and their appropriateness and interest-level for your pupils?
b) What reservations do you have about it?
4. How much freedom do you feel you have to decide what you teach and how you teach it?
5. a) In some schools, teachers in a department work together quite closely, so that there may be said to be a “departmental ethos,” or core departmental values and priorities. Would you say this is the case for your school?
b) (If yes) How would you describe the current values and priorities of your department?

BELIEFS AND VALUES ABOUT HISTORY (and where they came from)

6. a) Why did you go into teaching?
b) Why have you remained in the profession?
7. What do you think are the purposes of school history? What do you want pupils to gain from their encounters with the past? (Feel free to take some time with this.)

Card sort exercise

This is a set of possible goals that you might have for your history students (see Appendix F for card contents). The idea is to group them or rank them so that they express what you feel is important for pupils to achieve. I’m interested in your comments about these goals, too, if you could “think aloud” as you go.

- Can rank or group as of equal importance
- Can set aside statements you disagree with
- Can indicate if something important to you is missing from the set

Prompt: Explain rationale for grouping, ranking, or excluding as you have. What do the groups signify?

8. What experiences have you had that have been most influential in the way you view history, and how you teach it? (thinking broadly – any sort of experience or influence)

Probes:

- a) Have you had particular courses that have shaped your views? PGCE?
- b) Are there particular books or publications about history education that you have found useful to your work as a teacher? (If so, which?)
- c) Have you ever had a colleague or mentor who has influenced your thinking about what history is?
- d) Has there been anything about how pupils respond to history that has influenced how you teach and view it?
- e) popular media (TV, fiction...)

DEFINING EMPATHY

9. How would you define “historical empathy?”
10. When you hear the word “empathy,” what sort of teaching ideas come to mind? (Can be ones you’ve tried, seen, thought of trying, or avoided.)
11. How do you think empathy compares with other historical concepts that teachers try to help pupils grasp and use (such as “causation” or “evidence”) in terms of the demands it makes on students?

Introduce my definition of empathy here

“To achieve empathy is to enter into some informed appreciation of the circumstances of people in the past, and to entertain their perspectives on issues and events.” (show on paper)

12. What do you think of this definition? Does it accord with your understanding? How do you think it resonates or differs from your thoughts about empathy?

INFLUENCES ON TEACHER’S THINKING ABOUT EMPATHY (where ideas came from)

13. What sort of experiences do you think have influenced your thinking and teaching about empathy?

Probes:

- a) When did you complete your PGCE course?
- b) Do you remember discussion of empathy as being part of your education as a teacher, undergraduate or professional? (If so) Has it had a lasting influence on your approach to teaching empathy?
- c) As far as you can recall, has empathy been a topic of discussion in your department? Has a colleague or mentor influenced your thinking?
- d) Do you think that the National Curriculum, GCSE guidelines and other policy documents have affected your thinking with regard to empathy? Publications?
- e) Was your thinking affected by the public debate in the late 1980s to early 1990s?
- f) Curriculum materials – textbooks, teachers’ guides?

14. a) In learning history *yourself*, what sort of things do you think have helped you to empathise with people in the past?
- b) Most people find that they cannot empathise with every topic they teach or encounter. I'm wondering if you could give some examples where you personally find historical empathy relatively easy, and ones where it is not (where are the limits of your empathy, do you think?).
- c) How do you think your own experiences of empathy have shaped your thoughts about how to help students develop it?

ROLE OF EMPATHY IN CREATING HISTORICAL KNOWLEDGE

15. Please read these 3 statements about the role of empathy in producing historical understanding. *Which is closest to your own view, and why?*
- A) "Empathy is a necessary condition of historical understanding. Historians who interpret their evidence without empathy will lack depth of insight into the subjects they study."
- B) "Empathy is a tool that is sometimes useful for a historian, but is neither necessary (nor appropriate) for interpreting all forms of evidence."
- C) "Because empathy involves imagination, it has no place in the production of knowledge about what happened in history."

Final Interview Questions

1.
 - a. Apart from the many approaches I've seen this year, are there other empathy strategies you use, maybe with a year group I haven't observed or you're not teaching this year?
 - b. Regarding the issue of identifying lessons that contained an empathy component, I want to revisit your thoughts on how you did this over the year, what signaled to you an empathy lesson.
2. I'd like to talk about your definition or conceptions of empathy, both as you've described it and as you've put it into practice during the year. It seems like there are several dimensions that are part of your understanding of empathy, so I thought I'd run through them to check if I have them right [various components raised here for each teacher, then] Do you have any sense whether your understanding of what empathy is has changed in the course of the research?
3. What sort of effects do you think the process of being part of this research study has had on your teaching this year?
 - a. Innovations large or small in your practice?
 - b. Have you perceived yourself as developing in the empathy dimension just by thinking about it and being asked questions about it?
 - c. Has there been anything different about your practice because of my presence on the scene?
 - d. What do you think constitutes progression in your *teaching* for empathy?
4.
 - a. What do you think are the most important things you do to make sure students understand what counts as empathy?
 - b. What do you think are the most important influences on pupils and their ability to empathise?
 - c. How helpful is it, do you think, to talk explicitly to students about empathy and to draw their attention to the many challenges involved in understanding other minds?
5. If certain constraints you've mentioned over the year could be alleviated, such as time pressures, resource limitations, and the ability and motivation levels of pupils, what sort of things do you think you might do differently in terms of teaching for empathy? (What conditions make the deepest sort of empathy possible, as opposed to other more basic or superficial types you've mentioned?)
6. Do you think your own feelings and knowledge and inspiration about a topic – and the way you express your engagement with it – affect the students' ability to achieve empathy? If so, to what extent?
7. Based on your own experience, if an intern were teaching some topic and asked you how they would know if the pupils were "getting it" in empathetic terms, what would you say? (How assess success/progress in this dimension during a lesson?)

8. Although you've told me that empathy is very important to you, do you think it still takes a back seat to the examination-assessed skills in terms of where you devote most of your time and effort?
9. There are a handful of researchers I've been reading who feel that it is impossible to understand your teaching (anyone's teaching) simply by observing your classroom. They think that what happens in the classroom is closely interwoven with who you are *as a person* – the life you lead, the values you develop as a result of your experiences, the totality of personal and out-of-classroom factors. All these come into play in shaping your teaching, the various choices you make. I'm wondering whether this idea resonates with you; to understand how you teach, and how you teach empathy in particular, is it important to grasp who you are not just as a teacher but also as a person more broadly?
10. **Agree, disagree, or qualify** (researchers' opinions, paraphrased):
 - a. It is important to "signpost" what empathy is and what it involves so that students recognise it as an objective. Drawing explicit attention to the issues and pitfalls of entertaining past viewpoints makes it easier for students to deal with them constructively (SREB, 1985).
 - b. *Knowing about* historical contexts is not the same as empathising; kids can reproduce empathetic lines or descriptions of the times without empathising (SREB, 1985).
 - c. It's important to confront pupils with the limitations and absurdities of their own ideas (Shemilt, 1984).
 - d. Pupils' experience-base is too weak for some sorts of empathy (Lee, 1983).
 - e. In teaching empathy, it's important to use source materials with sufficient "atmosphere" to invoke their creator or user. Vividness and immediacy of the sources – their aesthetic qualities – are important in evoking a receptive response from pupils (Portal, 1983).
 - f. A single mode of teaching is not appropriate for developing the various kinds of insight and experience involved in empathy; it's necessary to cater for the initial stage of projecting personal feelings into a situation, then for developing background knowledge of what was typical of the time, then for the opportunity to identify with a *particular* subject or group through authentic detail (Portal, 1989).
 - g. Students often react with amusement or bewilderment at the ways of the past, but teachers may compound their confusion by emphasising the particularity, strangeness, and backwardness of the past (Dickinson & Lee, 1984).

- h. There is a strong link between the levels of responses obtained from pupils and the style of teaching employed. Openness, acceptance, and warmth are vital. Empathy requires a certain kind of learning environment – it is affected by the human dynamics that operate in history classrooms (Cairns, 1989; Blake, 1998).
- i. The process of motivating pupils is tangled up with emotional response and moral sensibility. How do we become fascinated by social issues? How do we make sense of burning issues that informed contemporary debates? We are engaged and driven by the gut and the heart... (Counsel, 2000)
- j. To avoid encouraging pupils in superficial moral judgments or sloppy, anachronistic thinking, we need to avoid questions like “Was the Treaty of Versailles fair?” and “Were the Victorians racist?” (Counsel, 2000).
- k. Teaching methods requiring empathetic explanation are, in general, more effective than those demanding description and, in particular, exercises constructed around empathetic dilemmas (resolving some paradox or solving some contemporary problem) and contrasts between past and present practices and beliefs should form the routine staple of teaching for empathy (Shemilt, 1984).
- l. Empathy can be valid at many levels, and projecting their own feelings and values may be a necessary foundation for students’ empathy (SREB, 1985).
- m. The key to encouraging empathy is to get students *excited* about the topic (Mr. Price, in Wineburg & Wilson, 1991).

[Questions specific to each teacher]

11. Is there anything more you’d like to say about any particular question?

Appendix C: Definitions of Codes

In alphabetical order

<p>activity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - organising exercise forming part of a lesson or homework assignment, and instructions and questions concerning how to do it
<p>anachronism accepted</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - teacher validates a student's anachronism or does not address as such - teacher asks an anachronistic question, expresses an anachronistic viewpoint, or uses an anachronistic activity without noting it as such in lesson or interview
<p>anachronism highlighted</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - teacher or student draws attention to the anachronism of a classroom comment, question, or activity
<p>analogy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - use of a past/present parallel by teacher or student
<p>assessing success at empathy/improvement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - teacher in interview evaluates degree to which own teaching promoted empathetic thinking, or identifies area for improvement
<p>assessing success at empathy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - teacher's feedback to students, during lessons, of how well they are doing at empathising with people in the past
<p>constraints</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - all factors limiting or adversely affecting the achievement of teachers' goals for a lesson - found in both lesson (more interpretive on my part) and interview data
<p>deducing or interpreting perspectives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - teacher or student offers, with or without prompting, suggestion about the meaning of sources or what happened in them, or a deduction from evidence; includes comments on historians' ideas about meaning as well
<p>differentiation/alternative views or encouraging</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - within lesson or interview, teacher or student acknowledges, explores (or encourages others to explore), or evaluates grasp of the variety of perspectives held by past people about circumstances or events. This may include discussion of what gave rise to the differing views, and awareness-raising about common dividing lines among groups of people (i.e. class, sex, nationality, etc.).
<p>encouraging link-making/use of contextual knowledge</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - teacher or student demonstrates links between past events or phenomena, or encourages others to draw upon contextual knowledge to make connections (often through questioning)
<p>explicit talk about empathy/issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - conscious raising of issues by teachers or students of either what empathy means or considerations that must be borne in mind when empathising; highlighting of challenges, pitfalls, and its role and importance in history.
<p>exploring alternatives or encouraging – teacher</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - instance during lesson of teacher posing a question to prompt thinking about other possible courses of action or views at the time (roads not taken), or teacher commenting upon an option and its feasibility
<p>exploring paradox or encouraging – teacher</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - instance in lesson where teacher highlights a seemingly paradoxical fact,

explains it, or asks questions to prompt students to explore the past logicity of it
facilitating factors - all factors supporting the achievement of teachers' goals for a lesson
humility/respect or encouraging - teacher or student makes a point or raises a question encouraging a posture of humility or respect toward people in the past and their dilemmas
inaccuracy accepted - factual inaccuracy by student or (infrequently) teacher during lesson that is not addressed as such (with teachers, may be a deliberate 'simplification')
inaccuracy addressed - teacher or student either explicitly highlights/explores an inaccuracy of fact or reasoning or simply re-orientes discussion to more accurate view
judgment or encouraging judgment - teacher - teacher makes or encourages students to make a judgment of past events from a modern perspective (teacher may do this in interview data as well as lesson)
Knowledge of aims/achievements - interview statement of teacher's knowledge or belief about the goal(s) in terms of empathetic understanding, and assessment of pupils' success in achieving it
Knowledge of content - interview comment (or where obvious, lesson data) reflecting teacher's knowledge or convictions about what history is and how it is practiced; about own level of knowledge of the subject matter; and about what is most fundamental for students to know (note that this code does not refer to <i>empathetic content</i> specifically)
Knowledge of educational context - interview comment relating to contextual factors framing or impinging upon the lesson, including school policies, school culture, departmental ethos and collaborations, curricular requirements, exam requirements, and factors concerning students, teachers, time, and material resources.
Knowledge of integrating empathy with other goals - teacher's knowledge or beliefs as stated in interview about the relationship between empathy and other educational goals, and how to integrate and prioritise them in the classroom
Knowledge of knowledge-conditions or conditions for empathy - teacher's knowledge or beliefs as stated in interview about what historical knowledge students must possess in order to empathise, as well as other conditions relating to pedagogy, attitude or orientation to the past, context, personality, and skills that are necessary for empathy
Knowledge of self/own thinking, learning - teacher's knowledge as expressed in interviews of own thoughts, reactions, and processes of learning - includes topics such as: feelings about curricular choices, challenges, hopes, habits and tendencies, surprises, teaching style, role in classroom, interests, own empathy, re-assessments and refinements of beliefs, sources of new learning
Knowledge of students/pedagogy capacities - teacher's knowledge or beliefs, as stated in interviews, regarding students' capacities in terms of intellect, maturity, experience and sensitivity/feeling
Knowledge of students/pedagogy difficult or easy for empathy - teacher's knowledge or beliefs expressed in interviews about any factors that influence the difficulty or ease for students of achieving empathy; mainly

includes matters such as nature of content, students' preconceptions and experiences
Knowledge of students/pedagogy general <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - teacher's knowledge and attunement to their students as people and learners (from interviews), and pedagogical means of addressing their needs; general pedagogical insights, not empathy-specific ones
Knowledge of students/pedagogy how react <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - teacher's knowledge or prediction from interviews about how students will react or have reacted to particular content or activities involving empathy, and how to utilise and take account of these responses pedagogically - reactions include pupils' thoughts, emotions, sensitivities, level of engagement with particular topic requiring empathy
Knowledge students/pedagogy preconceptions, existing knowledge <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - teacher's knowledge or beliefs from interviews about the preconceptions held by students that affect their historical understanding (typically related to content, sometimes to process or value of subject), or about the existing knowledge and awareness students bring with them (type, extent, ability to use), and the teacher's thinking about how to work with these ideas
Knowledge strategies/resources prompting empathy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - teacher statement in interview regarding a strategy/activity or resource used to stimulate (or in some cases to lay the groundwork for) empathetic thinking, and where present the rationale for choosing it
Knowledge/Beliefs on value of empathy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - teacher's knowledge or belief about the value or purpose of empathising in history (interview data); role of empathy in understanding
knowledge of conditions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - teacher's statement or question during lesson concerning the appertaining historical conditions, the factors that framed the possibilities for action at a given time and place (and broadly answers the questions "What was life like?" or "What did people experience?") - addresses the following matters of climate or circumstances: physical/material, political, economic, social & behavioral (conventions, rules), religious/moral, intellectual/knowledge-related, educational, geographical and strategic.
knowledge of feelings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - teacher's statement or question during lesson about the known or likely feelings and emotions experienced by individuals or groups of people in the past
knowledge of narrative/events/facts <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - teacher's statement or question during lesson relating to the narrative, chronology, or facts of an event
knowledge of people/psychology/tendencies <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - teacher's or student's expression of something s/he considers to be a principle of human psychology, and thus a basis for reasoning about people's choices, tendencies, and thinking in the past - also teacher's or student's exploration of the personal psychology of an individual in history
knowledge of previous or other contemporary history <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - teacher or student during lesson draws attention to historical events previous to the ones under study, placing emphasis on changes as seen from the perspective of the time – where people then were coming <i>from</i>, or what other contemporary people were doing, thinking

<p>knowledge of thoughts/beliefs/logic</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - teacher's statement or question in lesson concerning the known or likely thoughts, beliefs, and guiding logic of people in the past about their world
<p>knowledge world today/how things work</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - teacher comment or question about the realities of the world today and what sort of systems and standards are in place
<p>knowledge/evaluation of significance/meaning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - teacher comment explaining what or how much a policy, decision, circumstance, or movement meant to an individual or group; a 'translation' for the students of a fact into its effects or significance
<p>language/term/definitional issue</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - issues concerning use of language including: - definitions of terms and phrases - instances of dramatic use of language (as in storytelling) - teacher or student commentary on language usage or comprehension, the importance of particular kinds of language, or facility with language
<p>logical reasoning/implications - student initiates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - student engages in a process of analogical reasoning using own knowledge of people and the world, and knowledge of circumstances at the time, to reach a hypothesis or formulate a question about how people in the past would most likely have reacted to specific situations
<p>logical reasoning/implications or encouraging – teacher initiates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - in lessons, when teacher engages in (sometimes consciously models) a process of analogical reasoning about an event in the past using own knowledge of people and the world, or asks a question requiring students to reason to arrive at a new understanding
<p>macrotheory</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - teacher abstracts from either an immediate teaching/learning experience or past experiences to formulate a <i>principle</i> regarding historical empathy: what it is, how to cultivate it, the dimensions or processes of students' empathetic thinking and what assists or poses a barrier to it
<p>other academic goals/skills</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - other (non-empathetic, though possibly related) academic or cognitive goals and skills teacher seeks to cultivate in a lesson, as expressed in lesson or interview data
<p>personal illustration</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - in lesson, teacher or student raises a fact or recounts an anecdote from personal experience, or uses self as a point of reference/comparison for historical topic under study
<p>priming/salience</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - teacher attempts to build class's interest and engagement by expressing own enthusiasm for the content or stressing its importance, value, or exceptionalism
<p>Response: emphasise/translate/shift/steer off idea</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - teacher responds to content of student's idea in one of several ways: by emphasising it – adding weight or depth to the idea with own comments; by steering away from it because it is not quite accurate or not very important; by shifting the meaning of the idea slightly to make it more accurate (creative mis-hearing); or by translating the idea into different terms, often more succinct or historically useful

<p>relating to students' lives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - teacher creates resonance by making a connection between the lives of students and the historical content
<p>research effects</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - teacher's comment or researcher's feeling that the research process or researcher may be influencing teacher's thoughts or curricular practice
<p>role-taking: student</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - student speaks (with prompting or without) in the role of a real historical figure, a representative of a group in history, or of someone else in the present
<p>role-taking: teacher</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - teacher speaks and sometimes also acts in the role of a person from the past, or of a representative of a historical group or nation, a student (particular or general), or of herself or himself (here usually modelling a real classroom response or likely thoughts about some particular event)
<p>sequence</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - teacher's comment relating to the ordering of topics or curricular activities within or across lessons, or rationale for this sequencing
<p>source of student knowledge</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - comment by teacher or student in which the source of a student's knowledge about past or present is either specified or obvious, or of unknown provenance but clearly drawn from outside of the immediate lesson
<p>source of teacher ideas/knowledge development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - all manner of resources teacher draws upon in gathering ideas for teaching (particularly but not exclusively for empathy; can be difficult to separate out), as well as comments about own process of knowledge development
<p>source's/exercise's empathetic value</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - teacher's statement during lesson concerning how a source or an exercise is valuable in empathetic terms
<p>student capacities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Evidence in lesson (sometimes interpretive) relating to pupils' capacities, including: teacher's direct comments; instances where capacities are suggested by student's ease or difficulty at grasping the question, issue, or content; student disposition toward content as mediated by age, maturity, or possibly sex; student requirements for help; way or level at which students interpret and answer teacher questions; students highlight own difficulties; time it takes students to do task
<p>Student comment/question about what known, thought, felt</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - in lessons, student statement or query about what people at the time knew (the information they could access), about the logic and content of their thoughts, or about the substance of their feelings; may be factual or imaginary as it is a student's <i>conception</i> of what was going through a past person's or group's mind
<p>Student comment/question exploring alternatives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - lesson comment or question in which student reasons or imagines what other plausible and possible courses of action, or ways of interpreting a situation, existed at the time; may involve speculation about how events might have turned out if different choices had been made (reasoning out of the effects)
<p>Student comment/question exploring paradox</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - lesson comment or question in which student draws attention to a past perspective or action that doesn't make sense from a modern perspective, often identifying gaps in own knowledge and seeking information to resolve puzzlement

<p>Student comment/question picturing world, what existed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - student comment or question regarding the conditions surrounding people during a historical moment: material things, institutions, geographical features, technologies, or people present on a scene
<p>Student comment/question regarding facts of past action/event/system</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - student comment or question about the facts of an event, action, or system of doing things in the past
<p>Student comment/question world, thinking today</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - student statement or question about the beliefs people hold today, about how the world now operates, or about current events
<p>student interactional style</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - student remark, affective response or gesture that helps to create the climate or culture of the classroom, usually student to teacher, sometimes student to student
<p>Student judgment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - judgment expressed by a student evaluating some past practice or idea - may be a historical or presentist judgment - may be a statement or an affective response (such as jeering or sound effects) that conveys an opinion
<p>teacher feeds answer sought</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - teacher answers own question, or uses question or clues to lead students very close to answer desired
<p>teacher interactional style</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - teacher comments and actions that help to set the climate of the classroom, to shape its human dynamics and notions of what forms of communication are valued and permitted; includes all ways that teacher <i>relates as a person</i> to students or sometimes to subject matter
<p>teacher's empathy/wonder</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - in lesson, teacher models own empathy, feelings, or sense of wonder at some person, event or experience in history
<p>teacher values</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - explicit expression of values teacher chooses to promote through curriculum and through classroom comments and modeling, including moral, affective, social, political, pedagogical, and academic/historical values
<p>then/now comparison</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - teacher compares some aspect(s) of the present and the past, highlighting either contrasts or constants between the two periods
<p>using sources for information, skills</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - instance of teacher or student using a source, directing attention to a source, or reflecting on how a source was used to extract contextual information, make deductions, give evidence for an argument or interpretation, or build other skills
<p>what it means to empathise</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - within lessons and interviews, expression of how teacher conceptualises empathy, what it means and/or what it does not mean; within lessons, frequently revealed through questions asked to students (partly interpretive)

Appendix D: Transcripts Used for Fine-Grained Analysis

Mr. Dow:

T17 Henry VIII, Anne and the Church

T13 WWI Trench Warfare

T21 Galen and Vesalius

Ms. Hayes:

T49 Castles

T27 Holocaust/Therazin

T8 Roman Education

Mr. Ingram:

T38 Hitler Youth II

T7 Medieval Life

T48 Meeting of English and Native Americans

Ms. Joslin:

T20 Medieval Church

T6 Attitudes toward Vagabonds

T9 19th-Century Attitudes toward Women

Appendix E:
Lessons Observed for Each Teacher
 Arranged by teacher and date

Transcript Number	Teacher	Year	Lesson	Date
T57	Dow		Initial Interview	26/09/01
T21	Dow	10	Galen and Vesalius	26/09/01
T13	Dow	9	WWI Trench Warfare	10/10/01
T5	Dow	9	WWI Generals	15/10/01
T25	Dow	9	Haig and the Battle of the Somme	29/10/01
T4	Dow	9	Gallipoli	5/11/01
T29	Dow	9	WWI and Empathy	12/11/01
T17	Dow	12	Henry VIII, Anne, and the Church	1/01/02
T61	Dow	(9)	Coursework Interview	28/01/02
T37	Dow	7	King David	18/03/02
T41	Dow	9	WWII Guest Speakers	8/07/02
T33	Dow	9	D-Day	15/07/02
T65	Dow		Final Interview	16/07/02
T55	Hayes		Initial Interview	19/09/01
T53	Hayes	9	WWI Trenches	28/09/01
T8	Hayes	7	Roman Education	2/11/01
T19	Hayes	9	WWI Deserters	6/11/01
T11	Hayes	7	Roman Slavery, Roman Feasts	14/11/01
T1	Hayes	11	Nazis and Women	12/12/01
T14	Hayes	11	Hitler Youth	9/01/02
T43	Hayes	11	Persecution of the Jews	15/01/02
T23	Hayes	7	Norman Conquest	30/01/02
T35	Hayes	11	Cold War	4/02/02
T59	Hayes	(9)	Coursework Interview	19/02/02
T27	Hayes	9	Holocaust/Therezin	19/02/02
T49	Hayes	7	Castles	27/02/02
T51	Hayes	11	Cuban Missile Crisis	27/02/02
T46	Hayes	9	End of WWII	5/03/02
T31	Hayes	9	Poverty	26/04/02
T39	Hayes	7	Crusades	1/05/02
T63	Hayes		Final Interview	17/07/02
T54	Ingram		Initial Interview	25/05/01
T7	Ingram	7	Medieval Life	25/05/01
T34	Ingram	8	Religious Change under the Tudors	5/10/01
T10	Ingram	7	Roman Army	18/10/01
T3	Ingram	8	Elizabeth I and Mary Stuart	19/10/01
T22	Ingram	10	Germans after WWI Defeat	31/10/01
T45	Ingram	7	Roman Entertainment (Gladiators)	15/11/01
T42	Ingram	8	Elizabethan Attitudes toward Poor	23/11/01

T15	Ingram	10	Treaty of Versailles	26/11/01
T18	Ingram	7	Battle of Hastings	29/01/02
T26	Ingram	8	Trial of Charles I	1/03/02
T58	Ingram	(7)	Coursework Interview	1/03/02
T30	Ingram	10	Hitler Youth I	13/05/02
T38	Ingram	10	Hitler Youth II	15/05/02
T48	Ingram	8	Meeting of English, Native Amer's.	17/05/02
T62	Ingram		Final Interview	12/07/02
T56	Joslin		Initial Interview	11/09/01
T16	Joslin	10	Witchcraft I	4/10/01
T32	Joslin	10	Witchcraft II	8/10/01
T6	Joslin	10	Attitudes toward Vagabonds	8/11/01
T9	Joslin	9	19 th Century Attitudes tow. Women	8/11/01
T24	Joslin	9	Women's Suffrage	15/11/01
T28	Joslin	9	Enthusiasm for WWI	21/02/02
T12	Joslin	7	Medieval Women	1/03/02
T47	Joslin	10	Tolpuddle Martyrs	11/03/02
T20	Joslin	7	Medieval Church	15/03/02
T44	Joslin	9	Changing Attitudes toward WWI	10/04/02
T52	Joslin	9	Anti-WWI Feelings	17/04/02
T60	Joslin	(9)	Coursework Interview	24/04/02
T50	Joslin	10	COs in WWI and WWII	9/05/02
T36	Joslin	10	Attitudes toward COs	13/05/02
T40	Joslin	7	Black Death	21/06/02
T64	Joslin		Final Interview	23/07/02

Appendix F: Card-Sort Data from the Initial Interview

Teachers were asked to group or rank cards with various possible goals for history teaching according to their importance and the value they placed on them.

They were asked to set aside cards whose purposes they did not share.

MS. HAYES

Life goals (“these are what you are trying to get to,” “most important ones,” “the effects on them, such as broadening their minds, have a high priority”)

Establish their identities by learning about their cultural background

See the relevance of the past as background for current issues

Encounter worldviews different to their own, so they grow beyond their present-minded, local perspectives

Critically examine their own beliefs and assumptions about human behaviour

Appreciate and enjoy the fascinating stories and details of history

Prepare for their examinations

“This is the way you are going to get to it” (closely related to top line)

Recognise the complexity of explaining historical events

Understand the procedures of “doing history”; gain the enquiry skills to make meaning for themselves

Understand that history consists of the *interpretations* of historians who write it

Understand historical concepts like “evidence,” “cause,” “empathy,” “change,” and “time”

Learn to think about issues in historical context*

Gain a sense of their own potential for shaping the present

* She takes this to mean thinking about issues today in context of what’s gone on in the past.

Set aside

Make judgments about people’s actions in the past

Understand history as a record of the progress of humanity

Discover the “laws” and “lessons” of history, so they can avoid repeating past mistakes (or even make reforms)

Master a specified body of historical facts

MR. INGRAM

“This is what I think is the important stuff...these are the things that are really really – as far as I’m concerned – what history is about, *roughly* in that order” (reading left to right)

Encounter worldviews different to their own, so they grow beyond their present-minded, local perspectives

Critically examine their own beliefs and assumptions about human behaviour

Discover the “laws”^{*} and “lessons” of history, so they can avoiding repeating past mistakes (or even make reforms)

See the relevance of the past as background for current issues

Understand history as a record of the progress of humanity

Make judgments^{*} about people’s actions in the past

Gain a sense of their own potential for shaping the present

Appreciate and enjoy the fascinating stories and details of history

^{*} “Not so sure about laws, but lessons to avoid past mistakes”

“wee bit concerned” [about judgments]...“I guess it is important to make judgments ultimately about what is right and wrong”

“Skills that I think we have to teach...they have to have the tools to be able to do [the ones above].”

Master a specified body of historical facts

Understand that history consists of the *interpretations* of historians who write it

Understand historical concepts like “evidence,” “cause,” “empathy,” “change,” and “time”

Recognise the complexity of explaining historical events

Learn to think about issues in historical context

Understand the procedures of “doing history”; gain the enquiry skills to make meaning for themselves

Set aside

Prepare for their examinations

Establish their identities by learning about their cultural background

MS. JOSLIN

Set aside: “things I don’t think are very important” which are

“Valuable things [that] have to do with the study of history”

“Personal life skills...using history to create attitudes and approaches to life enhancing”

Encounter worldviews different to their own, so they grow beyond their present-minded, local perspectives	Recognise the complexity of explaining historical events	Master a specified body of historical facts
Learn to think about issues in historical context	Make judgments* about people’s actions in the past	Understand history as a record of the progress of humanity
Critically examine their own beliefs and assumptions about human behaviour	Understand that history consists of the <i>interpretations</i> of historians who write it	Discover the “laws” and “lessons” of history, so they can avoid repeating past mistakes (or even make reforms)
Gain a sense of their potential for shaping the present	Critically examine their own beliefs and assumptions about human behaviour	Prepare for their examinations
See the relevance of the past as background for current issues	Understand the procedures of “doing history”; gain the enquiry skills to make meaning for themselves	
Establish their own identities by learning about their cultural background	Appreciate and enjoy the fascinating stories and details of history	

*“In the broader sense, linked to interpretations”

MR. DOW

“As a very rough ranking I’ve put those two at the top.”

Appreciate and enjoy the fascinating stories and details of history*

Prepare for their examinations

*He changed wording to “the love and fun of history”

“I’ve grouped these as of secondary importance.”

Discover the “laws”* and “lessons” of history, so they can avoid repeating past mistakes (or even make reforms)

*He said, not laws but trends

See the relevance of the past as background for current issues

Learn to think about issues in historical context

“Ranked these last”

Master a specified body of historical facts

“Thinking about their own place and response”

Gain a sense of their potential for shaping the present

Critically examine their own beliefs and assumptions about human behaviour

Establish their own identities by learning about their cultural background

Encounter worldviews different to their own, so they grow beyond their present-minded, local perspectives

“Very important skills”

Recognise the complexity of explaining historical events

Understand historical concepts like “evidence,” “cause,” “empathy,” “change,” and “time”

Understand the procedures of “doing history”; gain the enquiry skills to make meaning for themselves

Understand that history consists of the *interpretations* of historians who write it

Understand history as a record of the progress of humanity

Make judgments about people’s actions in the past

Set aside

Appendix G: Sample Full-Text Transcripts

Note: names and place names have been changed.

MS. JOSLIN

Women's suffrage role plays

Year 9 (lower band)

15/11/01 (Thurs 9:15-10:15 am)

Handouts: Arguments to colour-code, 2 role-play scenarios

T: We were discussing last lesson why women didn't have the vote. As a starting point today, on the sheet of paper that everyone has, I have put lots of different reasons both for and against women getting the vote. Some of them you already know about from the work that we did last week, and from the film and from the cartoon that we analysed last week. Others, especially arguments for women getting the vote, might be things that we haven't thought about yet. Later on in the lesson I am going to give you a scenario to act out, a role play to do, where you are going to be having a conversation with someone - and you are going to have a chance to put over your point of view in the role of that person. Before we can do that, I want to be sure that you have lots of ideas about why some people thought women should have the vote, and others thought that they shouldn't. So the first thing you need to do to prepare yourself is look at the information I have put on the sheet in those triangles and boxes and circles and things, and I want you to colour-code it - so that the arguments **for** women having the vote are in one colour, and the arguments **against** are in another. Coloured pencils is probably the best way to do it, but be sure you don't cover up the writing. If you haven't got coloured pencils, but have got pens that are different colours, or a pencil or pen, you can just outline the outside of the box in pen for one side and a different sort of pen for the other. The ideal thing is to have some nice light coloured pencils, that is the perfect thing. Shh girls, I want to make sure that you know what you're doing here. So **colour** coding them, arguments for in one colour, arguments against the other colour. That should take you about three or four minutes to identify those.

(Pause for pupils to contemplate, and T gives help to individuals, sorts them out on instructions.)

T: You can't find any more arguments against? How many have you got against? Only three? It's half and half, actually. What do you think that means, then?: "It would be bad for the country to be run by the kind of politicians women would choose?" Does that suggest that women should get the vote, or that they shouldn't? You can't tell? If women got the vote, then they would choose politicians who aren't very good at running the country, is what that means. [higher] So, is that an argument that they should? [pause] I think you could say that people who thought that women would choose politicians that wouldn't be very - clever, not very **good** at running the country, don't want women to have the vote, do they? So that's an argument against.

.....

T: Molly, how are you getting on? "Women would only vote for good-looking men": does that suggest that they should get the vote, or the opposite? If they're only going to vote for good-looking men, does that mean they **should** get the vote or they shouldn't?

S: They shouldn't.

T: [sorts her out; hard to hear T's comments] [louder] Okay, can everyone put their pencils or pens down just for a moment now. I want to look at the rest of this page before we go on. First of all, let's just check that you're all right, shall we. This has proved to be more of a

problem than I expected, and some of you have confused one or two. Let's start up at the top of the page. The argument that women don't know enough about **serious** politics, is that an argument for or against them having the vote? What would you say, Claire?

S: Against.

T: Against, okay. Tell me why men considered that women didn't know much about serious politics, why. In Victorian times, think about what we learned about women.

S: Because they weren't classed as being intelligent. They didn't go to school and they had to learn from their mothers.

T: That's right, and politics wasn't one of the things that was generally taught to them. Remember I said that at parties, after dinner men would go into their own separate rooms and smoke their cigars and drink their port and talk politics, while the women would have something less alcoholic and talk about staff and nannies and cooking and things like that. That went on for a long, long time.

S: And fashions.

T: And fashions, right. So, the argument that they didn't know enough about politics was quite a strong argument, seemed like they're not interested. Let's go across the page. Here's another argument. "Women **must** have representatives in Parliament to fight for their rights." Is that an argument for or against them getting the vote? That's an argument **for**, isn't it. Make sure you've got for. What sort of rights were they talking about, what sort of rights didn't women have that they might be able to fight for?

S: They didn't have a right to education.

T: They didn't have a right to go to school. There were schools for young girls, there weren't schools for older girls. What other rights didn't they have? Do you remember from the film? You shouldn't be colouring now, please put your colours down for the minute, so that you're not missing anything. What other rights didn't they have? Harriet.

S: They didn't have much teaching.

T: They didn't have the right to go to **school**, yeah. There was school for young girls, there was school for older girls, right. What other rights didn't they have? Gail.

S: They didn't have much **work**.

T: They didn't have a right to go out to take up jobs. Most people wouldn't hire women, and there were very few jobs they were allowed to do. And were there any other rights connected with education, any other things they weren't allowed to do that women often do now?

S: They weren't allowed to teach.

T: They were allowed to be teachers, as long as they weren't married. But what other professions were they not allowed to do?

S: Miss, how could they be teachers if they couldn't get any education themselves?

T: [laughs] That's a good question, right. The women who tended to teach would be women who had been taught by governesses in their homes, and then they would turn into a teacher/governess and go into people's homes themselves. And some women had the benefit of education to read and write, of course, so they would teach very young children basically how to read and write, sometimes in their houses, in their sitting room, that kind of thing. But professions like lawyers and doctors women couldn't be, because they weren't allowed to go to

university and study those courses. So those were rights that they needed. Can you find something else on the page that links that to that idea, matches it, or explains it a bit more? “Women must have representatives in Parliament to fight for their rights”: is there another quote anywhere on the page that would help to explain that a bit further?

S: “MPs will take no interest in laws which help women and children unless women are able to vote.”

T: So would you mark those with a little tick to show that there is a link between those two points. We’ll build up a picture of those that go together. Let’s go back to the top. “It would be bad for the country to be ruled by the kind of politicians *women* would choose”: is that an argument for or against? Donna, what did you think?

S: Against.

T: Against, because the country will go to the dogs if women are voting for handsome young men who don’t know anything. So “Women will just vote for good-looking men” is an argument ... Gail?

S: Against.

T: Against, okay. “Women who are just as well-educated as men should be able to vote.” Harriet, is that an argument for or against?

S: For.

T: Right. Moving on, “Women will vote the same as their husbands or their fathers”: is that an argument for or against?

S: Against.

T: Okay, let’s have somebody from this group here. “Women are not physically or mentally *strong* enough to get involved in political movements”. Is that an argument for or against? Against, yes. This is the one that Queen Victoria wrote in a letter. She was the Queen who ruled the country – and she really did rule in those days, not like now when the Queen doesn’t really rule – but she wrote a letter which said that “women will become very unfeminine and therefore unattractive to men if they insist on doing things which only men should do.” Was that an argument for or against women getting the vote?

S: Against.

T: It’s *against,* yes. The idea that it was unfeminine to worry your little head about things that women shouldn’t be worried about. Do you ever find - that sometimes boys don’t like you to be too smart? [“Yes.” “Yup.”] Have you ever found that boys don’t really like you to be smarter than them?

S: They think that – they like to know that you’re a *girl* [...]

T: Yeah. So there’s this general idea that being smart and involved isn’t too feminine. Maybe that’s still around today, on the whole. Can you look at the two at the bottom on the left? Do you want to read one, Tasha?

S: [reading slowly] “Women will neglect their proper duties as wives and mothers if they get involved in politics.”

T: So is that an argument for or against?

S: Against.

T: Does that relate to another point that's similar? "Women will become unfeminine" if they neglect their proper duties. Right, so we've got the idea of these arguments, and we've been talking about things you could add to those arguments. Now I am going to give everyone role-play. (Hands out individual tasks to pairs.) Okay, just listen for a minute so you know what to do with this. Everyone has a scenario, and you have to write a conversation. If you are doing a husband and wife conversation, you have to do it like this, as "this is what the husband says," "this is what the wife says." Ladies! Stop talking and listen! [pause] You need to know exactly how to do this. You take the scenario and write the conversation between two people. On the board is a model of a husband/wife conversation. If you are doing the one with mother and daughter, it will be similar except that it will be what the mother says and what the daughter says. You need to check your sheets for ideas, but write the conversation as if it's your own. You can get quite emotional about it if you like, and you can use quite strong language – nothing too rude, though, please. You've got 15 minutes to write the conversation, and then we're going to do it and put it on the tape so we can have a record of how you got on.

(Pupils get to work, and teacher deals with individuals. Threatens to move one girl who is not getting down to her work.)

T: You understand this, do you? "You are a 25-year old woman who is not married but hopes to get married soon to a man you met on your law course. Universities would be mainly male, but right at the end of Victorian times, it *was* possible for a few women to do things like that. You are determined to do everything you can to see that the government passes a law which allows women to vote. Your mother is glad that you have done so well, and glad that you have gone to university, even though not many of her friend's daughters have done that – you'd be an exception, you know? Especially in those times. But she is a bit worried because she is afraid that you will not be able to get a husband or have a happy marriage if you pursue this idea of campaigning for women's votes." So what you need to do is write a conversation in which your mother is giving her point of view of why she thinks that it's all very well to have an education but she doesn't think her daughter should get involved in politics. And the daughter *defends* herself and says why she thinks she should. So the best way to go about this is to look on this page to see what the mother might say. If the mother is against her, what arguments might she use to persuade her daughter that it's not a very good idea to get involved in politics?

S: Yeah, she could say, "How do you expect them to get the vote?"

T: That would be against it, though. It's not on here, but it would be against the idea. Right? See if you could find a couple of more points here that the mother might say. [Student points to some.] Right, you've got a few things that the mother might say, so start with her, and then think what the daughter would say in return. And for what the daughter would say in return, you need to look at the green things, don't you? She might be saying "Well, I'm educated, I have a degree. If I don't try to help women get the vote ..." So start with the mother first.

S: Are we going to do this in front of the class?

T: Only if you want to. Depends how you feel about it.

T: Right, which one are you doing? And you could listen, because I think you're doing the same one, aren't you? So – what you have to do is look at the sheet and find ideas that a rich man might have, and what he might say to his wife who is trying to get involved in politics. You need an argument against to start with, don't you. What is he worried about? She is going to lots of political meetings with her friends, because she wants to get involved. Say she is going to a suffragettes meeting tomorrow, and he doesn't want her to go. Look at the arguments against, and see where he might start. He might start there. [Student indicates something.] You *could,* but I think it would be more interesting, more exciting, and more realistic, if you started with what the man *really* thinks.

S: He would start with that one, wouldn't he?

T: He *might* start with that. But what he's mad about is that she's going off to political meetings, right? That means that when he comes home from work, she's not there. So what arguments against women getting the vote do you think he might start with? ["That one."] I think he'd start with that one. He'd go for the jugular, wouldn't he? And what might she say back to that?

S: [not sure]

T: She might just say things like, [unperturbed voice] "Ooh, supper's [...]. It's not going to stop me from doing what I want to do." So then he'd have to think of something *more*! Maybe he would say something like that [points to sheet][male voice] "Well, some women being involved in politics, I don't find that very attractive in a woman." He might say something like that, wouldn't he.

S: We're going to start off saying we're the woman [...]

T: Okay, so you want to start with her? Yeah. So she is going to tell her mother that she intends to work towards women getting the vote, okay. She's going to tell her that it's important for her to do that. Why might she think it was important for her to do that? It could be that the conversation will open with her saying, "Now that I've graduated from university and was given an education, I intend to put it to some good use. *I* am going to get involved in campaigning for women's votes." And then you could look at these points to see what her mother might argue to say that she shouldn't do it. Right? That's the scenario, isn't it. "I'm now a lawyer, I'm in a position to do something for my fellow women, *I'm* getting involved in trying to get women the vote." Start there. Then I think it'll flow easily after that.

S: Miss, is that all we have to do? [Ask T to read her dialogue.] This is some words that we made up.

T: [chuckles, and reads] Oh, that's *very* good. I know the tune for that! [She sings "Da da da da, da da da da da."] I know that tune [sings a line]. Right, that's good – where'd you find that!?

S: Ms. Taylor told me.

T: There's lot of stuff like that on the internet now, isn't there. That's clever. Let's get this *started* then, shall we, because we don't want to be the only ones without anything. [referring to song, I think] If you want to because you think it's worked out quite well, then do it.

T: [to another group] Right, so you are the rich man and your wife is going off every Thursday afternoon and meeting with her friends to discuss campaigning for votes for women. Okay? She wants women to get the vote and will do what she can to help. And her husband isn't very pleased, he doesn't want this to happen. So we could start with *him*. We could pick out from *here* arguments against, so where would you start? She hasn't cooked his dinner maybe. You [higher] might start there, but can you think – look at some other ones. 'Cause this argument's much better if you had come prepared.

S: Yes, that one.

T: How about that one?

S: Yes.

T: I think that's it – because he is mad because she's been out and not doing what she should do, okay? And then, you don't need to just copy those words. Just make that him. [peremptory tone] "I'm not sure if I'm too happy about your going out to meetings every afternoon, you know. Your place is in the home. What is she going to say back to him?"

S: That one.

T: She could say that, she could say that "I really care about women getting the vote, I don't think it's **fair** that women should [...]." She might say that. And what might he say back?

S: I don't know.

T: She says that "It's unfair that we have different views, and women should have the vote." So what would you say back to those sorts of things? [pause, then teacher imitates a man] "Ah, women want to be just like **men,**" okay? Okay, what's she going to say? Would she agree with that?

S: No.

T: No. She'd say, "Well, you don't give us enough credit. If you've so much intelligence [...]." So he starts giving many arguments after that, doesn't he. You don't have to use the exact words off the sheet, just use the ideas. Put it in the words he'd use, but use the ideas.

T: Do you know what you can do? You can make another page for all the points that you contribute in this argument, and then see if you can incorporate those. And maybe change this sentence a **little** bit, so it says something like, "Women should be able to vote, otherwise Members of Parliament won't take any interest in things that women want **done.**" Okay? And then tick off what you've **thought** about, and then see if you've got any ideas left over that you could use.

T: [to another group] So how are you doing? So this is **good,** great. "I find you very unattractive." [laughs] Okay, you **might** say that, and you might say, "Actually, when women go to town [...]."

S: [loudly] Well, I don't know if they do, though. It's [...] these people. [other girl laughs]

T: That could be another way of saying it, couldn't it? [laughter] So what you need to do now, you've got to pick some of the arguments **for,** and choose one that will fit your scenario.

S: It's not fair.

T: Yeah. She could say "Yeah, but it's not fair" –

S: Could you say, "The difference between men and women" –

T: Yeah. Yeah, that would be a good thing to say next? Then how would you put your arguments against? [kids giggle] Now, be sensible. If women get the vote, it means that the people that represent you on the Town Council or the government will do what you want them to do. So suppose you were voting for [name of town] Council and you wanted them to build a really nice new Leisure Centre. The idea is that you vote for the person who promises they'll do that, and that way your voice is heard, your opinion is considered and maybe things will happen. What are some of the things that women wanted to change? Women might be able to get more jobs, and what about women's property? What happened to women's property when they got married? Do you think they would want to change that? [inaudible response] So the way you could make this real is by saying that you want to be sure that laws are passed that will allow women to keep their own property or go to university. See if you can put some of these things in.

T: [to another group] How's it going? [brief response] So you've done the land-owner and his wife. How much have you done? You need to look at the sheets and see if you can get a bit more than that. He says she will vote for the handsome-looking men, so what is she going to say to that? ["Um – "] She's going to deny it, she'll say that he doesn't give women credit for their intelligence, then maybe she's going to use one of these arguments, and then he'll come in and say "But *wait* a minute! Wait a minute. Women are" One of the problems is that you don't seem to have colour-coded consistently. Can you see a difference in the colour? Right, the pink ones are *for,* so what you need to do is just alternate between them and put the right ones next to the right people. But put a bit of *life* into it, don't just copy off those. 'Cause you *can,* can't you, you've got lots of ideas. So she's going to say, "That's nonsense, women are just as intelligent as men and it's *unfair* that there's different rules." He's going to say, "But women will be unfeminine if they try and do things that men do. I personally don't think women are attractive who get involved in politics." That's what they felt! Right everybody, you've got about three more minutes to finish.

S: Miss, when you're finished –

T: Have you ticked off all the ones that you've included? Because you might be able to find one more if you see what ones you haven't talked about. Maybe. What have you heard about going to these meetings? [reading] "If I want to go to meetings, I will. It's not right you should be at home cooking, cleaning and having – it's not right." So you've done that one. [reading] "Why is that every woman should have a job that men do?"

S: [reading] "Why is it that every woman should do a woman's job? Men should do it as well."

T: We::ll, do you think in the Victorian times they would have gone as far as to think that men should do housework?

S: I don't know. But if you were a woman, you'd think things like that anyway. I mean, you *always* think things –

T: You *do* say things that are a bit far-fetched, I know. But I think we need to keep within Victorian ideas, and this is very modern, this is very 1990s when we think that men should do that. I think you're getting *slightly* away from – . The idea is to think the way they thought at the time. You maybe need to find one other of these arguments, really.

T: [softly] I know you girls don't like to talk in front of the class, but I'd love you to do this if you would. Because you've got such a nice idea and I think it would come over really, really well. [They indicate agreement.] Excellent.

T: Right, we're going to stop now, because we need to have time to do some of these conversations. Girls, everyone needs to stop your work now. And stop chattering and stop fidgeting. We're going to do this for the tape, so we can see what our ideas our like. So could you pay *special* attention to being absolutely *silent,* not make any noise at all while we are taping the conversations. Really, really listening. So, which pair would like to go first? Would you come behind my desk, so you can put your stuff down here.

S1: Kelly is a 25 year-old girl who has just graduated from university. She is unmarried, although she hopes to get married soon to a man who she met on her Law course. She wants the government to pass the law which allows women the vote, and I'm against it. "I don't think you're strong enough to get your point across to the government, darling."

S2: But mother, I really want to do this, as women are treated unfairly and with no respect.

S1: Why bother, when women will just vote for good-looking men, and if they are married they will vote the same as their husbands.

S2: Don't you want women to have the same rights as men, and not be treated just like low-life housewives, and also be able to vote on principle?

S1: I understand your view, darling, but I think women will become unfeminine and unattractive if they do vote.

S2: Now, mother, look what you are doing. You are not giving me the right to be free and do as I please when it comes to politics. You are just like some of the men out there.

S1: But women don't know that much about politics.

S2: No, mother. **You** don't know much about politics or the rights of women.

S1: Fine, you go out there and try and get that vote, but I'm telling you that you are not strong enough to get that vote.

S2: That's your opinion, mother: always leave it to the government! Goodbye.

T: Right, I think that was **excellent.** **Really, really** good, and lots of really good points there. Now, can we have the next pair.

S1: I'm really proud of you, that you have graduated from university. But are you sure it's wise to fight for women's votes, because you don't know much about serious politics, and we women are not physically strong enough to get involved with politics.

S2: Yes mother, I do realise that, but don't you think it's unfair to have different rules for men and women? Otherwise MPs will take no interest in laws which help children and women. Also some women are just as well-educated as men, so why can't we vote?

S1: Do what you think's wise, but be careful.

T: Right, lots of good points together there. I like the way they combined them together. Shh! Girls, this is brilliant, but you do have to listen. Susie, what do you want to say?

S: Can we do ours? Even if it's wrong?

T: That's fine; it doesn't matter if it's wrong! Yes, you can. Come on.

S1: What worries me about you going to these meetings is that you're never here when I come home. That isn't right, you should be at home cooking, cleaning, and looking after the kids.

S2: I don't see why every woman should do these women's jobs. I think the men should do it as well, because it isn't fair. I think the men should do the women's jobs for a day, see how **they** feel.

S1: **That's** it. Don't start this, or I'll chuck you out.

S2: That's fine! Me, my sisters and my friends shall fight and persevere for women's rights.

S1: You won't have any money, though.

S2: [mournfully] You'll leave me? If you don't believe in women's rights, then goodbye forever.

S1: Look dear, I've told you - it's not right! I'm the one who has got the money for the family.

S2: And I'm the one who cooks, cleans and polishes. Do you remember the time when I fell down the stairs and broke my arm, and you still made me tidy up.

S1: Please, I'll do the cleaning!

S2: No, you don't stand a chance! Bye!

T: That was great! In *some* ways it could very much be a conversation in a rich household, but in other ways it sounds a bit like an argument you could have now, doesn't it? Very often arguments do get down to "No, you don't!" "Yes, I do," but when your writing is to show some empathy, what you need to aim to do is put in some facts and information, like the stuff you've got on your sheet, as *much* as you can incorporate. That was a good skit, it just needed just a little bit more of the true ideas. Okay, last one then.

S1: I am very proud of you, but we need to talk.

S2: That's okay, I'll meet you in the lounge in five minutes.

S1: Do you *really* think you're doing the right thing, trying to get the vote for women?

S2: Educated women should be able to vote, don't you think that's right?

S1: Well, women only neglect their proper duties as mothers and wives if they get involved in politics. Just think what your *father* would say – he believes very strongly in only men having the vote.

S2: Well, women must have representatives in Parliament to fight for their rights. And as for father, I do love him so but, if it comes to it, I will go against him.

S1: Women will only become unfeminine and therefore unattractive to men if they insist on having a vote.

S2: It is unfair to have different rights for men and women.

S1: Well, what are you going to do?

S2: I'm going to follow my heart and fight for the right to vote for women. Goodbye, Mother.

S1: [pleading tone] Annie, Annie, don't do this to me!

T: That was *brilliant, excellent,* you did really really well with that. What I would like you to do for next time is that if you haven't it already, can you please copy up the conversation in your exercise book so that you've got a record of it. If one of you has written it up, perhaps you wouldn't mind lending the book to your partner so that they can write it up in neat. Right, you need to take the sheets with you. When you're ready, stand up and push your chairs in.

MR. INGRAM

Trial of Charles I

1/03/02 (Friday 2-3:15 pm)

Year 8 (23 boys, lower band)

Materials: *Societies in Change* (SHP) p. 61, cue cards for roles and Bradshaw's questions for trial, handout "Execution of Charles I" (draw pictures and fill in words)

(Lesson opens with talking to individual pupils in preparation for their parts. A lot of noise, a sending out, but only very minor snippets of speech. T holds up witness' card, says "You need to be able to remember what you're going to say...You've got five minutes to finish off what you're saying." Kids get busy finishing this task, which they started last lesson. Each boy has an individualised card describing who they are, historically, and what they believe and should say. T also tells several students what they should say. They write on the back what they're going to say at the trial. While they finish this T writes the order witnesses will be called on the board – using their historical names.)(Much noise, excitement)

T: Are you witnesses all ready? Remember *you* are the person on the card, so you are going to say 'I was a servant to the king.' [answering another student's question:] He wrote letters to the Scots, and tried to start the war again. Get that in somewhere.

S: What do I have to say?

T: At the start you say 'Bring the prisoner in,' and then you bring him in. You will say, 'How do you plead?' and he will say 'I refuse to accept the authority of this court.' You send him out. The second day you go through this, and the third day you call him in, the same thing happens. He refuses to accept the authority of the court, so the fourth day you don't bring him in, you call the witnesses in instead. Right, one more minute!

T: [after pause] Okay, everyone quiet please. Shh! Shh! Shh! Shh! Excellent. [quietly] Now, we need to make a courtroom. [student starts interrupting] *Quiet.* Did I ask for any advice from you? No. What we're going to do is pull that double desk back a little bit. You and you can move that table. That's it. Line the chairs up along there [along walls] for people to sit in. Shh, don't speak to me, just do it. (etc.) [Eric, as Bradshaw, is sitting on a chair placed on a table. The chair for Charles I is opposite.] [T shouts at them, loudly, to move chairs without talking. Talking continues.] Don't talk! Keep your mouth shut, for once! Now, this is an engraving from some time after the trial, not too long after [he puts picture on overhead]. It shows what the trial was like. We've got Bradshaw in a slightly higher position than he actually was, but he was at one end of the court. And then you've got the chair Charles sat in at the other end, and you can see that there were spectators at either side. Now what we've got is witnesses at one side and just members of the public on the other side. So we're trying to recreate the court a little bit. So – what's going to happen then is Bradshaw is going to control proceedings by calling the king in, asking him to give evidence, sending him out, and also calling witnesses in. So that's (on the board) the order you are going to be coming in at. When you're a witness you're going to sit here, in this chair next to me. [off to side of Bradshaw][moans about location]. When you're talking, try and get into character a little bit. Witnesses remember that you *passionately* believe either for or against the king, apart from the person who is neutral and you passionately believe in peace. So if you are a witness for the prosecution you *passionately* believe that the king was wrong and Parliament was right, and if you're a witness for the defence you *passionately* believe that the *king* was right and Parliament was wrong. So let's try to get some feeling into this. So, are we ready? Okay, let's start. Let's go back – how many years is that? – 350-odd years to the trial of Charles I. Off you go, Bradshaw.

Bradshaw: Bring forth the prisoner. [He is brought forth roughly by guard.] [bit monotone] The charges you are being charged with are over-ruling the rights and liberty of the people, taking away the power of Parliament, levying war against Parliament and the people.

T: Ask him how he pleads.

Bradshaw (woodenly): How do you plead?

Charles [with feeling]: I refuse to accept the charges of the court.

Bradshaw: Send the prisoner away.

T: So now we come to the second day of the trial.

Bradshaw: Bring forth the prisoner. Do you plead guilty to the charges against you?

Charles: I *still* refuse the charges.

Bradshaw: It says here, 'By the authority of the Commons of England I charge you with atrocities.'

Charles [slowly, reading]: I deny that. This is not to be debated by you. The Commons of England was never a court of law.

Bradshaw: Confess or deny the charge.

Charles: By what authority do you sit?

Bradshaw: Take him away.

T: [cheerily] Very good second day. Okay, third day of the trial.

Bradshaw: Bring forth the prisoner. How do you plead?

Charles: I deny the charges against me.

Bradshaw: Take him away.

T: [laughs] So, Bradshaw getting nowhere because the king refuses to recognise his right to judge him. Why does the king refuse to recognise his right to judge him? Who is the only person who can judge him? Sam.

S: God.

T: Yes, God is the only person that Charles thinks can judge him. So – Bradshaw decides to hear witnesses without the king.

Bradshaw: Thompson, witness number 1. [pause] What evidence do you have.

T: [hinting] Read your *card*. Just read it. [Thompson has not written his evidence on his card] Oh no no no no no no *no*! Okay, you'll have to go.

T: Okay, bring in the second witness.

Bradshaw: Bring in Charles Lewis. What is your evidence?

Lewis: [with great passion] *Parliament* started the war! *Parliament* killed innocent people – [correcting] prisoners! [giggles] Charles was a kind and innocent man.

T: At least it had style.

Bradshaw: Next witness. Elizabeth Styles, what is your evidence?

Servant: I was a servant to the king. I was sending letters to the Scots.

T: That's evidence that the king has rebelled against Parliament. Charles is refusing to hear evidence, he's refusing to accept the court's authority so he's being tried in his absence.

Bradshaw: Edward Cotswold.

Cotswold: [with feeling] The king was only defending himself. Parliament have really taken over the war, Parliament have taken control on the 22nd of March, 1642.

Bradshaw: Call Thomas Carter. [pause] What is your evidence?

Carter: [softly] I changed sides in the war because I disagreed with Charles. I thought he was taking ship money and they need it.

T: [laughs to self]

Bradshaw: (to next witness, Arthur Walden) What is your evidence?

Walden: [with feeling] God has chosen Charles to be our king. He believes in the divine right of kings, this shows that he believes in God and never goes against him.

T: [laughs softly]

Bradshaw: (to next witness, James Morton) What do you have to say?

Morton: This is a civil war between king and Parliament, there has been too much killing and violence and I think there should be no more killings.

Bradshaw: The court judges that Charles Stuart is a tyrant, traitor, murderer and a public enemy of the people. He shall be put to death by severing his head from his body. Take him away.

T: Excellent. Very well done everybody. Okay, next lot come up. [This time a group of three students – judges? – sits in front of and below Bradshaw at front of court.] That was a very good first one, let's make sure that yours is as effective. Let's go.

Bradshaw (to teacher): Would Bradshaw have been a posh man?

T: He may well have been, yes.

Bradshaw [with feeling, animation]: Bring him in. [pause] Do you plead guilty or not guilty to these charges?: Over-turning the rights and liberties of the people, taking away the power of Parliament, leading war against the Parliament and the people.

Charles: Remember, the court is meant to be the king's court and under his authority.

Bradshaw: Take him away.

T: That's brilliant. Second day.

Bradshaw: Bring him in. [laughter] I sit here today by the authority of the Commons of England, which has called you to account.

Charles: I deny it; show me your precedent. The divine right of kings is not to be debated by you. The Commons of England was never a court of law.

Bradshaw: Do you confess or deny the charge?

Charles: By what authority do **you** sit?

Bradshaw: Take him away.

T: Okay, third day.

Bradshaw: Bring him in. Do you plead guilty or not guilty?

Charles: By what authority do you sit?

Bradshaw: Take him away. You are going to be beheaded and killed.

T: You don't know that. You haven't heard the evidence! [laughs] Call the first witness.

Bradshaw: I call the first witness, John Thompson.

Thompson: Charles has taken all our rights as MPs, and I saw him raise his flag at Nottingham, and I heard him send his army in. It was not right to arrest five MPs, and he broke the rule about coming into the House of Commons.

Bradshaw: Hmm. Next witness.

Lewis: [with a little reading trouble] I think that Parliament's army committed atrocities. For instance, after Parliament's victory they killed all the survivors as traitors. Charles was very kind, he didn't tell his soldiers to commit atrocities. [Someone does something that provokes general laughter.]

Bradshaw: Elizabeth Styles.

Styles: I was a servant to the king and made friends with him. Before he got caught I noticed that he was carrying letters to Scotland. I thought it was to his uncle, and then I found half-written letters threatening to plot with Parliament. [T, softly: Oooh.] Two days later I was caught. Can I go now? [laughter]

Bradshaw: Edward Cotswold.

Cotswold: [fluently and with feeling] I believe that Charles was dragged into war only by Parliament's unreasonable demands. I believe that the war was started when Parliament took control of the army on the 22nd of March 1642. Charles was only raising his standard at Nottingham to try and defend his country.

Bradshaw: Thomas Carter, please.

Carter: I think Charles was guilty of several counts of killing innocent people. And I urge Parliament's army to hurt him. [T laughs]

Bradshaw: Arthur Walden.

Walden: I am a priest from Yorkshire. Only God can choose a king, you and Parliament should abandon the trial or no-one will believe in the authority of God.

Bradshaw: And James Morton.

Morton: I believe that the king and Parliament should be friends, and then it would be more peaceful. Thank you. [T laughs]

Bradshaw: I call King Charles in now.

T: Are you going to sentence him now?

Bradshaw: You are hereby sentenced to be beheaded on the 30th of January. Take him away.

T: Excellent. Fantastic. Both of them were very, very good. Okay, now can we rearrange the room a little bit please. [They do.] Now, stop talking, pens down, look this way. Now even if today we decided as a country to execute our queen. How do you think a lot of people would feel? I would be quite pleased, but – Tim? [class laughs]

S: Some people might be shocked.

T: Yes. A lot of people would be very, very shocked, wouldn't they? Why would people be shocked do you think, Joe?

S: She doesn't do much, so she hasn't done anything against them.

T: She's quite an inoffensive old lady. What else?

S: She's a hundred and one and she is – .

T: That's the Queen Mother. ["Oh."] We're talking about the Head of State. She's part of the Royal Family, so we'd be shocked by that. *You* go and sit over there. Sam?

S: Her mother helped in the war.

S: What, to start the war?

T: Perhaps.

S: Prince Charles would come into power.

T: That's another good reason not to execute the Queen. Okay, we would be very shocked. Imagine then if, like it was in 1649, when most people – a lot of people believed that God had put the king in power, that the God who everybody believes in had put the king in power. Imagine how shocked they were when after that trial, three days after that trial ends, this scene happened in London outside the Banqueting Hall of Whitehall. Whitehall? Westminster, I think. [He puts engraving on overhead of Charles' beheading in front of Whitehall with crowd gathered around.] It was the morning of Monday 30th January, it was a very cold morning, and a huge crowd gathered to see this event at which Charles I was executed. It was a very cold morning, and to make people think that he wasn't cold he wore an extra shirt so he wouldn't *shiver.* He went to his death quite bravely, and it drew a large crowd. What can you see - around the platform, what do you think that is?

S: Soldiers.

T: Right. Lots of soldiers. Because this was such a shocking event to many people, the army had to be there to stop people rushing the stage. I don't know if it's so good in this print, but I'll show you another one. You can see there's a woman fainting here because she is so amazed and shocked by the idea of a monarch being killed. So this was a truly *shocking* event for many, many people. Can you get the books out, please. When you get one, can you turn to page 61 please. You can see the top picture is the one I've got on the board, it's just the other way round. You can see B is someone who is turning away in disgust, and in the bottom left is a woman fainting. If you look at Source 10, the picture below that, you can see something interesting as well. You can see towards the left there looks to be a little boy holding his hand up underneath the head of the king. Why do you think they're doing that, Tim?

S: To get a bit of the king's blood.

T: Why would they want some of the king's blood, do you know?

S: So that they would have something left of his body?

T: Um. No. Who do a lot of people think has put the king on earth, Eric?

S: They want some of God.

T: They think this blood is going to have special powers. Those of you who know something about the Bible will know that Jesus was supposed to cure illnesses by his touch. Some people thought that perhaps a monarch who has been appointed by God, if they felt their blood, and if they were touched by a king they would be cured. People were thinking the same thing of Charles I's blood. If they could catch some of the blood it would be able to cure illnesses. So this was a truly shocking event for many people. Now, open your exercise books please. What I want you to think about is – I want you to imagine that you are in this crowd. Imagine it is 1649, the country has just been through this brutal civil war that we've studied. You've seen what the Civil War was like. The king has been executed. Remember that most people, virtually everybody, believes in God. The Parliamentarians believe very much in God. Everybody believes in God. Not everybody believes that kings are put on earth by God, some people still do. We want to imagine what people were thinking about at this time. I want you to imagine that you're in that crowd, and I want you to write a short account, for about ten minutes or so. And I want you to **think** whether you would be a Royalist, somebody who supported the king during the war, and you are standing there. What are your feelings as you watch your leader get executed? Would you be thinking this is a crime, 'cause it's against God? How do you feel about the king being executed? Or you can decide to be on the Parliamentarian side, and how would you feel? You might be very very happy to see the king being executed. You might think that this is **fair reward** for the crimes he's committed, that we just talked about in the court, or you could think 'Perhaps have we gone too **far**?' As a Parliamentarian do you think this is a step too far, that you've won the war and that that is enough. Yes, Eric. [Kids work very quietly.]

S: Was there a Royalist rebellion, trying to save the king?

T: Charles II, his son, had got support from Scotland, because a lot of Scots were still quite Royalist. He had brought an army down south, but he was heavily defeated at Worcester, I think, in 1651. The war was over, and Charles II had to go into hiding. And it wasn't until Cromwell died that monarchy came back. Yes, Tim.

S: What if you wanted to be like a Royalist while you were at war, but if you had to be [...].

T: Yep, 'cause then you could write about mixed emotions. How you think that Charles **was** wrong but this has gone too far; you feel **dreadful** that the king is being executed.

S: Can we make up names or use our own?

T: Use Edward W. That's a good solid English name, Edward! Any questions? I want you to spend ten minutes by yourself, so I don't want any talking.

S: Where is his body now, buried where?

T: I **don't** actually know. I think it might have been buried somewhere and then dug up and reburied in Westminster Abbey. Kings and queens normally these days are buried in Westminster Abbey in London, but Charles was executed for being a traitor and was buried somewhere else. But when Charles II came to the throne and the idea of having a king in

charge of the country came back, they dug up Charles I's body and they reburied it in Westminster Abbey. I *think* it's in Westminster Abbey.

S: Where was he executed in front of?

T: In front of the Banqueting Hall in Whitehall, in central London, the City of London. This building still exists, actually. It's the only part of the original Palace of Westminster that survives. So, ten minutes. Imagine what it would be like and how you would be feeling when you are observing this.

S: Could you be like a news reporter, like saying how people felt?

T: Yeah, okay, that would be one way of doing it, yes. You could talk about how both sides felt, that perhaps Parliamentarians as well were shocked. That's a good idea.

(Pause for silent working.)

S: What was the man called who cut off his head?

T: An executioner.

S: Did executioners get paid quite a lot?

T: I think they did, actually. They generally covered their faces, but they obviously didn't in this one. I'm not sure if it was the State Executioner that beheaded Charles I, I'd have to find out.

S: Could you be the executioner and say what your feelings were?

T: No, no. The assignment is you are either a Royalist or a Parliamentarian.

.....

S: Sir, how do they know there was a little boy, and a woman that fainted in the crowd?

T: There were people there who were recording it, someone either drawing it there or drawing it from memory. The fact is that we've got two different drawings showing that somebody fainted in the crowd probably means that there was somebody who fainted there.

.....

T: How do you personally feel? Are you upset, are you devastated? How did other people *feel*? Did they think it was wrong, did they think it was right? Say something about that.

.....

S: It that Charles's blood?

T: Yeah. That's what it suggests – people were trying to pick it up.

.....

S: Sir, is that an axe they used?

T: Yes. Axe was a preferred method of execution in Britain for beheading. In France they used a sword. When Anne Boleyn was beheaded, she wanted to be beheaded with a sword because she was royalty and she could *choose* how she wished to be beheaded. Then because they didn't have anybody skilled enough to execute her with a sword in Britain, they had to get somebody over from France to execute her. Although it sounds very simple, it's actually an extremely difficult thing to do, to cut somebody's head off. Not that I've tried it, but ... ! It's bones and gristle and stuff like that, and very rarely was somebody's head cut off in one go. I think with Charles it took two. Certainly Mary, Queen of Scots, they couldn't actually get her head *off,* the executioner had to use a knife to finish it off with. There was one public executioner who used to get really drunk before he did it, and his aim wasn't very good because of it. He himself nearly got lynched by the crowd, they started to storm the platform

because they were so disappointed with his dreadful performance of trying to cut somebody's head off. They became big public events.

S: One of Henry VIII's wives got [conked?] too, and it used to be on that programme, about Henry VIII's wives.

T: Divorced, beheaded, survived, divorced – so that would have been, which one is it? Anne Boleyn, Catherine –

S: Not the second one.

T: Catherine *Parr,* I think.

S: It must have been a cool job, because you got paid *and* you get to the execution.

T: I can't actually see it being particularly pleasant. Right, can we spend *two* minutes finishing off in silence your account of how you *felt* when observing the execution of Charles I.

S: Sir, can we draw an illustration of it?

T: If you want to.

S: Sir, can you put 'devastated' up on the board, please. [He does.]

T: Devastated, good word. Devastated means you are shocked, your world *crumbles,* you are so devastated. So, just finish off the next sentence or two of what you're writing, and we'll hear a couple of people's pieces of work.

S: Sir, was he handcuffed before he was killed?

T: He had his hands tied behind his back, yes.

S: Sir, this picture shows that his hands weren't tied behind his back.

T: I'm not awfully sure. All those sources suggest that his hands weren't tied behind his back. I'm not an expert on the execution of Charles I. Yes, Simon.

S: Why didn't they use a guillotine?

T: Guillotines weren't around then, it was just an axe. It was about a hundred or so years later. Okay, finish off and let's hear a couple of accounts. We'll have some Royalist accounts first of all. Go on then, Ben.

S: I think that it was wrong about this, because if they wanted to kill Charles why didn't they kill him at war? Everybody apart from some people would be gutted that Charles got beheaded. I went around the crowd and asked some people what they thought about this event. Most people said they were very devastated, and so was I.

T: Okay, good, the idea that the Royalists are going to be devastated. John?

S: When I saw Charles's head sliced off like the end of a cucumber, I threw up. It was so sick to see my own king die. I saw the smirk on the executioner's face. [some laughter] I was disgusted with Parliament, they could have put him in prison but not executed him. When I went to bed, in my dreams, I saw the scene again, and blood fly out of his neck.

T: Nice, [sarcastically] thanks. Anyone got anything about Charles being put on earth by God or anything like that? Tim, are you going to read yours? Are you a Royalist?

S: No, I'm the other one.

T: I want another Royalist. Anyone else do the Royalist side? Somebody must have done Royalist. Is everyone going to celebrate Charles's death?

S: No.

T: Have you done Royalist?

S: No. I haven't, honest.

T: Go on.

S: Do I have to? ["Yes."] Why? It'll be rubbish.

T: Try it, please.

S: I believe that Charles should not have been killed. It is a devastating event. Parliament had already won, so why they did they kill the king? He was defending his rights. God has appointed him, so he should rule.

T: *Absolutely brilliant.* That was absolutely superb. A very good understanding that a lot of people felt he was appointed by God and also why did Parliament need to take it this far. That's excellent. Let's go on to some Parliamentary ones. Tim, you start, and we'll go round as many as we can get in.

S: I am happy that the king is finally dead. He made too many mistakes, like refusing to pay taxes, so he made the ships mad. I also think King Charles was guilty. He had attacked the basic liberties of everyone in the country. Why did he not just take it like a man who was guilty and knew that he had done wrong? It was good to see the king die, and it was a pleasure to watch him die.

T: *Excellent.* Some really good language, the idea of the liberties being taken from the people, and that Charles was rebelling against his people. Gary?

S: I was happy the king was being executed, but when the day came I felt disgusted by the number of people who turned up for this event. One thing I saw when I got there was a boy collecting some of Charles's blood. A woman fainted in shock as the executioner lifted the axe and chopped. [rest inaudible]

T: One more. Go on, James. You've had your hand up for ages.

S: [intro inaudible] All the blood was running on my head. I can't believe what I saw. Everyone around me liked it. I hated it, so I ran and ran and ran...[reads slowly, with difficulty]

T: Very good, the idea that people were disgusted. Right, we're going to have to stop there. Can you get your homework diaries out now, please. Shh! Your homework is to complete this sheet, that's for next Friday. There is a sheet on the table called 'The Execution of Charles I.' You basically have to draw the pictures and fill in the words, okay? Listen. Looking this way. How do you think many people *felt* in Britain when Charles I was executed? Let's have somebody else ... Fred?

S: Shocked.

T: Okay, many people felt shocked. Why do you think they felt shocked, Patrick?

S: Because they believed that he was appointed by God.

T: Excellent. Many people thought he was appointed by God. Eric, there might have been quite a large minority who weren't shocked. Why would that be?

S: Because they were fighting for Parliament and felt he hadn't abided by the rules. He tried to kill five MPs.

T: Excellent. Because Charles had gone against the rules of what they saw was right. Excellent. Okay, do you want to pack away.

MS. HAYES

Persecution of the Jews

15/01/02 (12 – 1 pm)

Year 11 (mixed, but “more able”)

Materials: 2 handouts, one a timeline

Pre-lesson comments: “I’m not sure how much of this is going to be about empathy.”

T said she thought the Holocaust was best taught through videos, but the problem is they need notes.

(Lesson starts by talking about mark scheme and improving grades, and talking about next time going through selected answers to questions.)

S: Which year was it that everyone got conscripted in Hitler Youth?

T: Mr. Neilsen says it was 1936, not 1939, which is why you all got it wrong. I didn’t penalise you for it because I realised it was confusing. First of all I’d like us to look at the answers to these questions. Right, Question 1. This was an easy one: What was the name of the Master race, Mark?

S: The Aryan race.

T: The Aryan race, good. How were they going to achieve this Aryan super-race?

S: Selective breeding.

T: Selective breeding and through eugenics. Selective breeding, and eliminating people who were not considered to be perfect Aryan specimens, either by sterilising them or, in the worst-case scenario, getting rid of them altogether. But yes, selective breeding to ensure that the Aryan master-race was achieved. How were Germans persuaded to believe in the idea of the master race, Scott?

S: They were basically brainwashed in schools, and propaganda.

T: Indoctrination in schools, brainwashing, propaganda.

S: There were advertisements and posters so that everything was all superb.

T: And what about people who weren’t superb, how were these depicted in posters and books? As lower people, in caricatures. You’ve got this idealised - person, the Aryan super-people. The tall blue-eyed blond-haired fit-looking man or this beautiful blond-haired woman. The person who isn’t acceptable, like this Jew for instance, is being shown as scum, beneath contempt, a dirty-old-man-type with his arm around the beautiful Aryan girl. So, the Jews would be seen as what?

S: Dirty.

T: Dirty, and what else? If you’ve got this beautiful pure Aryan girl and the dirty old man – ?

S: Impure.

T: Impure, and what else? [higher] If you have a daughter who is a beautiful blonde, or you were yourself a beautiful blonde, how would you perceive the Jews, how would you feel about them?

S: They’re not good enough for you.

T: They're not good enough for you. If you think about today, you've got the caricature of the old man in the dirty mack, the 'flasher.' [some laughing] Now, in these caricatures the Jewish men are made to look quite gruesome and repulsive, but they've got their arm around the beautiful Aryan maiden, so how did you think young girls would start to look at Jewish men? They would see them as repulsive, but they might *also* see them as a little bit of a threat. This image being portrayed that not only are the Jews beneath contempt but they are also a threat.

S: Fathers wouldn't want to see their daughters with them, and they were a threat to the young men because they wouldn't want to think that their young women were being taken away by Jews.

T: So what are you going to do with your threat? How is this going to make you feel, what are you going to be prepared to *do* about this threat? If somebody is a threat to you –

S: Eliminate it.

T: Eliminate the threat, get rid of it. You can see the build up here, these Jews are not just nasty, dirty scum of the earth, - they are also a threat, they're a threat to the *purity* of our Aryan women and, as such, they must be eliminated. [higher] It's pretty horrible stuff really, when you think about it. I was doing some work on this with Year 9 this morning, and one of Hitler's sayings - was that when he came to power he would hang the Jews one by one. He actually said a lot more than that, but it was a bit of a sanitised version for Year 9. He said things like that he would hang them and leave them rotting on the gallows. *But* the thing is that you've got Hitler [higher] openly saying things, and [astonished tone] people voted for him. That is actually a very - appalling - thought.

S: Maybe they voted for him because he scared them –

T: No, no: Once he got into *power,* they were scared to *oppose* him.

S: Yeah. Something about him appealed to everybody.

T: So many things about him appealed.

S: He was a change. He was actually, like, putting things into practice and actually making a change.

T: Right. He's got – there's almost two agendas here. There was one agenda that is very appealing, and there is another agenda, to do with the Jews, which people quietly forgot about in order to - hang on to the things that looked good. Kerry.

S: Did the ordinary Germans not like the Jews anyway?

T: Right. He's *building* on existing prejudices, good. There is an existing prejudice about the Jews, that people don't actually like the Jews already. This is just a step further, isn't it? What do you think about, did people really believe it when Hitler said he was going to hang the Jews, or did they see it as a figure of speech? Yeah, Scott?

S: By saying to people that they are pure you are complimenting them, so they will take his side.

T: Yes, this will appeal. You're pure, and not only are you pure but you're superior. Hitler actually said that it was better to be a street cleaner in Germany - than a king in another country. Because the Germans were a superior race, they were the Master Race. Very seductive, very appealing. You are pure, you're perfect. [higher] Now matter how low you might think you are, you are better than people in other countries because you - are - German.

Very appealing, very appealing on a personal level - and also very appealing on the level that Germany is great but he's going to make it even better. [listing tone] He is going to solve all the problems. If you haven't had a job, you'll have a job under Hitler. If you haven't got food, you'll have food under Hitler. All these ideas are going on, so you close your mind to the nasty stuff - and just go for the stuff that is appealing. So, we've got that people were being indoctrinated at school. What about religion, how were the Germans persuaded to believe in the idea of the master race through religion? Yes?

S: They were told there were two sides to the Old Testament, and that God had a special people.

T: They were told that the idea that the Jews were God's chosen people was false and that actually, if you looked at the Bible properly, God had a special purpose for the Aryans, for the Aryan super-race. Good. And also they were told that Hitler played a key part in this - pretty horrible - in God's purpose for the Aryans.

S: Is Germany, were they religious? Was it a religious country?

T: They were quite a religious country, yes.

S: Were they Church of England?

T: More Catholic. Well, a *mixture,* but a lot of Catholics in Germany at that point. But a mixture. It wouldn't be Church of England, it was the Lutherans, who are Protestants.

S: Did they not realise that Jesus was a Jew? All the religion in the Bible came from the Jews.

T: *Yes,* but you see it was all twisted. And let's be honest, how many people - actually - read - the Bible? So they were *told* that actually what the Bible was saying was not that the Jews were the chosen race - which is what the Bible *does* say - but they were told that really the *Aryans* were the chosen race.

S: Was Hitler trying to blind them to get power?

T: [sigh] I don't know, Scott. I think that Hitler obviously came to believe it because he became a megalomaniac, convinced in his own superiority. A megalomaniac, so that he was power mad, power becomes everything. So probably initially he appreciated that this wasn't exactly true, in fact was a downright lie, but he did actually come to believe in it. [higher] And I don't think we should get away from the fact that people didn't have *access* to enough information to make considered opinions anyway. I mean, the information that was available within Germany after Hitler came to power was exactly what Hitler wanted people to know. Remember, the radio sets were only able to pick up signals from within Germany, so they weren't - exposed to things like the World Service or the Voice of America which would give them an opposite point of view. They were constantly told through news, through radio, Hitler's ideas and that this was the way to go and that everything in Germany was wonderful. Access to phones would be incredibly limited, no internet, nothing like that. So eventually you will persuade people. And you've got to remember that some people probably hadn't got the intellectual ability to look at it properly anyway, and they would be the most easily brainwashed. And then you've got the part that fear is playing, that people are gradually becoming aware that to oppose Hitler and the Nazis is a very risky thing to do. Okay, question 3. Oh, hold on. We mentioned paintings and sculptures and posters, didn't we, that they are all made out to promote this idea of the super race. Question 3: What were the physical characteristics of members of the Master race? Marina?

S: They were big, strong, tall, and they had blond hair and blue eyes.

T: Yeah, good. Men were tall, strong, fair hair, blue or grey eyes.

S: Men were good fighters, and women were fertile and had babies.

T: Women were fertile, definitely. And women were also submissive.

S: No mental or physical disability.

T: No mental or physical disabilities, good. Okay, question 4: What is eugenics? Let's have somebody who hasn't answered yet. What is eugenics, Alice?

S: Doing away with people, so that you only get people who are desirable.

T: Right, good, good. It's the study of *race,* in a sense. It's methods of improving the quality of the human race, so that you only get people with desirable characteristics. This is largely going to be achieved through selective breeding, only allowing people to mate with people who are also of desirable characteristics. - How was selective breeding going to be achieved, Drew?

S: Was it these places that they set up for the SS?

T: Yes.

S: Approved women were allowed to go.

T: And what was that programme called?

S: Lebensborn.

T: Good. The Lebensborn programme was one way. Scott?

S: Minorities were not to reproduce with Aryans.

T: They banned any sort of sexual intercourse between Aryans and non-Aryans, and particularly between Aryans and Jews. They actually also had these race *farms* as well. Question 6: Who were the minorities in Nazi Germany? Caroline, who were the minorities?

S: Jews, gypsies, insane people, tramps, beggars and alcoholics. [T: Good.] And Slavs.

T: The Slavs were slightly different, in that they were regarded as sub-human but slightly better than the Jews. They weren't out to exterminate the Slavs, they were going to use them as slave labour. And homosexuals. They were groups that in any way threatened the purity - of the Aryan - race. Okay, so why were they treated as social outcasts? Nick?

S: Because the Nazis wanted to get rid of them, to keep the race pure.

T: Yes, the Nazis wanted to keep the race pure and they wanted to avoid any danger of polluting or diluting the race, so they wanted them to be seen as outcasts, not somebody you mixed with or have any dealings with. Scott.

S: They were different as well, they stood out.

T: Umm, *would* they, though? Would they necessarily stand out?

S: The Jews had badges.

T: The *Jews* would stand out, once they were made to wear badges. But if you remember back to that video, how that woman said that her friend, although he was Jewish, was actually blond and looked a perfect Aryan. And so walked into a café which said that Jews were not welcome and then said 'Oh I'm sorry, I've made a mistake.' But he was disappeared, wasn't he.

Question 8: What forms of persecution did they suffer – consider each group separately. Gypsies, Drew?

S: They were forbidden to travel and were not allowed to breed or have families.

T: Right, good. And what happened to them in the end?

S: They basically got wiped out like the Jews.

T: Yeah. Well, they weren't wiped out, but he attempted to wipe them out with the Jews. They were sent to extermination camps. Kerry, what about tramps and beggars?

S: They were sterilised and taken off the street and made to work.

T: Right, good. So put to forced labour. What were they called, tramps and beggars?

S: Community aliens.

T: Community aliens, good. Caroline, what about alcoholics?

S: They had their heads shaven and persistent offenders were sent to concentration camps.

T: Right. So their heads were shaven, persistent offenders were sent to concentration camps. Why were their heads shaven, what was the purpose of this?

S: Humiliate them.

T: Yeah, to humiliate them.

S: Why would it humiliate them?

T: Well, because then if you were walking round with a shaven head, everybody would say you were an alcoholic. It's to make you good – after the war, women who were seen as collaborators with the Germans in occupied countries, their heads were shaven so that they stood out as people who had slept with Germans or been friendly with Germans.

S: That happened in *Band of Brothers*.

T: Did that happen in *Band of Brothers*? Hmm, I've not seen this *Band of Brothers*. What about the insa::ne, Pam?

S: They were given injections.

T: Right, lethal injections. Right, good. You can see here - on all of these that there is a progression. In some ways the first stage is an ostracising, making them a social outcast, or making them stand out in some way so that people can see that they are different. Then you've got sterilising, sterilising so that there is no danger of them breeding with Aryan people. And then you've got the third stage, which is actually eliminating them altogether. When we come on to look at the treatment of the Jews you will see that there are stages in the treatment of the Jews as well. It's an *escalation.* Why do you think that the treatment is carried on like this, what's happening here? Why don't they just walk in and shoot the lot of them? Drew?

S: It's like a build up, so that you get everybody's support. If you like give propaganda to someone, and they start to accept it, you take it a little bit further and they accept that, and they just keep on accepting it. If you go straight to the last level, they don't accept it. It's like you can gradually introduce something to someone, but you can't like do it quickly.

T: Good. You're right. Kerry?

S: If you just go in and kill everyone, there is more of a risk of war –

T: Or rebellion. If they had just gone in and killed them – if somebody walked in here today and said ‘Right, six of you are social outcasts. You’ve got dark hair, or grey eyes or something. And you are going to be taken outside and *shot,*’ I would *hope* that the rest of us would try and do something about it. But if it’s a gradual escalation then, as Drew said, you get people to accept each stage and it’s a gradual build up. Also think about it from another perspective, Mark, that Hitler and the Nazis were, in a sense, testing the water. If people accepted the first stage they would move on to the second stage, and if the second stage were accepted they would move on to the third stage. By the time you get to the third stage, the Nazis are all-powerful anyway and so opposing them is a very dangerous thing to do. Alice?

S: With the Jews, though, in the end they needed a quick solution - because it was war time and they would have to kill them ...

T: There is some suggestion that they were actually trying to send the Jews all to – Madagascar, wasn’t it? Trying to send the Jews away to live in a place on their own, but they were backed into a corner by the war. It’s a very difficult one, and there are various schools of thought over this amongst historians, because you’ve got to weigh against this Hitler’s statements in *Mein Kampf* that he intends to kill them all anyway. In a sense from the start Hitler is saying ‘I’m going to kill them.’ But the argument is, would he have done that if there hadn’t been war. There is also arguments between historians as to whether he intended war from the start or not.

S: If he hadn’t, would he have written *Mein Kampf*?

T: Um, I don’t know. He may well have done.

S: It’s a massive thing, like the Bible, wasn’t it?

T: Well, it as seen by them as being like the Bible. It’s a load of rambling mish-mash if you ever look at it; it’s a mess. [undistinguishable comments from students] Historians are called ‘intentionalists’ and ‘structuralists’ over Hitler. The argument is: did Hitler actually intend these things all along, and have a master plan that he was carrying through or to some extent, was he overtaken by events like the war? [Student comment] No, but then if you said it was *intentionalist,* you could say that once he went to war nobody was going to stop him. If he had done it sooner, that perhaps international opinion would have come against him but, once he was at war and had taken over countries, by the time he had brought in the Final Solution – he’d actually occupied Poland and large parts of Eastern Europe, so nobody could stop him. And he could also do it quite quietly and secretly to begin with. I mean, places like Auschwitz, they moved all the inhabitants of Auschwitz *out* - and constructed the extermination camp. So you can argue both ways, Alice. There is actually evidence on both sides. But it’s a good point to make, but be aware that he did say all along that he was going to kill them. Right, so the Jews themselves – what happened to the Jews?

S: Exterminate, exterminate!

T: Drew, sensible responses please. What happened to the Jews, what happened initially? What happened to them on Kristallnacht, for instance? You saw that on the video.

S: Broken glass.

T: Their property was destroyed or their property was confiscated. What about the Jews themselves, what happened to them? Yes.

S: They had to wear badges.

T: They had to wear badges, yes. What about physically, what sort of physical abuse did they have?

S: They were beaten up.

T: Yes. So first of all they were beaten up. They were made to wear badges, treated as outcasts. Kerry?

S: They were banned from everywhere, and had less rations than anyone else.

T: They were banned from everywhere, not even allowed to sit on the same park bench as Aryans, not allowed to use the same swimming pools. Not allowed to go to school or university. They lost their jobs, - they lost their *homes.* Where were they forced to live?

S: Ghettos.

T: Right. They were forced to live in ghettos. Under the Nuremberg Laws they lost their rights as citizens, they were no longer entitled to be German citizens. In a sense this meant then that anyone could do anything they liked to a Jew and would not be punished for it.

S: What if Jews revoked their religion?

T: It wouldn't do you any good. Because like, the girl in the video, she wasn't actually a practising Jew, she was a Christian. But because her *father* was Jewish, she was still classed as a Jew. There were various categories of Jews, like quarter-Jews and half-Jews and eighth-Jews, and what have you, but yeah. It depended on whether one of your grandparents, or two of your grandparents, or your great-grandmother or whatever. Eventually this led to - well, the whole thing is known as the Holocaust, but eventually this led to the Final Solution.

S: There must have been loads of people who had a bit of Jew somewhere, most of Germany.

T: No, not really, because actually the number of Jews in Germany was quite small. [pause] The Jews became much more of an issue once Hitler started invading east, so there were huge numbers of Jews in Poland and in Russia, - but in Germany itself they were very much a minority group. Question 9 we've already answered, which is 'Who were called Community Aliens?' which is tramps and beggars. Question 10: Why would many Jewish people find themselves confused - about the real intentions of the Nazis? Matthew?

S: It is because they told them they were going to be re-homed, and they when they got on the trains they went to the concentration camps.

T: That's very true, that when they went to the concentration camps they were told they were going to be relocated, rehoused in the East, and then when they got there they were killed. Marina?

S: Is it because they weren't persecuted like consistently throughout the years when Hitler came to power? And in 1936 during the Games they weren't persecuted -

T: Good. Yeah. It wasn't a consistent persecution. So things seemed to be very bad - and then - so like in 1933 and 1934, Hindenburg, who was still President, stopped some of the more extreme measures against the Jews. Then in 1935 you had the Nuremberg Laws which made things very bad. But like Marina said, during the 1936 Olympics, all persecution stopped. Why? Kerry?

S: So that other people coming into the country wouldn't see what was going on.

T: Right. Because Hitler wanted to keep it quiet at this stage, he didn't want it to be obvious to visitors from outside what was happening to the Jews. It was all quietly done. But then, in

1937, there was *more* persecution, and in 1938 there was Kristallnacht. Then you've got the business that Matthew was talking about, where the Jews were told they were going to be resettled, which was followed - by - the Final Solution.

S: What was Kristallnacht?

T: Kristallnacht, and I know we're going to be looking at it in more detail, if you remember on the video it was the night when they smashed the synagogues, smashed Jewish shops, burned loads of synagogues. The reason it was called Kristallnacht was because there was so much broken glass on the ground that it looked like crystals shining in the light of the fires. So it was called Kristallnacht.

S: When I went on the German exchange we went into one of the synagogues that survived that day. It hadn't survived, but it was still standing. Everybody thought it was like a massive *gift,* so they rebuilt it.

T: Hmm, that would be interesting. Where was that?

S: In Augsburg(?), I think. I think it was that. I know it survived some massive thing, so I think it must have been that.

T: It would probably be Kristallnacht, yeah. Right, what I want you to do - is to have a look at these two handouts now. I've given you this 'From boycott to destruction' one because it gives you a - timeline, effectively, of the various - things that were done to the Jews, starting in April 1933 shortly after Hitler has come to power and when he orders a boycott of Jewish shops, doctors and lawyers. And going all the way through to June 1942, when you have the first mass gassings of Jews at Auschwitz concentration camp. And you can see that some of these are really awful things, - and then others of them seem horribly *petty,* just really out to turn the screw, like confiscating Jewish radio sets, not giving clothes coupons to Jews.

S: Clothes coupons?

T: With rationing in the war, you would need them to buy clothes. You not only needed money, you needed the coupons. They didn't get the coupons, so they couldn't buy clothes. All Jewish passports had to have the letter J stamped on them in red.

S: That is so evil.

T: I know.

S: Did they all have the same first name?

T: Yes. Women were called Sarah, and were men called Isaac or Israel? Israel.

S: What if an Aryan was called Sarah, you know?

S: There were Germans who were upset about that.

T: Well, by this point actually Germans aren't going to protest about anything, because if you do then you are treated the same as the Jews. [Brief aside to another teacher.] I'm not going to go through all of these, but I want you to take the time to look through them and see how this persecution built up, and also just how far-reaching it was and how it infiltrated every aspect of life for Jewish people. Now, what do you think - given this situation, how do you think that Jewish people would feel?

S: Slightly peeved.

T: Well, does that sum it up, really, Mark, 'slightly peeved'?

S: You can't really do it without using rather explicit words, can you.

T: Well, no, I think –

S: Isolated.

T: *Isolated,* yes, definitely.

S: You'd be hurt.

T: You'd be hurt, yeah, you've got Jewish people who've been living in the community who view themselves as totally German. Holding down in many cases very responsible posts – doctors, teachers, lawyers. If you remember, on the video you had that bit of cine film of the Jewish family who were obviously quite affluent, because how many –

S: What's cine film?

T: You've never heard of cine film? [laughing] It's a forerunner of video, okay? Moving pictures. There's loads of cine film of me when I was a little girl. Moving pictures without sound, home movies. Before video, back in the Dark Ages, people would take cine film of their families on outings and things like this. Now, given that this cine film was obviously taken in the 1930s, this must have been a very well-to-do family that you were seeing the pictures of, because hardly anybody would have had a cine camera in those days. So it's a picture of this obviously quite well-off, quite privileged family, they all look nicely dressed and everything else. And all of a sudden their lives - start - to be turned upside down. So yes, *isolated, hurt.* What else?

S: Angry?

T: Angry, definitely. What else? How would you feel if you were a Jewish mother or father, and you've got children, and these things are happening? How are you going to feel about this, Kerry?

S: Guilty that my kids are Jewish, and I might resent being Jewish.

T: You might resent the fact that you're Jewish. Do you think that would depend on how devout a Jew you were, how committed a Jew you were. Because if you weren't a very committed Jew then, yes, you may well feel like that. In fact you may well resent it very much if you don't regard yourself as a Jew, like the woman who was a Christian, and you are still being persecuted because you've got Jewish ancestry. But if you are a devout Jew ... Think about it from your own point of view now. Anybody here who is a committed Christian, would you turn against Christianity, or would you resent the people who are doing this to you?

S: That is so hard to say. It is, because you are not in that situation.

S: It depends on what kind of person you are.

T: It is very hard to say, you're right. And you're right, it does depend on what kind of person you are. But I think in a sense if you have got a very sincere faith –

S: If you were a devoted Jew, then you wouldn't, I don't think –

S: You would die for your cause, wouldn't you.

S: You'd question why they were so narrow-minded.

T: You would question why other people were so prejudiced against you, and I think that you would appreciate that actually this prejudice was totally wrong. It wasn't your Jewishness that was wrong, it was their opinion of it. Caroline.

S: Would you not question the whole religion, though – if *they* were wrong, why –

T: Now, I think that's a difficult one, yeah. And certainly, if we get a chance to watch *Genocide* through, there is a very moving passage in the film where one of the concentration camp survivors describes a lorry load of women being taken to the gas chamber and how one of the rabbis, one of the Jewish religious leaders, said 'God, see this, do something about this,' and nothing happened, and he said 'There is no God.' But you see, part of faith - is accepting - that there are some things that we don't understand. And so, you have to – people who were brought up as complete devout orthodox Jews, the actual belief in Judaism and their loyalty to Judaism was an *integral part of their lives,* completely. I accept your point, Kerry, and certainly less devout Jews or people who didn't consider themselves to be Jews but who were considered to be Jews because of their ancestry, may well resent this Jewishness. But I think probably real orthodox Jews - wouldn't turn against their Jewishness as much. Scott?

S: Weren't the Nazis more against what the stereotype of what the Jews looked like, less than the actual religion of Judaism?

T: Yeah, I don't think there was any real rationale behind it, about what you looked like or how you worshipped or anything else, it was basically that the Jews were a scapegoat for the Nazis. Hitler used the Jews to be blamed them for anything that was wrong in Germany.

S: Were they actually against the actual religion?

T: I don't think a lot of the Nazis understood the religion. They were just a *different group.* If you're going to pick on a scapegoat, then the most convenient one is a group that is different, that you can single out. And the Jews always tended to live in their own communities, so they could be seen as a separate group. And so it was easy to single them out. It's also building, as Kerry said before, on existing prejudices. There has been hatred of the Jews going back to medieval times and beyond, so it's building on that prejudice. And a lot of it is resentment and jealousy, because as a group the Jews *were* very successful. Very intelligent, very prosperous, successful businessmen. Often very successful lawyers, professional people, doctors. Think about people like – *Einstein* was a Jew, a very successful scientist. So there is a resentment there, and Hitler plays on all this. The Jews are a useful group, from that point of view. The thing that you must never forget in all this is just *how* a prejudice of some sort can be taken and twisted.

S: A jealousy.

T: Yes, a jealousy or a prejudice, and twisted - to such that it gets to genocide. Actually gets to outright genocide. That is why *today* in school we are extremely hard on anybody who we find making racist comments or racist remarks. People sometimes say ↑'Oh, it's only a name!' but that is the start, that's how it starts. If you tolerate it, it's like Hitler and his escalation. You think a name is okay, well then maybe a bit of pushing around is okay, maybe a bit of leaving out's okay. Maybe a bit of killing is okay. Zero tolerance is a much better approach to all this.

S: After the genocide and the Holocaust, were there much Jews left?

T: There were some left. The estimate was that, across Europe, there were 11 million Jews, and that included the Jews in Britain, because Hitler intended to take over Britain. And they killed six million.

S: Wasn't there a massive scare, that people never wanted to be Jews after that?

T: I don't think there was a massive scare, it's possible that some people maybe felt that they couldn't handle any more. But tied up with the end of the war you got the creation of the Jewish state in Israel. We can't give the time to this, but this is why the Jews have fought so hard for Israel and that this is a Jewish state, a Jewish homeland, which they hadn't had for generations.

S: You said there were 11 million Jews, and six million were killed. But those six million weren't all Jews, though. That lady –

T: Six million were killed. That lady would be classed as a Jew.

S: Out of those six million, not all were Jews.

T: Yes, but a lot would be. The Poles and the Russians would be classed as Jews. [softly] The thing is that we don't even actually know how many were killed, because a lot were killed that there were no records of.

S: Do you know how many were killed of other kinds of people?

T: I don't know, Kerry. I'll try and find out for you. There will never be an accurate figure because so many were killed. If you ever get the chance to go to Auschwitz, the walls at the entrances are just lined with pictures of the people who died. It really is horribly bizarre, but the Nazis actually kept quite stringent records in places like Auschwitz. But in other places, where they sent in Einsatzgruppen, which were assassination hit squads, they would just line people up and kill them, and very little record would be kept.

S: It's probably – if you take into account the number of people who were killed in the concentration camps, you've also got to take into account the people who were killed in the streets.

T: Yes, exactly. So it's a very vague number but, having said that, I don't think the six million is the relevance. I think what you've got to think about is that every one of those six million, seven million, whatever it was, was a *person.* I think you have to reduce this – not reduce it, you have to bring it to the level of one individual, one life lost. Like the people who were killed in the Twin Towers. You've got fathers - sons - brothers - husbands, and each of them is a life. It's their families and how their families are touched by that life. How many of you have seen *Schindler's List*? There is a really moving bit at the end when there is a group of people, and then it comes straight forward to the present day and goes into colour, and it's the memorial to Schindler in Israel. There is a whole line of people filing past it, and the people who are filing past are the descendants of the Schindler Jews. So it's not just the one person who is killed, particularly when this is somebody is young, but that that person could have gone on to achieve who knows what in their life? Maybe discovered a cure for cancer, maybe been a fantastic teacher, maybe been a wonderful actress. Maybe lived a totally ordinary but happy life. But they also had the potential to have children of their own, so those unborn children were effectively killed as well. People like Anne Frank, she would have grown up to marry and have her own children, they would have had children. If you kill one person, how many unborn generations are you also eliminating? That is something you have to remember. I think the six million is very hard to get your head round. Think of *one,* and then try and multiply that six million times. You can't do it. But at least if you can try and get your head round one you can see the enormity of what was done. [pause] Right, I want you to keep this and refer back to it, because it is quite useful stuff. I'd like you to look at this other handout, on 'Why did Hitler want to persecute the Jews and why was Hitler able to persecute the Jews?' I actually think the second one is probably the one I find hardest to get my head round. The first one, about why did he want to persecute the Jews, in some ways you can explain that through jealousy, madness, obsession. But the second one, 'Why was he able to do it?' I don't think I will ever understand why he was able to do it. Can you read the first paragraph, Drew.

S: (Reads about anti-Semitism in history. Jews being highly educated and having good jobs.)

T: Good. In the Middle Ages and later, the Jews were actually called 'Christ Killers,' they were seen to be the murderers - of - Christ. And there is an awful thing here, and I'm sure that if we could all delve far enough back in to the past of our own ancestors, we may well come across something that we would rather not know. Particularly in the years of the British Empire, Britons were not slow at treating other races badly. I'm not comparing them to Hitler here, but I'm saying that there are things in the past that have gone on that are not things to be proud of. But why should people today be held responsible for what somebody did?

S: Some people's grandparents are racist because they've grown up like that.

T: Yes. But should you be held responsible? If you think about German people today, we should never hold German people today responsible for what their fathers or grandfathers did in the war! You are not guilty, and this idea of calling people 'Christ Killers,' saying Christ was murdered by – in fact it was the Romans who actually carried out the crucifixion. They said that the Jews agreed to Christ being killed way back in 33 AD and so today the Jews are to blame. Scott?

S: What was that about Darwin?

T: Darwin's theories of evolution were part of this idea of the survival of the fittest, and eugenics. Darwin saw the thing of survival of the fittest, but Darwin wasn't racist. Darwin wasn't using survival of the fittest in a racial way, but people used it to support their own prejudice. It gave this *false scientific* background to their basic prejudice. Okay, next bit, Mark.

S: (Reads handout on how Hitler tapped into this anti-Semitic aspect of German culture. Hitler had had a dismal time trying to make a living as an artist, having the artistic temperament but none of the talent. Rejected by Academy, lived little better than a tramp from 1909 to 1913. Had interest in politics, and published anti-Semitic articles in papers. Blamed Jews for all that was wrong with the world.)

T: So in a lot of this you can see this jealousy coming in, that while Hitler was basically a tramp in Vienna he saw wealthy Jews and started to resent it, started to latch on to this. And with this mish-mash of bits of philosophy, bits of ideas picked up from here and there, he gets into this hatred of the Jews, which builds on the existing prejudices. Okay, Marina, can you read the next bit.

S: (Circumstances had helped Hitler.)

T: That was the Versailles Treaty, and the stab in the back is what? Ending the war in the November. Remember the November Criminals, the people who had signed the surrender in November 1918. Go on, Marina.

S: (Economic problems of early 1930s. Combined these with his anti-Semitism and produced his doctrine of hatred. Offered simple solution to problems Germany faced. Hitler did not set out to eliminate all Jews, process happened gradually.)

T: People got to the stage of thinking that maybe they didn't quite like this, but most of what Hitler was doing is perfect and this is just a bit of a down-side. And they never had really liked the Jews, so – pretty horrible, isn't it? Right, I've got some work I'd like you to do for next lesson. You need to have a look at these handouts again, and the textbook pages 54 to 55. Make notes under these heading. It's best to divide it up into these stages, which it does in the textbook anyway, so it makes it easier. Use your textbook and the handouts to help you.

MR. DOW
Haig and the Battle of the Somme (simulation)

29 October 2001 (Mon. 10-11 am)

Year 9 (mixed ability)

2 handouts

T: We're going to be going into the computer room today. We are going to be doing a simulation on the Battle of the Somme, to see if you can make decisions which are going to alter the outcome of the war. We looked at the battle last lesson before half term. What did we find out about the battle? How many men died?

S: Over 60,000 on the first day.

T: Right, over 60,000. [pause] The battle was in 1916, massive death and injury toll on the first day.

S: The men were like under-motivated because William Haig had like killed all of them before.

T: Not *William* Hague! He's the Conservative. [laughter] *General* Haig. That's a brilliant point about the soldiers being unmotivated, and that is a crucial factor. If you're not feeling up for the battle, up for going over the top, then you're going to be doing it half-heartedly and you're going to feel like a victim. But why was there *such* a big death toll? Can anyone remember why?

S: 'Cause they kept going over the top even though they weren't accomplishing anything.

T: So why didn't they accomplish anything? Continue.

S: 'Cause the Germans were shooting them down like flies, and they had big machine guns.

T: They were cut down because the Germans had machine guns across No Man's Land. The British knew they were going to be there, so what did they do to try and get rid of these machine guns? Hands up, please.

S: They bombed them.

T: Right, yeah. They bombed the *hell* out of them, for days on end they were raining down shells on the positions, but they weren't successful. *Why* were the big guns not successful?

S: Because they had concrete trenches which they went inside.

T: They were dug-outs rather than trenches. Now the whole point of the Somme was to try and make a breakthrough. There was this line of trenches running from Belgium right through down to Switzerland. [draws picture on board] And they had been stopped there since 1914, so we are two years into the war exactly, and they are trying to make push through where the Somme passes over the front-line.

S: Why at the Somme?

T: Just because they felt the Germans might be weak there and they could concentrate them there.

S: I mean, why was it called the Somme?

T: Oh, because of the river. And why did they call the river the Somme? Don't know.

S: When they dug the trenches, wouldn't they get shot when they were digging the first ones they dug?

S: Is it true that they dug from like, behind?

T: Occasionally, but basically they would dig them at night and dig them out of the way of the enemy to start with. You can dig over here when the enemy is over there, but some of them did get killed while digging trenches certainly. Go on, George.

S: Is it true that they'd go for a whole forward [?], so it goes like way back.

T: Yeah, they'd gradually move up, yeah. Right, we're going to focus on this guy today. We're looking at General Haig. This battle can be seen as nothing but a failure, where up to a million men on both sides were lost. Three-quarters of those were the British and the French soldiers, mainly British. They didn't make much progress, they only made about seven miles in total, so it seems to have failed. But then we look at the next battle, Passchendaele in 1917, and that did exactly the same thing. Now we're going to see here, it is easy to criticise in hindsight for their decisions, but it's not as easy as that. The target is there, we've got so many men. We've got to come up with strong reasons why we can criticise him, so we look at the situation he was in and say "He should have done this." If we can't find an alternative then it's difficult to criticise.

S: After the war, wasn't he made like an earl and didn't he set up a *charity*?

T: I don't know, I haven't heard that. I don't know about the charity, it's an interesting point, though. Go on, Martin.

S: Didn't he meet his objectives, his own objectives?

T: [hurried] Well, Britain won the war in the end, so that was his primary objective. But he didn't break through in the Somme and get through the German lines. No he didn't, no. We were going to quickly look to see what the situation was before the battle. Look on the sheet. It says, "After the failure of the Germans to defeat the Allies in August 1914 the war on the Western Front virtually came to a stand-still. Both sides dug lines of trenches which stretched from the Belgian coast to the Swiss border, each side then tried to break through the enemy's trenches. The attack on the Somme was an attempt by the British and French to break through the German trenches either side of the River Somme. Events however did not go according to plan." The diagram at the bottom of your page is what the plan was. You've got the British on the left, who were supposed to be going across No Man's Land where the wire had already been cut at night, the German trenches were supposed to have been destroyed by the bombardment. The fortified villages behind the German trenches were supposed to have been destroyed as well. The artillery fire was guided where to fire by aircraft who would fly over the German lines, and then they destroyed the German artillery. The idea was that in a week they would have taken *all* of the German lines. But if you look at the top of that page it says "The Germans knew that the British were going to attack because of mistakes made by the British commanders who sent the troops a Good Luck message which the Germans picked up. The artillery bombardment before the infantry attack was *not* successful. It had been intended that the bombardment would break the German barbed wire, destroy their trenches and kill the soldiers. It did none of these things, because the German trenches were too deep and strong. Also the British artillery was of poor quality, many of the shells were duds and the guns were dangerous and sometimes would explode, killing the crews who loaded them. The crews became known as the Suicide Club. Spotter planes were used to spot the German targets and locate them for British artillery, however low cloud and mist reduced the area of visibility (so they couldn't fly, basically), and when the bombardment stopped, the British soldiers went over the top, the German defences and artillery were still intact. The British soldiers were mown down by machine gun fire as they walked across No Man's Land." Right, that's the situation then. This is what we you are are going to fill in as we do the computer simulation to see if you can beat Haig. At the bottom of the sheet you can see the toll on the

first day: 40,000 injured or taken prisoner, 20,000 deaths. Your target is to beat that figure. The record is that someone got it down to 27,000 injured and casualties and down to 13,000 deaths. What you're going to do is that you have decisions to make as you go through. The battle is divided into five sectors. What you've got to do is decide how you're going to divide your troops. You've got the bombardment first of all. Are you going to spread your bombardment equally? You've got 2,000 artillery so you can divide that up between these five sectors. You could have all 2,000 guns placed on Sector 3 or you could divide it equally and have 250, 250, 500 – you can decide how you're going to divide it. You can decide how many days bombardment: you can have up to seven days bombardment, but the drawback to that is that it means seven days when the Germans know you're coming. You bombard too much and they are going to prepare for it, if you bombard too little then you're not going to destroy them. Then decision 2: explosive mines. You've got ten mines to, again, divide. You could have ten mines all in Sector 4, and nothing in the others, or you could have two in each. You decide when you're going to detonate your mines: just before the attack, during the attack, several days before the attack. Where are you going to put your infantry: that's decision number 3. Again you could divide it. You've got 17 battalions, with 2,000 men in each battalion. And when do you attack? Do you attack at night, at dawn, during the day? You have to think about when is the best time. And then *how* to attack. That's Decision 4. You have different ways of attack. You've got the British trenches over here, and then you've got the German trench over here. If you attack in a wave formation [DR draws sketch on board -- see notes], you have lines of soldiers like waves going across, with equal divisions between the different waves. Send a thousand men over, then you send the next thousand over, and we go across in waves. You could have varying spaces between them, one way ahead and then a gap to the next two. Or you can send over rushes of men [illustrates], men in a group in different places in a not very organised rush, not in a consistent line. Then Decision 5 is how do you use your artillery. There are two kinds. You can say, "We are going to attack at 7 a.m., and the artillery bombardment is going to stop at 6.59," so you set it by the clock. So you send the artillery over until nearly 7.00, and then the artillery stops and the men come out and charge over the top. That is setting a fixed time for the artillery stopping. The most dangerous method, but more effective, is called 'creeping barrage' [illustrates]. If you use this first method, as soon as the artillery stops the Germans would come out of their dug outs and into their trenches and man the machine guns, so they've got a few minutes before you get across. If you use a creeping barrage, you keep the bombardment going as you advance and if you are here, your artillery shells are landing there. When your men get to here, the artillery shells advance and land there.

S: They'll have to be careful they don't hit their men, won't they.

T: That's the danger.

S: If you want to.

T: Well, it depends. Communication is going to be dotty. Communication usually goes, under attack.

S: I'll get on better than him.

T: Well, they haven't. Believe me, they haven't. So all you need is this sheet, you need a pen, and you can work in pairs. [They move to computer room.] Log yourselves on. Right, look this way please. Go from Start to Programmes, go to Humanities, then go to Place – Battle of the Somme, then Play – Simulation. When it asks if you want an Introduction, go Yes. The instructions are here.

S: Do you see blood?

T: No, no you don't. The graphics aren't brilliant. It's not like a computer game; it's not that advanced.

S: Is it a cartoon or does it look like real men?

T: Cartoon thing. [to another group] So you're going for three?

S: Yeah, 'cause they said it'd be three days before the Russians organised their army.

T: Well, the Russians are already fighting by this time, so I wouldn't worry about the Russians here. Take what Haig did. You know he got it wrong, so if you're the same as him, that's going to be bad news. You've got to try to alter it from him.

[lots of background excitement]

(Kids argue they need volume; T says they don't, it's just a little whiz-bang. T explains to a different group what the red line represents, what they have to do. Reminds them to check what Haig did – he had a five-day bombardment.

T: [again] A good thing is to check what Haig did each time. 'Cause you know he got it wrong, so if you do the same as him, that's going to be more damaging to you.

[T moves around to different groups, observes that one group is dividing its strength into three. Helps with use of program, what the choices are.

T: If you fire on all three, the impact is spread out. If you fire on one, you'll create more damage on one. A good thing to click on is to see what Haig did. We know he got it wrong, so look for an alternative.

S: I'm not very good at this.

T: It's tough. 'Cause your problem is you're attacking, and they are just waiting there. And it's difficult to beat them when they're just waiting. If they were attacking, then they would be the ones who were losing the men.

.....

T: See what Haig did; what did he do? Haig always attacked at dawn, so they always expected him at dawn.

[T points out that one group is assuming too many men in its ranks. Helps another group analyse its mistakes, why losing it in sectors 4 and 5. "Oh dear." Helps a group see that the 3-day bombardment wasn't quite enough.]

T: It's [program] telling you why it didn't work: they expect it, they knew you were coming. It'll give you your death toll, you're trying to beat theirs. I don't think you've done it. So you've managed 62,000 casualties, 31,000 deaths.

S: Can we go for the highest?

T: No. Try and beat it, you've done appallingly there. So write down your scores, and see if you can do it. Red is the German attack and green is you. So you've lost pretty badly.

S: [different student] We shouldn't be attacking the trenches, we should go for the villages.

T: Okay, well so –

S: You're spreading yourself out there. Spreading yourself thin. Concentrate on something.

T: [next group] Are you done? [sees their score] That's not good, that's not good. [laughs] That's really bad! Okay, think about how you can change it, think about what decisions you made this time, and say "Right, *those* didn't work, so what are we going to go for that's going to improve your chances this time.

T: [next group] Check what Haig did. [pause] Think about what your main threat is. What is your main threat to your soldiers?

.....

S: We beat General Haig.

T: You beat him! [goes over to check] Oh wow. [to class] We've got our first people to beat Haig over here. Got 10,000 less than Haig on the casualties, 5,000 less on the deaths. Fantastic performance. Getting near the record there now. Do it again, see if you can beat it.

T: [to researcher] It's a limited program, it's quite good at some things, but – [attention distracted]. The comparison with the modern graphics they get on the PlayStation games is huge, so it's a little pedestrian for them.

[students comes up to T to report score]

T: Wow! Wow. Very close. You're about second place there now.

S: [different student] If we put more shells on there and there, and more soldiers there and there?

T: Oh, I see. Sort of balance it out. Yeah, good idea. Go for that.

S: [different student] They killed our guy!

T: Oh dear.

S: It's not fair.

T: Not fair. So what have you done different from last time?

S: We set a few more mines, we set a few more troops in the middle, we bombarded on different days at different times.

T: Right. So when are you going to attack?

.....

T: [answering student's question] People have been getting about sort of 42 or 41,000 in casualties, and then about 21-22,000 on the other. But the best one Peter and Maria got was 15,000 on this one, and 30,000 on that one.

S: Look what we got.

T: Wow, fantastic! Second place then. 32,000 and 16,000. Brilliant.

S: Should we do it again?

T: Yeah, give it a go again. One more time, just enough time. [to class, loudly] Got someone else under Haig: 32,000 injuries and 16,000 deaths. Fiona and Abby.

.....

T: You beat it! Fantastic, third place. You beat it, that's amazing.

.....

S: [lets out a whoop] We won.

T: You beat it? Oh wow. Wow, yeah, you did. Third place. [announces] Someone else has beaten Haig now, four groups have beaten Haig. Tracy and Michelle over here. [after pause] Five minutes left now, five minutes to finish off. Log off when you're finished this one, and go back to the classroom.

S: Ha! Look at that!

T: You've done it. Fantastic! That is a new record, by a long way.

S: We've got a new record!

[Kids tell their classmates. For segments in computer room, see also my notes on program. Then, back in the classroom...]

T: Right at the end we got a new record of 10,000 deaths and 23,000 casualties and prisoners. Now, we need to find out what they did to break the record, first of all.

S: We only did a bombardment on one area, we did everything in the middle.

T: So you just pounded one area. Why do you think that worked and the other system didn't work?

S: They might have fought if we spread out.

T: Right. And you didn't advance in the other four sectors. So why didn't the Germans try and attack in Sectors 1, 2, 3 and 5? Why did they stay where they were?

S: 'Cause they didn't *have* to.

T: Why? Why aren't the Germans doing many attack?

T: Throughout the whole of the First World War the Germans didn't try and make many advances. There was only *one* big German attack, which was at Verdun. Mostly the Germans didn't attack. So why did the Germans just sit there waiting for the British attacks? Kathleen.

S: Is it because they thought if the British wasted all their ammunition on them, they can just wait?

T: Yeah, exactly. They can just take their time with the British, 'cause they know the British are getting heavier losses, and the French as well, if you remember. They're going to wear the British and French down earlier. Why did the Germans feel able to defend their positions, why are they feeling fairly happy with the situation they're in now?

S: 'Cause they've got those dugouts.

T: They had some strong trenches dug out. And where are the Germans?

S: Is it that village?

T: Not so specifically. Generally, why are they happy to stay where they are, and the French and the British *aren't* happy to stay where they were?

S: 'Cause they're already right in France.

T: The Germans are half-way through France and they can just sit and wait there and the British will eventually wear themselves down. Now after that, how can we criticise Haig? What can we criticise him for? Hands up, please. Most of you lost more men than Haig, many of you lost 20 or 30,000 *more* men than Haig lost, so on what grounds can we criticise Haig?

S: He like rushed into his plans, he didn't think of any strategies, of like what the Germans were doing.

T: Fantastic. So he *rushed in.* So we can accuse Haig of rushing in. What else can we criticise him for?

S: He didn't run the simulation properly!

T: [laughs] He said he didn't run the computer simulation properly. What else can we say about Haig, after that?

S: He didn't change tactics.

T: Didn't change. Okay, he didn't change tactics, he almost always attacked at dawn.

S: We probably would have done it better if we were paid to do it like he was – we would sit around for hours.

T: Well, the thing you've got to remember about all this is that this is not a game on a computer, this is human lives. We are talking about 50,000 people here who were killed or injured. It was a big responsibility on that man. He was responsible for the death of 20,000 men in one day, and it doesn't matter how thick-skinned you are, that will have some effect on you, surely. And some decisions made now by President Bush and the Prime Minister –

S: [...]

T: So what should we say about President Bush bombing Afghanistan now, hitting the Taliban, but also hitting some Afghan civilians. Should we criticise him for what he's doing there?

S: He's not bombing the Afghani civilians like that. Yeah. What if the Afghans like just decided to come and bomb [our town] just like that? [murmuring]

S: But they can't.

T: Well, they got New York. They can. Go on, Stephen.

S: I know they've dropped bombs on us, but if President Bush is bombing all the little towns to get the soldiers that are hiding, why couldn't they do the same to England? All the little towns.

T: So you're saying that he's doing something he shouldn't be doing. A criticism. Okay. Martin.

S: You know, it was like Iraq, when they bombed Iraq. You had people in this country that are *paid* to look out for these things and to like keep our intelligence. And they said they'd tried sending like the electric bombs over. You've got people *paid* so they can pick up stuff like they're trying to bomb us. There are people in Intelligence who are paid, and what happened was that the Americans knew that they were coming, the Israelis told them they were coming.

T: For the attack on New York?

S: Yeah. The Israelis said, 'Look you've got to watch their back now, 'cause the Taliban have suicide bombers.'

T: But it wasn't [...], was it?

S: And they said, 'No, we won't get attacked, we're America, we're great.'

T: Yeah. Heidi, what were you going to say?

S: Had America thought about it, they've done the easy bit, the bombing – I think they should stop bombing them and do something else now.

S: Well, Tracy said they're going to come across and bomb us. They haven't even got the bombs –

T: No, she was saying they should do.

S: – of other countries. Half the people in Afghanistan are part of the Taliban. You don't know who is part of the Taliban regime. They *all* were.

T: Not all of them.

S: In Afghanistan, they're all part of the Taliban.

T: No, that's not true. [hubbub] Just to finish off now, how would the average American or British soldier who might be going into Afghanistan or has gone already, how might feel they feel about going into Afghanistan? What kind of feelings do you think they're going to have? Kathleen.

S: I know people who were caught in the Trade Center, [...] is that a *person.* And I would think, oh yeah, I've got to do that. They're just thinking that they can come along and like fly a plane into one of the biggest – well, actually, hang on a minute! If everyone's saying, "Oh, you can't bother," how can they have any control of their people?

T: So you're saying we're doing the right thing by going in there. How would you feel, going back to 1915, how would you feel if you were a British soldier, up against the Germans in the trenches? How would you feel in that Battle of the Somme?

S: I'd feel in the Battle of the Somme, like really down, like I was going to die, so might as well [inaudible; class laughs]. But if I was an RAF soldier, you don't get the FAF (?) easily –

T: So you're feeling happy because you haven't got much time to die in.

S: Because you've got more experience than the Taliban, and imperial weaponry.

T: But did British soldiers feel it was the *right* thing to do, to fight Germany.

S: The thing is, like, you've been taught to live with them.

T: Okay. Peter, is it the right thing to do? 1916, Battle of the Somme. Are you doing the right thing?

S: The thing is, a lot of people there didn't actually have a real reason, or like Martin's, to fight. But like the people in America, a lot of them are going to be like really up for it because they're going to be thinking of all their people that died.

T: That's a good point to make. The average American soldier now would know what was happening. How much would the average British soldier understand about why he was fighting? He is out in the middle of the Battle of the Somme going "What the hell am I doing here? What's happened?" Does he know about the arms race, does he know about the alliance system? It's stuff we know about, but the British average soldier is not going to know a great deal about that. He knows that Germany has invaded France but he could say "That's just not my problem." People started to become *demotivated* because they were thinking, "We're not there for the right reason," and that is going to cause problems. That was a problem for Haig, how is he going to *make* his men feel motivated? One thing that generals do is they visit the men at the front, Haig very rarely did that. Haig wasn't a big one for visiting the men and cheering them up. ■

Bibliography

- Anderson, C. W. (1989, February 24). *Policy implications of research on science teaching and teachers' knowledge*. Paper presented at the NCRTE Seminar for Education Policymakers: Competing Visions of Teacher Knowledge, Washington, DC.
- Argyris, C., & Schön, D. A. (1974). *Theory in Practice: Increasing Professional Effectiveness*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Ashby, R., & Lee, P. J. (1987). Children's concepts of empathy and understanding in history. In C. Portal (Ed.), *The History Curriculum for Teachers* (pp. 62-88). London: Falmer Press.
- Bailey, C. (1975). Knowledge of others and concern for others. In J. Elliott & R. Pring (Eds.), *Social Education and Social Understanding* (pp. 87-95). London: University of London Press.
- Bailyn, B. (1997). On the teaching and writing of history. *History Matters!*, 9(6), at <http://www.history.org/nche> (Archives). Accessed November 22, 2003.
- Bain, R. B. (2000). Into the breach: Using research and theory to shape history instruction. In P. N. Stearns & P. Seixas & S. S. Wineburg (Eds.), *Knowing, Teaching, and Learning History: National and International Perspectives* (pp. 331-352). New York: New York University Press.
- Ball, D. L. (2000). Bridging practices: Intertwining content and pedagogy in teaching and learning to teach. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 51(3), 241-247.
- Ball, D. L., & McDiarmid, G. W. (1990). The subject-matter preparation of teachers. In W. R. Houston (Ed.), *Handbook of Research on Teacher Education* (1st ed., pp. 437-448). New York: Macmillan.
- Barker, B. (1978). Understanding in the classroom. In A. K. Dickinson & P. J. Lee (Eds.), *History Teaching and Historical Understanding* (pp. 121-132). London: Heinemann.
- Barnes, A., & Thagard, P. (1997). Empathy and analogy, at <http://cogsci.uwaterloo.ca/Articles/Pages/Empathy.html>. Accessed November 22, 2003.
- Barnett, J., & Hodson, D. (2001). Pedagogical context knowledge: Toward a fuller understanding of what good science teachers know. *Science Education*, 85(4), 426-453.
- Barton, K. C. (1996). Narrative simplifications in elementary students' historical thinking. In J. Brophy (Ed.), *Advances in Research on Teaching: Vol. 6. Teaching and Learning History* (pp. 51-83). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Barton, K. C. (1997). "Bossed around by the queen": Elementary students' understanding of individuals and institutions in history. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, 12(4), 290-314.
- Barton, K. C., & Levstik, L. S. (1998). "It wasn't a good part of history": National identity and students' explanations of historical significance. *Teachers College Record*, 99, 478-513.

- Barton, K. C., & Levstik, L. S. (in press). *Teaching History for the Common Good (manuscript)*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Beattie, A. (1987). *History in Peril: May Parents Preserve It*. London: Centre for Policy Studies.
- Ben-Peretz, M. (1995). An essay-review of 'Making Sense of Teaching'. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 11(1), 103-106.
- Berliner, D. C. (1986). In pursuit of the expert pedagogue. *Educational Researcher*, 15(7), 5-13.
- Berliner, D. C. (1988). *The Development of Expertise in Pedagogy*. Paper presented at the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, New Orleans, LA.
- Blake, C. (1998). Historical empathy: A response to Foster and Yeager. *International Journal of Social Education*, 13(1), 25-31.
- Boddington, T. (1980). Empathy and the teaching of history. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 28(1), 13-19.
- Boix-Mansilla, V. (2000). Historical understanding: Beyond the past and into the present. In P. N. Stearns & P. Seixas & S. S. Wineburg (Eds.), *Knowing, Teaching, and Learning History: National and International Perspectives* (pp. 390-418). New York: New York University Press.
- Booth, M. (1980). A modern world history course and the thinking of adolescent pupils. *Educational Review*, 32(3), 245-257.
- Booth, M. (1983). Skills, concepts, and attitudes: The development of adolescent children's historical thinking. *History and Theory*, 22(4), 101-117.
- Booth, M. (1994). Cognition in history: A British perspective. *Educational Psychologist*, 29(2), 61-69.
- Booth, M., Culpin, C., & Macintosh, H. G. (1987). *Teaching GCSE History*. London: Hodder and Stoughton.
- Breakwell, G. M. (2000). Interviewing. In G. M. Breakwell & S. Hammond & C. Fife-Schaw (Eds.), *Research Methods in Psychology* (2nd ed.). London: Sage.
- Bromme, R. (1987). Teachers' assessments of students' difficulties and progress in understanding in the classroom. In J. Calderhead (Ed.), *Exploring Teachers' Thinking* (pp. 125-146). London: Cassell.
- Brophy, J. (1996). Introduction. In J. Brophy (Ed.), *Advances in Research on Teaching: Teaching and Learning History, Vol. 6* (pp. 1-16). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Brophy, J. (Ed.). (1991). *Advances in Research on Teaching: Vol 2. Teachers' Knowledge of Subject Matter as it Relates to their Teaching Practice*. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Brown, S., & McIntyre, D. (1993). *Making Sense of Teaching*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Bruner, J. S. (1960). *The Process of Education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bryant, M. (1970). Documentary and study materials for teachers and pupils: Part II Theories and Practices. *Teaching History*, 1(4), 272-278.
- Burnett, R. E. (2001). *Karl Barth's Theological Exegesis: The Hermeneutical Principles of the Romerbrief Period*. Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck.

- Cairns, J. (1989). Some reflections on empathy in history. *Teaching History*, 55, 13-18.
- Calderhead, J. (1989). Reflective teaching and teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 5(1), 43-51.
- Carlsen, W. S. (1999). Domains of teacher knowledge. In J. Gess-Newsome & N. G. Lederman (Eds.), *Examining pedagogical content knowledge: The construct and its implications for science education*. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Kluwer.
- Carretero, M., Jacott, L., Limon, M., Lopez-Manjon, A., & Leon, J. A. (1994). Historical knowledge: Cognitive and instructional implications. In M. Carretero & J. F. Voss (Eds.), *Cognitive and Instructional Processes in History and the Social Sciences* (pp. 357-376). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Carter, K. (1990). Teachers' knowledge and learning to teach. In W. R. Houston (Ed.), *Handbook of Research on Teacher Education* (pp. 291-310). New York: Macmillan.
- Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, F. M. (1996). Teacher as curriculum maker. In P. W. Jackson (Ed.), *Handbook of Research on Curriculum* (pp. 363-401). New York: Macmillan.
- Claxton, G. (2000). The anatomy of intuition. In T. Atkinson & G. Claxton (Eds.), *The Intuitive Practitioner* (pp. 32-52). Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Clegg, A. A., Jr. (1991). Games and simulations in social studies education. In J. Shaver (Ed.), *Handbook of Research on Social Studies Teaching and Learning* (pp. 523-529). New York: Macmillan.
- Cochran, K. F., DeRuiter, J. A., & King, R. A. (1993). Pedagogical Content Knowing: An integrative model for teacher preparation. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 44(4), 263-272.
- Coffey, A., & Atkinson, P. (1996). *Making Sense of Qualitative Data: Complementary Research Strategies*. London: Sage.
- Collingwood, R. G. (1946). *The Idea of History*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press.
- Coltham, J., & Fines, J. (1971). *Educational Objectives for the Study of History (Pamphlet No. 35)*. Saffron Walden: The Historical Association.
- Connelly, F. M., Clandinin, D. J., & He, M. F. (1997). Teachers' personal practical knowledge on the professional knowledge landscape. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 13(7), 665-674.
- Cooper, H. (1994). Historical thinking and cognitive development in the teaching of history. In H. Bourdillon (Ed.), *Teaching History* (pp. 101-121). London: Open University Press.
- Cooper, P., & McIntyre, D. (1995). The crafts of the classroom: Teachers' and students' accounts of the knowledge underpinning effective teaching and learning in classrooms. *Research Papers in Education*, 10(2), 181-216.
- Cooper, P., & McIntyre, D. (1996). *Effective Teaching and Learning: Teachers' and Students' Perspectives*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Counsell, C. (1999). Teaching history. *History Today*, 49(11), 18-20.
- Counsell, C. (2000). Editorial. *Teaching History*, 100, 2.

- Cunningham, C. (1995). *The effect of teachers' sociological understanding of science on classroom practice and curriculum innovation*. Unpublished PhD, Cornell University.
- Darnton, R. (1984). *The Great Cat Massacre and Other Episodes in French Cultural History*. London: Allen Lane.
- Davis, O. L., Jr. (2001). In pursuit of historical empathy. In O. L. Davis, Jr. & E. A. Yeager & S. J. Foster (Eds.), *History Empathy and Perspective Taking in the Social Studies* (pp. 1-12). Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Davis, O. L., Jr., Yeager, E. A., & Foster, S. J. (Eds.). (2001). *Historical Empathy and Perspective Taking in the Social Studies*. Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Dawson, I., & Banham, D. (2002). Thinking from the inside: Je suis le roi. *Teaching History*, 108, 12-18.
- DES. (1985a). *GCSE: The National Curriculum for History*. London: HMSO.
- DES. (1985b). *General Certificate of Secondary Education - The National Criteria: History*. Southampton: HP Ltd.
- Deuchar, S. (1987). *History--and GCSE History*. London: Centre for Policy Studies.
- DfEE. (1999). National Curriculum Programme of Study for Citizenship (Key Stage 3), at <http://www.nc.uk.net/nc/contents/Ci-3--POS.html>. Accessed August 2, 2003.
- DfEE. (2000). National Curriculum Programme of Study for History (Key Stage 3), at <http://www.nc.uk.net/nc/contents/Hi-3--POS.html>. Accessed August 2, 2003.
- Dickinson, A. K. (1984). Assessment, examinations and historical understanding. In A. K. Dickinson & P. J. Lee & P. J. Rogers (Eds.), *Learning History* (pp. 187-209). London: Heinemann.
- Dickinson, A. K., Gard, A., & Lee, P. J. (1978). Evidence in history and the classroom. In A. K. Dickinson & P. J. Lee (Eds.), *History Teaching and Historical Understanding* (pp. 1-20). London: Heinemann.
- Dickinson, A. K., & Lee, P. J. (1978). Understanding and research. In A. K. Dickinson & P. J. Lee (Eds.), *History Teaching and Historical Understanding* (pp. 94-120). London: Heinemann.
- Dickinson, A. K., & Lee, P. J. (1984). Making sense of history. In A. K. Dickinson & P. J. Lee & P. J. Rogers (Eds.), *Learning History* (pp. 117-153). London: Heinemann.
- Downey, M. T. (1995). *Perspective taking and historical thinking: Doing history in a fifth-grade classroom*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.
- Downey, M. T., & Levstik, L. S. (1988). Teaching and learning history: The research base. *Social Education*, 52(5), 336-342.
- Downey, M. T., & Levstik, L. S. (1991). Teaching and learning history. In J. Shaver (Ed.), *Handbook of Research on Social Studies Teaching and Learning* (pp. 400-410). New York: Macmillan.
- Doyle, W. (1986). Classroom organisation and management. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of Research on Teaching - 3rd edition* (pp. 392-431). New York: Macmillan.

- Dulberg, N. (2002). *Engaging in history: Empathy and perspective-taking in children's historical thinking*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.
- Dunkin, M. J., Welch, A., Merritt, A., Phillips, R., & Craven, R. (1998). Teachers' explanations of classroom events: Knowledge and beliefs about teaching civics and citizenship. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 14(2), 141-151.
- Edexcel. (2000). Edexcel GCSE in History C - Schools History Project. At <http://www.edexcel.org.uk/VirtualContent/17830.pdf>, Accessed July 31, 2003.
- Edwards, A. D., & Furlong, V. J. (1978). *The language of teaching: Meaning in classroom interaction*. London: Heinemann Educational.
- Edwards, D., & Mercer, N. (1987). *Common Knowledge: The Development of Understanding in the Classroom*. London: Methuen.
- Elbaz, F. (1981). The teacher's "practical knowledge": Report of a case study. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 11(1), 43-71.
- Epstein, T. (1994). The arts of history: An analysis of secondary school students' interpretations of the arts in historical contexts. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, 9(2), 174-194.
- Eraut, M. (1995). Schön shock: A case for reframing reflection-in-action? *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, 1(1), 9-22.
- Eraut, M. (2000). Non-formal learning and tacit knowledge in professional work. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 70, 113-136.
- Fancourt, N. (2003). *Assessing Empathy (Unpublished Farmington Fellowship Report)*. Oxford: Farmington Institute.
- Feldman, A. (1997). Varieties of wisdom in the practice of teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 13(7), 757-773.
- Fenstermacher, G. D. (1994). The knower and the known: The nature of knowledge in research on teaching. *Review of Research in Education*, 20, 3-56.
- Field, S. L. (2001). Perspectives and elementary social studies: Practice and promise. In O. L. Davis, Jr. & E. A. Yeager & S. J. Foster (Eds.), *Historical Empathy and Perspective Taking in the Social Studies* (pp. 115-138). Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Foster, S. J. (1999). Using historical empathy to excite students about the study of history: Can you empathize with Neville Chamberlain? *The Social Studies*, 90, 18-24.
- Foster, S. J. (2001). Historical empathy in theory and practice: Some final thoughts. In O. L. Davis, Jr. & E. A. Yeager & S. J. Foster (Eds.), *Historical Empathy and Perspective Taking in the Social Studies* (pp. 167-181). Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Foster, S. J., & Yeager, E. A. (1998). The role of empathy in the development of historical understanding. *International Journal of Social Education*, 13(1), 1-7.
- Foster, S. J., & Yeager, E. A. (1999). "You've got to put together the pieces": English 12-year-olds encounter and learn from historical evidence. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, 14(4), 286-317.

- Gardner, H. (2003, April 21). *Twenty years of multiple intelligences: Reflections and a blueprint for the future*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.
- Geertz, C. (1973). *The Interpretation of Cultures*. New York: Basic Books.
- Gertner, J. (2003). The futile pursuit of happiness. *New York Times Magazine Online*, at <http://www.nytimes.com/2003/09/07/magazine/07HAPPINESS.html>, Accessed September 7, 2003.
- Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research*. New York: Aldine DeGruyter.
- Grossman, P. L., Wilson, S. M., & Shulman, L. S. (1989). Teachers of substance: Subject matter knowledge for teaching. In M. C. Reynolds (Ed.), *Knowledge Base for the Beginning Teacher* (pp. 23-36). Oxford: Pergamon.
- Gudmundsdottir, S. (1990). Curriculum stories: Four case studies of social studies teaching. In C. Day & M. Pope & P. Denicolo (Eds.), *Insight into Teachers' Thinking and Practice* (pp. 107-118). London: Falmer.
- Gudmundsdottir, S., & Shulman, L. (1987). Pedagogical content knowledge in social studies. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 31(2), 59-68.
- Gunning, D. (1978). *The Teaching of History*. London: Croom Helm.
- Guskey, T. R. (1986). Staff development and the process of teacher change. *Educational Researcher*, 15(5), 5-12.
- Hahn, C. L. (1994). Controversial issues in history instruction. In M. Carretero & J. F. Voss (Eds.), *Cognitive and Instructional Processes in History and the Social Sciences* (pp. 201-219). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Hallden, O. (1994). On the paradox of understanding history in an educational setting. In G. Leinhardt & I. L. Beck & C. Stainton (Eds.), *Teaching and Learning in History* (pp. 27-46). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Hallden, O. (1997). Conceptual change and the learning of history. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 27, 201-210.
- Hammersley, M. (1992). *What's Wrong with Ethnography: Methodological Explorations*. London: Routledge.
- Hammersley, M. (1998). *Reading Ethnographic Research: A Critical Guide* (2nd ed.). London: Longman.
- Harris, R. (2003). Empathy and history teaching - An unresolved dilemma? *Prospero*, 9(1), 31-38.
- Hashweh, M. Z. (1987). Effects of subject-matter knowledge in the teaching of biology and physics. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 3(2), 109-120.
- Hirst, P. H. (1974). Liberal education and the nature of knowledge. In P. Hirst (Ed.), *Knowledge and the Curriculum* (pp. 30-53). London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- HMI. (1985). *History in the Primary and Secondary Years: An HMI View*. London: HMSO.
- Holt, T. (1990). *Thinking Historically: Narrative, Imagination, and Understanding*. New York: College Entrance Examination Board.

- Hughes, M. (1995). *Historical Imagination and Education*. Unpublished DPhil, Oxford University.
- Husbands, C. (1996). *What Is History Teaching?: Language, Ideas and Meaning in Learning about the Past*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Husbands, C., Kitson, A., & Pendry, A. (2003). *Understanding History Teaching*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Husbands, C., & Pendry, A. (2000). Thinking and feeling: Pupils' preconceptions about the past and historical understanding. In J. Arthur & R. Phillips (Eds.), *Issues in History Teaching* (pp. 125-134). London: Routledge.
- Hvolbek, R. H. (1993). History and the humanities: Teaching as destructive of certainty. In R. Blackey (Ed.), *History Anew: Innovations in the Teaching of History* (pp. 3-9). Long Beach, CA: California State University Press.
- Jaworski, B. (1994). *Investigating Mathematics Teaching: A Constructivist Enquiry*. London: Falmer Press.
- Jenkins, K., & Brickley, P. (1989). Reflections on the empathy debate. *Teaching History*, 55, 18-23.
- John, P. D. (1991). The professional craft knowledge of the history teacher. *Teaching History*, 64, 8-12.
- Kagan, D. M. (1992). Professional growth among preservice and beginning teachers. *Review of Educational Research*, 62(2), 129-169.
- Knight, P. (1989a). A study of children's understanding of people in the past. *Educational Review*, 41(3), 207-219.
- Knight, P. (1989b). Empathy: Concept, confusion and consequences in a national curriculum. *Oxford Review of Education*, 15(1), 41-53.
- Knight, P. (1996). Research and the improvement of school history. In J. Brophy (Ed.), *Advances in Research on Teaching: Teaching and Learning History, Vol. 6* (pp. 19-50). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Labaree, D. F. (2000). On the nature of teaching and teacher education: Difficult practices that look easy. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 51(3), 228-233.
- Lampert, M. (1984). Teaching about thinking and thinking about teaching. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 16(1), 1-18.
- Landvogt, J. (2001). Affecting eternity: Teaching for talent development. *Roeper Review*, 23(4), 190-196.
- Lee, P. J. (1978). Explanation and understanding in history. In A. K. Dickinson & P. J. Lee (Eds.), *History Teaching and Historical Understanding* (pp. 72-93). London: Heinemann.
- Lee, P. J. (1983). History teaching and the philosophy of history. *History and Theory*, 22(4), 19-49.
- Lee, P. J. (1984a). Historical imagination. In A. K. Dickinson & P. J. Lee & P. J. Rogers (Eds.), *Learning History* (pp. 85-116). London: Heinemann.
- Lee, P. J. (1984b). Why learn history? In A. K. Dickinson & P. J. Lee & P. J. Rogers (Eds.), *Learning History* (pp. 1-19). London: Heinemann.
- Lee, P. J., & Ashby, R. (2001). Empathy, perspective taking, and rational understanding. In O. L. Davis, Jr. & E. A. Yeager & S. J. Foster (Eds.),

- Historical Empathy and Perspective Taking in the Social Studies* (pp. 21-50). Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Lee, P. J., Dickinson, A. K., & Ashby, R. (1997). "Just another emperor": Understanding action in the past. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 27, 233-244.
- Leinhardt, G. (1986). Expertise in mathematics teaching. *Educational Leadership*, 43(7), 28-33.
- Leinhardt, G., & Greeno, J. G. (1986). The cognitive skill of teaching. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 78(2), 75-95.
- Levstik, L. S. (1993). "I wanted to be there": The impact of narrative on children's historical thinking. In M. Tunnell & R. Ammon (Eds.), *The Story of Ourselves: Teaching History Through Children's Literature* (pp. 65-77). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Levstik, L. S. (2001). Crossing the empty spaces: Perspective taking in New Zealand adolescents' understanding of national history. In O. L. Davis, Jr. & E. A. Yeager & S. J. Foster (Eds.), *Historical Empathy and Perspective Taking in the Social Studies* (pp. 69-96). Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Levstik, L. S., & Barton, K. C. (1996). "They still use some of their past": Historical salience in elementary children's chronological thinking. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 28(5), 531-536.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic Inquiry*. London: Sage.
- Little, V. (1983). What is historical imagination? *Teaching History*, 36, 27-32.
- Low-Beer, A. (1989). Empathy and history. *Teaching History*, 55, 8-12.
- Lowenthal, D. (1985). *The Past is a Foreign Country*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lowenthal, D. (2000). Dilemmas and delights of learning history. In P. N. Stearns & P. Seixas & S. S. Wineburg (Eds.), *Knowing, Teaching, and Learning History: National and International Perspectives* (pp. 63-82). New York: New York University Press.
- Luff, I. (2000). "I've been in the Reichstag" Rethinking roleplay. *Teaching History*, 100, 8-17.
- Ma, L. (1999). *Knowing and Teaching Elementary Mathematics*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Macaulay, T. B. (1937). *England in 1685*. London: Thomas Nelson and Sons.
- Macintosh, H. G. (1987). Testing skills in history. In C. Portal (Ed.), *The History Curriculum for Teachers* (pp. 183-219). London: Falmer Press.
- Mackey, J. A. (1991). Adolescents' social, cognitive, and moral development and secondary school social studies. In J. Shaver (Ed.), *Handbook of Research on Social Studies Teaching and Learning* (pp. 134-143). New York: Macmillan.
- Marks, R. (1990). Pedagogical content knowledge: From a mathematical case to a modified conception. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 41(3), 3-11.
- Marsden, W. E. (1989). "All in a good cause": Geography, history and the politicization of the curriculum in nineteenth and twentieth century England. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 21(6), 509-526.
- Martin, D., & Brooke, B. (2002). Getting personal: Making effective use of historical fiction in the history classroom. *Teaching History*, 108, 30-35.

- Mastin, S. J. (2002). "Now listen to Source A": Music and history. *Teaching History*, 108, 49-54.
- McAleavy, T. (1998). The use of sources in school history 1910-1998: A critical perspective. *Teaching History*, 91, 10-16.
- McCully, A., Pilgrim, N., Sutherland, A., & McMinn, T. (2002). "Don't worry, Mr. Trimble. We can handle it." Balancing the rational and the emotional in the teaching of contentious topics. *Teaching History*, 106, 6-12.
- McDiarmid, G. W. (1994). Understanding history for teaching: A study of the historical understanding of prospective teachers. In M. Carretero & J. F. Voss (Eds.), *Cognitive and Instructional Processes in History and the Social Sciences* (pp. 159-185). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- McDiarmid, G. W. (1996). Challenging prospective teachers' understandings of history: An examination of a historiography seminar. In L. Schauble & R. Glaser (Eds.), *Innovations in Learning: New Environments for Education* (pp. 203-241). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- McDiarmid, G. W., Ball, D. L., & Anderson, C. W. (1989). Why staying one chapter ahead doesn't really work: Subject-specific pedagogy. In M. C. Reynolds (Ed.), *Knowledge Base for the Beginning Teacher*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- McEwan, H., & Bull, B. (1991). The pedagogic nature of subject matter knowledge. *American Educational Research Journal*, 28(2), 316-334.
- McLemee, S. (2003). Getting emotional. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 49, A14.
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative Data Analysis*. London: Sage.
- Mitchell, J., & Marland, P. (1989). Research on teacher thinking: The next phase. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 5(2), 115-128.
- Morris, E. (June 21, 2001). Just our imaginations, running away. *New York Times Online*, at <http://www.nytimes.com>, Accessed June 21, 2001.
- Norman, N. (2000). *The use of television for the teaching and learning of mathematics in secondary school*. Unpublished DPhil, Oxford University.
- Nott, M., & Wellington, J. (1994). Science teachers, the nature of science and the National Science Curriculum. In J. Wellington (Ed.), *Secondary Science: Contemporary Issues and Practical Approaches* (pp. 32-43). London: Routledge.
- Parker, W. C. (1991). Achieving thinking and decision-making objectives in social studies. In J. Shaver (Ed.), *Handbook of Research on Social Studies Teaching and Learning* (pp. 345-356). New York: Macmillan.
- Patrick, H. (1988). The history curriculum: The teaching of history, 1985-87. *History Resource*, 2(1), 9-14.
- Pendry, A. (1994). *The pre-lesson pedagogical decision-making of history student teachers during the internship year*. Unpublished DPhil, Oxford University.
- Phillips, R. (1998). *History Teaching, Nationhood and the State: A Study in Educational Politics*. London: Cassell.

- Polanyi, M. (1967). *The Tacit Dimension*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
- Portal, C. (1987). Empathy as an objective for history teaching. In C. Portal (Ed.), *The History Curriculum for Teachers* (pp. 89-99). London: Falmer Press.
- Postman, N. (1995). *The End of Education*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Reynoldson, F. (1997). *Indians of North America*. Oxford: Heinemann.
- Riley, K. L. (1998). Historical empathy and the Holocaust: Theory into practice. *International Journal of Social Education*, 13(1), 32-42.
- Riley, K. L. (2001). The Holocaust and historical empathy: The politics of understanding. In O. L. Davis, Jr. & E. A. Yeager & S. J. Foster (Eds.), *Historical Empathy and Perspective Taking in the Social Studies* (pp. 139-166). Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Robson, C. (1993). *Real World Research*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Rogers, P. J. (1984). Why teach history? In A. K. Dickinson & P. J. Lee & P. J. Rogers (Eds.), *Learning History* (pp. 18-38). London: Heinemann.
- Rogers, P. J. (1987). History -- The past as a frame of reference. In C. Portal (Ed.), *The History Curriculum for Teachers* (pp. 3-21). London: Falmer Press.
- Romanowski, M. H. (1996). Issues and influences that shape the teaching of U.S. history. In J. Brophy (Ed.), *Advances in Research on Teaching: Teaching and Learning History, Vol. 6* (pp. 291-312). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Rosenstone, R. A. (1994). The historical film: Looking at the past in a postliterate age. In L. Kramer & D. Reid & W. Barney (Eds.), *Learning History in America: Schools, Culture and Politics* (pp. 141-160). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Roth, K. J. (1996). Making learners and concepts central: A learner-centered, conceptual change approach to fifth-grade American history planning and teaching. In J. Brophy (Ed.), *Advances in Research on Teaching: Teaching and Learning History, Vol. 6* (pp. 115-182). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Sabers, D. S., Cushing, K. S., & Berliner, D. C. (1991). Differences among teachers in a task characterized by simultaneity, multidimensionality, and immediacy. *American Educational Research Journal*, 28(1), 63-88.
- Sansom, C. (1987). Concepts, skills and content: A developmental approach to the history syllabus. In C. Portal (Ed.), *The History Curriculum for Teachers* (pp. 116-141). London: Falmer Press.
- Schön, D. A. (1983). *The Reflective Practitioner: How Professionals Think in Action*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Schwab, J. J. (1964). The structures of the disciplines: Meanings and significances. In G. W. Ford & L. Pugno (Eds.), *The Structure of Knowledge and the Curriculum*. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Seixas, P. (1993a). The community of inquiry as a basis for knowledge and learning: The case of history. *American Educational Research Journal*, 30(2), 305-324.
- Seixas, P. (1993b). Historical understanding among adolescents in a multicultural setting. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 23, 301-327.

- Seixas, P. (1994). Confronting the moral frames of popular film: Young people respond to historical revisionism. *American Journal of Education*, 102, 261-285.
- Shavelson, R. J., Webb, N. M., & Burstein, L. (1986). Measurement of teaching. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of Research on Teaching* (3rd ed., pp. 50-91). London: Macmillan.
- Shawyer, G., Booth, M., & Brown, R. (1988). The development of children's historical thinking. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 18(2), 209-219.
- Shemilt, D. (1980). *History 13-16 Evaluation Study*. Edinburgh: Holmes McDougall (Schools Council Publications).
- Shemilt, D. (1983). The devil's locomotive. *History and Theory*, 22(4), 1-18.
- Shemilt, D. (1984). Beauty and the philosopher: Empathy in history and classroom. In A. K. Dickinson & P. J. Lee & P. J. Rogers (Eds.), *Learning History* (pp. 39-84). London: Heinemann.
- Shepard, C., Reid, A., & Shepherd, K. (1993). *Peace and War*. London: John Murray.
- Shulman, L. S. (1986). Paradigms and research programs in the study of teaching: A contemporary perspective. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of Research on Teaching* (3rd ed., pp. 3-36). New York: Macmillan.
- Skidelsky, R. (1988, March 1). History as social engineering. *The Independent*.
- Skolnick, J., Dulberg, N., & Maestre, T. (1999). *Through Other Eyes: Developing Empathy and Multicultural Perspectives in the Social Studies*. Toronto, Ontario: Pippin Publishing.
- Slater, J. (1989). *The Politics of History Teaching: A Humanity Dehumanized?* London: Institute of Education.
- Sockett, H. (1987). Has Shulman got the strategy right? *Harvard Educational Review*, 57(2), 208-219.
- Spoehr, K. T., & Spoehr, L. W. (1994). Learning to think historically. *Educational Psychologist*, 29(2), 71-77.
- SREB. (1986). *Empathy in History: From Definition to Assessment*. Eastleigh: Southern Regional Examinations Board.
- Stake, R. E. (1995). *The Art of Case Study Research*. London: Sage.
- Stockley, D. (1983). Empathetic reconstruction in history and history teaching. *History and Theory*, 22(4), 50-65.
- Strauss, A. L., & Corbin, J. M. (1990). *Basics of Qualitative Research: Grounded Theory Procedures and Techniques*. London: Sage.
- Sutherland, M. B. (1986). Education and empathy. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 34(2), 142-151.
- Thatcher, M. (1993). *The Downing Street Years*. New York: HarperCollins.
- Thompson, D. (1984). Understanding the past: Procedures and content. In A. K. Dickinson & P. J. Lee & P. J. Rogers (Eds.), *Learning History* (pp. 168-186). London: Heinemann.
- Thompson, F. (1983). Empathy: An aim and a skill to be developed. *Teaching History*, 37, 22-26.
- Torrance, H., & Pryor, J. (2001). Developing formative assessment in the classroom: Using action research to explore and modify theory. *British Educational Research Journal*, 27(5), 615-631.

- Truman, P. (1990). Teachers' concerns over the current vogue in teaching history. *Teaching History*, 58, 10-17.
- VanSledright, B. (1996). Closing the gap between school and disciplinary history?: Historian as high school history teacher. In J. Brophy (Ed.), *Advances in Research on Teaching: Vol. 6. Teaching and Learning History* (pp. 257-289). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- VanSledright, B. (1998). On the importance of historical positionality to thinking about and teaching history. *International Journal of Social Education*, 12(2), 1-18.
- VanSledright, B. (2001). From empathic regard to self-understanding: Im/positionality, empathy, and historical contextualization. In O. L. Davis, Jr. & E. A. Yeager & S. J. Foster (Eds.), *Historical Empathy and Perspective Taking in the Social Studies* (pp. 51-68). Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield.
- VanSledright, B., & Kelly, C. (1998). Reading American history: The influence of using multiple sources on six fifth graders. *The Elementary School Journal*, 98, 239-265.
- Verloop, N., van Driel, J., & Meijer, P. (2001). Teacher knowledge and the knowledge base of teaching. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 35, 441-461.
- von Borries, B. (1994). (Re-)Constructing history and moral judgment: On relationships between interpretations of the past and perceptions of the present. In M. Carretero & J. F. Voss (Eds.), *Cognitive and Instructional Processes in History and the Social Sciences* (pp. 339-355). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Walsh, W. H. (1958). *An Introduction to Philosophy of History*. London: Hutchinson & Co.
- Webb, K., & Blond, J. (1995). Teacher knowledge: The relationship between caring and knowing. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 11(6), 611-625.
- Wertsch, J. V. (1998). *Mind as Action*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- White, J. J. (2003). *What about the content in pedagogical content knowledge?* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.
- Wilen, W. W., & White, J. J. (1991). Interaction and discourse in social studies classrooms. In J. Shaver (Ed.), *Handbook of Research on Social Studies Teaching and Learning* (pp. 483-495). New York: Macmillan.
- Wilson, S. M. (1991). Parades of facts, stories of the past: What do novice history teachers need to know? In M. Kennedy (Ed.), *Teaching Academic Subjects to Diverse Learners* (pp. 99-116). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Wilson, S. M., & Berne, J. (1998). Teacher learning and the acquisition of professional knowledge: An examination of research on contemporary professional development. *Review of Research in Education*, 24, 173-209.
- Wilson, S. M., Shulman, L. S., & Richert, A. E. (1987). '150 different ways' of knowing: Representations of knowledge in teaching. In J. Calderhead (Ed.), *Exploring Teachers' Thinking* (pp. 104-124). London: Cassell.

- Wilson, S. M., & Wineburg, S. S. (1988). Peering at history through different lenses: The role of disciplinary perspectives in teaching history. *Teachers College Record*, 89(4), 525-539.
- Wilson, S. M., & Wineburg, S. S. (1993). Wrinkles in time and place: Using performance assessments to understand the knowledge of history teachers. *American Educational Research Journal*, 30(4), 729-769.
- Wineburg, S. S. (1991). On the reading of historical texts: Notes on the breach between school and academy. *American Educational Research Journal*, 28(3), 495-519.
- Wineburg, S. S. (1994). The cognitive representation of historical texts. In G. Leinhardt & I. L. Beck & C. Stainton (Eds.), *Teaching and Learning in History* (pp. 85-135). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Wineburg, S. S. (1996). The psychology of teaching and learning history. In D. C. Berliner & R. C. Calfee (Eds.), *The Handbook of Educational Psychology* (pp. 423-437). New York: Simon and Schuster Macmillan.
- Wineburg, S. S. (1998). Historical thinking and other unnatural acts. *Phi Delta Kappan (manuscript version; in press)*, 80(7), 1-30.
- Wineburg, S. S. (1999). Historical thinking and other unnatural acts. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 80(7), 488-499.
- Wineburg, S. S. (2001). *Historical Thinking and Other Unnatural Acts*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Wineburg, S. S., & Fournier, J. (1994). Contextualized thinking in history. In M. Carretero & J. Voss (Eds.), *Cognitive and Instructional Processes in History and the Social Sciences* (pp. 285-308). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Wineburg, S. S., & Wilson, S. M. (1988). Models of wisdom in the teaching of history. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 70(1), 50-58.
- Wineburg, S. S., & Wilson, S. M. (1991). Subject-matter knowledge in the teaching of history. In J. Brophy (Ed.), *Advances in Research on Teaching: Vol. 2* (pp. 305-347). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Wolcott, H. F. (1994). *Transforming Qualitative Data: Description, Analysis and Interpretation*. London: Sage.
- Yeager, E. A., & Doppen, F. H. (2001). Teaching and learning multiple perspectives on the use of the atomic bomb: Historical empathy in the secondary classroom. In O. L. Davis, Jr. & E. A. Yeager & S. J. Foster (Eds.), *Historical Empathy and Perspective Taking in the Social Studies* (pp. 97-114). Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Yeager, E. A., & Foster, S. J. (2001). The role of empathy in the development of historical understanding. In O. L. Davis, Jr. & E. A. Yeager & S. J. Foster (Eds.), *Historical Empathy and Perspective Taking in the Social Studies* (pp. 13-19). Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Yeager, E. A., Foster, S. J., Maley, S. D., Anderson, T., & Morris, J. W. (1998). Why people in the past acted as they did: An exploratory study in historical empathy. *International Journal of Social Education*, 13(1), 8-25.
- Yin, R. K. (1994). *Case Study Research: Design and Methods* (2nd ed.). London: Sage.

- Yinger, R., & Hendricks-Lee, M. (1993). Working knowledge in teaching. In C. Day & J. Calderhead & P. Denicolo (Eds.), *Research on Teacher Thinking: Understanding Professional Development* (pp. 100-123). London: Falmer Press.
- Zumwalt, K. (1988). Are we improving or undermining teaching? In L. Tanner (Ed.), *Critical Issues in Curriculum. Eighty-Seventh Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Secondary Citations

This bibliography includes works referenced within citations in the text.

- Baranowski, M. (1974). *A Pilgrim's Progress through the Project*. Schools Council Occasional Paper No. 2, London: Schools Council Publishing.
- Barton, K. C. (1990). Developmental research in history. Unpublished paper, University of Kentucky.
- Blakeway, S. E. (1983). Some aspects of the historical understanding of children aged 7 to 11. Unpublished MA dissertation, London University Institute of Education.
- Basch, M. F. (1983). Empathic understanding: A review of the concept and some theoretical considerations, *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association*, 31, 101-126.
- Berti, A. E., & Bombi, A. S. (1988). *The Child's Construction of Economics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cazden, C. (1988). *Classroom Discourse*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Connell, R. (1971). *The Child's Construction of Politics*. Carleton, Australia: Melbourne University Press.
- Connelly, F. M., & Clandinin, D. J. (1990). Stories of experience and narrative inquiry, *Educational Researcher*, 36, 203-222.
- Fancett, V. S., & Hawke, S. (1982). Instructional practices in social studies. In Project SPAN staff and associates (Ed.), *The Current State of Social Studies: A Report of Project SPAN* (pp. 207-263). Boulder, CO: Social Science Education Consortium.
- Farrar, M. T. (1988). A sociolinguistic analysis of discussion. In J.T. Dillon (Ed.), *Questioning and Discussion: A Multidisciplinary Study* (pp. 29-73). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Fischer, D. H. (1971). *Historians' Fallacies: Towards a Logic of Historical Thought*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Furth, H. (1988). Playful conceptions. *Science*, 242, 450.
- Ginzburg, C. (1981). *The Cheese and the Worms: The Cosmos of a Sixteenth-Century Miller*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins Press.
- Goetz, J. P., & LeCompte, M. D. (1981). Ethnographic research and the problem of data reduction, *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 12, 51-70.
- Goldstein, A. P., & Michaels, G. Y. (1985). *Empathy: Developmental Training and Consequences*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Hochschild, A. (1983). *The Managed Heart: Commercialization of Human Feeling*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Huberman, M. (1985). What knowledge is of most worth to teachers? A knowledge-use perspective. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 1, 251-262.
- Husserl, E. (1931). *Ideas: General Introduction to Pure Phenomenology*. London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd.
- Knight, P. T. & Green, A. J. (1993). Review article: History schemes for Key Stage2, *Education 3-13*, 21(3), 54-57.

- Körber, A. (1998). Can our pupils fit into the shoes of someone else? In Joke van der Leeuw Roord (Ed.), *The State of History Education in Europe* (pp. 124-138). Hamburg: Hamburg University Press.
- McCrary, N. (2002). Investigating the use of narrative in affective learning on issues of social justice. *Theory and Research in Social Education, 30*, 255-273.
- Megill, A. (1989). Recounting the past: 'Description,' explanation and narrative in historiography, *American Historical Review, 94*, 627-653.
- Schools Council (1980). *Explorations in Teaching Schools Council Project: History 13-16*. Leeds: Holmes McDougall.
- Simkin, J. (1989). *Voices from the Past: GCSE and Empathy*. Hove: Spartacus.
- Turiel, E. (1983). *The Development of Social Knowledge*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- van Dijk, T. A., & Kintsch, W. (1983). *Strategies of Discourse Comprehension*. New York: Academic Press.
- Wedgwood, C. V. (1960). *Truth and Opinion: Historical Essays*. London: Collins.