RUNNYMEDE

Runnymede Perspectives

History Lessons

Teaching Diversity In and Through the History National Curriculum

Claire Alexander, Debbie Weekes-Bernard and Joya Chatterji

Runnymede: Intelligence for a Multi-ethnic Britain

Runnymede is the UK's leading independent thinktank on race equality and race relations. Through high-quality research and thought leadership, we:

- **Identify barriers to race equality and good race relations;**
- **Provide evidence to support action for social change;**
- **Influence policy at all levels.**

Runnymede
St Clement's Building,
London School of Economics,
Houghton Street, London WC2A 2AE
T 020 7377 9222
E info@runnymedetrust.org

www. runnymedetrust.org

Disclaimer

This publication is part of the Runnymede Perspectives series, the aim of which is to foment free and exploratory thinking on race, ethnicity and equality. The facts presented and views expressed in this publication are, however, those of the individual authors and not necessariliy those of the Runnymede Trust.

ISBN: 978-1-909546-06-6

Published by Runnymede in February 2015, this document is copyright © Runnymede 2015. Some rights reserved.

Open access. Some rights reserved.

The Runnymede Trust wants to encourage the circulation of its work as widely as possible while retaining the copyright. The trust has an open access policy which enables anyone to access its content online without charge. Anyone can download, save, perform or distribute this work in any format, including translation, without written permission. This is subject to the terms of the Creative Commons Licence Deed: Attribution-Non-Commercial-No Derivative Works 2.0 UK: England & Wales. Its main conditions are:

- You are free to copy, distribute, display and perform the work;
- You must give the original author credit;
- You may not use this work for commercial purposes;
- You may not alter, transform, or build upon this work.

You are welcome to ask Runnymede for permission to use this work for purposes other than those covered by the licence. Runnymede is grateful to Creative Commons for its work and its approach to copyright. For more information please go to **www.creativecommons.org**

Acknowledgements

We would like to extend our enormous thanks to the staff and pupils at Manchester Academy, Langdon Park School and Thomas Tallis School for their time and hard work on the local history projects produced, and for their tireless support for this project. We would also like to thank the many teachers who responded to our consultation and to the participants at our Expert Roundtables whose views are included in this paper.

Our thanks are also due to Laurence Brown, Georgie Wemyss, Steve Martin and Johnathan Tetsill who ran inspirational workshops with the pupils, and to the staff at the Museum of London Docklands, the Greenwich Heritage Centre and the Ahmed Iqbal Ullah Race Relations Centre for hosting trips from our participating schools. We would also like to extend our thanks to the Widening Participation teams and Departments of Sociology, History and Geography at the University of Manchester; Goldsmiths, University of London; Queen Mary University of London and King's College London for the time and support given in the development of our local launches and expert roundtable. Our thanks are extended also to Lucy Powell MP who sponsored our parliamentary event for pupils and to Debbie Abrahams MP and Jim Fitzpatrick MP for their additional support. We would also like to extend huge thanks to the members of the Project Advisory Group for all advice and support given during the life of this project.

Finally our thanks are extended to the AHRC, University of Manchester and University of Cambridge for making this work possible.

Contents

Executive Summary **3**

Summary of Recommendations **3**

Introduction: A National Curriculum? **4**

History 2014 **7**

About the Project **9**

1. Recognizing the Value of Diverse Histories 11
2. Working with the New History Curriculum: Ideological and Practical Concerns 12
3. Teacher Recruitment and Training 14
4. 'Joining-up History': Resourcing Diversity in the Curriculum 15

Conclusion **17**

Recommendations **18**

1. Schools and the National Curriculum 18
2. Teacher Training and Diversity in the Profession 18
3. A 'Joined-up' Approach to Curricula and Resources 19

Notes **20**

References **21**

Executive Summary

This paper explores the continued importance of teaching a diverse curriculum at a time when issues of racial and ethnic equality and diversity have been increasingly sidelined in the political discussion around 'British' values and identities, and how these should be taught in schools. The new History National curriculum, in particular, has provoked widespread controversy around what British history is, who gets included in this story and how best to engage young people in increasingly (super)diverse classrooms with the subject. The new curriculum provides both opportunities for, and constraints on, addressing issues of equality and diversity, but how these are put into practice in an increasingly fragmented school system remains less clear. Building on our earlier *Making British Histories* project, website and publication, Runnymede worked on *History Lessons* with three schools in Manchester and London to explore the challenges and opportunities facing teachers and young people in the classroom in the teaching and learning of diverse British histories. This was combined with evidence from a broader consultation with history teachers, academic and local historians, museum representatives and archivists to examine how schools and teachers might best address issues of diversity in the classroom, the problems they encounter, and how these might be overcome. We argue that it is not only the content of what children and young people are taught in schools that is at issue, but how teachers are supported to teach diverse curricula effectively and confidently. Our research further reinforces our view that the teaching and learning of diverse histories in innovative ways should not be considered an activity solely to encourage the interest of disengaged minority ethnic students but as a way of creating a subject that engages *all* students in order to prepare children for life as adults in multicultural Britain.

Summary of Recommendations

In sum, we identify a number of recommendations requiring both policy and research intervention:

- Creating a history curriculum that is truly 'national';
- Re-imagining British history and identity to recognize the central role of diverse communities in its formation;
- The importance of mainstreaming diversity;
- Making diversity training compulsory for teachers;
- Recruiting a diverse history teaching workforce;
- Creating links between universities, teachers and civil institutions;
- The revisiting of history course assessment at GCSE.

Introduction: A National Curriculum?

In September 2014 – and to surprisingly little fanfare – the new National Curriculum was launched in schools in England. Encompassing all pupils of compulsory school age (from key stages 1–4) in the state-funded school sector, and ranging across 12 'core' and 'foundation' subjects, the curriculum is designed:

> *… to provide pupils with an introduction to the essential knowledge that they need to be educated citizens. It introduces pupils to the best that has been thought and said; and helps engender an appreciation of human creativity and achievement.* (Department for Education, 2013)

The aim of the national curriculum is twofold:

- To promote 'the *spiritual*, *moral*, *cultural*, mental and physical development of pupils' and 'of society';
- To prepare pupils 'for the *opportunities*, *responsibilities* and *experiences of later life*' (Department for Education, 2013: our emphasis).

The road to the revised curriculum was, of course, rather more tortuous – perhaps less surprisingly, given the explicit acknowledgement of the not-so-hidden curriculum in the government's focus on the state-funded education sector producing suitably acculturated, employable and biddable British citizens and workers (Department for Education, 2011, 2013; Alexander et al., 2012). It is revealing that 'spiritual, moral and cultural' needs are placed ahead of 'mental and physical' development, that individual development is linked to societal norms and values, and that knowledge is placed at the service of 'citizenship' and the labour market. Given this strongly normative, utilitarian and 'top-down' agenda, it is perhaps inevitable that what comprises both the ethical vision of the curriculum and its content – what constitutes 'essential knowledge' and 'the best that has been thought and said', or who is included in the 'human' at the heart of 'human creativity and achievement' – have been hotly contested, most publicly in the controversial revisions to the English Literature and History curricula, which were heavily criticized for being insular and narrowly nationalistic.

The proposals for a revised history curriculum, in particular, sparked a storm of critique and counter-critique from across the political and intellectual spectrum, and from academics, institutions, community groups and individuals, both condemning and championing the dominant foundational motif of 'Our Island Story' as the basis for the government's vision of what should constitute British history in the 21st century. Then Secretary of State for Education Michael Gove's history curriculum was focused on the celebration of British history and 'the distinctive role of these islands in the history of the world', as a means of 'ensuring today's young people are prepared for their duties as citizens'. Viewed by many academic historians as a retreat to a more conservative and traditionalist view of history as a unilinear narrative of national destiny and progress, the proposed reforms encompassed both content and method, focused on political institutions, grand events and powerful individuals, imbibed through a Gradgrindian version of 'fact, fact, fact'.

As we discussed in our earlier Perspectives paper, *Making British Histories: Diversity and the National Curriculum* (Alexander et al., 2012), the concerns around the initial proposals were threefold:

i) scope – that it artificially imposed barriers between 'British' and 'world' history and considered the former in isolation from the latter;

ii) content – that it flattened historical content and sacrificed depth to 'facts and dates' disengaged from critique and the recognition of multiple and contested histories, sources and chronologies;

iii) method – relatedly, that the teaching of history retrenched from more participatory methods, project work and 'patch courses' which engaged with more critical analysis of historical sources, towards 'rote learning' and examination.

In addition, our own critique highlighted the ways in which the idea of 'Britain' itself excluded its more ethnically and socially diverse roots and routes, positioning migrants, black and minority ethnic and religious communities at the margins of the nation, rather than as an integral part of 'our island story'. For us, the primary question was – and indeed remains – who constitutes 'the nation' in the national curriculum?

In the wake of this furore, the draft national curriculum was subject to two periods of consultation during 2013 – between February and April, and again in July and August, and underwent significant revision in scope and content, though perhaps less so in method. Leading historians consulting on the curriculum changes were particularly successful in shifting the balance between 'British' and 'world' history, arguing:

> *Students should learn about British history, but knowledge of the history of other cultures (and not only as they have been encountered through their interactions with the British Isles) is as vital as knowledge of foreign languages to enable British citizens to understand the full variety and diversity of human life.* (D'Avray et al., 2013)

We might also argue, moreover, that it is equally vital for British citizens to understand the full variety and diversity of British life and history, which takes it beyond the traditional focus on what one leading academic historian characterized as 'Hitler and Henries' (Mandler, 2014). Indeed, the strength of public engagement and concern around the proposed curriculum's lack of diversity, and particularly the place of 'black history' can perhaps best be seen in the success of Operation Black Vote's campaign to retain key black British figures such as Mary Seacole and Olaudah Equiano in the new curriculum.[1] Underpinned by a Runnymede Trust briefing to the Department for Education based on our Making British Histories research and publication (discussed below), the Campaign gathered over 36,000 signatures, including leading historians and over 70 MPs, including the Deputy Prime Minister Nick Clegg.

Such a recognition of the diversity of Britain's national past seems more urgent in the context of its increasingly superdiverse present and future. The most recent Census data shows that 20 per cent of people in England and Wales identified with a group other than White British, and that over 8 million people (around 14 per cent) categorized themselves as Black or Minority Ethnic. This category itself is characterized by increased internal diversity, with a significant increase in African, Arab and 'other Asian' communities and in those identifying as of mixed race (Centre on Dynamics of Ethnicity, 2012a). The relatively younger demographic of this community is reflected in the education system and in particular the state funded sector at which the National Curriculum is targeted. BME children and young people constitute nearly 17 per cent of the 0–15 age range of England and Wales (Office for National Statistics, 2011) and make up 23.2 per cent of state funded secondary and 27.6 per cent of state-funded primary schools – a proportion which is considerably higher in the urban areas in which most BME communities live (Centre on Dynamics of Ethnicity, 2012b).

These demographics raise challenging questions for a curriculum avowedly aimed at inculcating a sense of citizenship and belonging, and instilling a strong sense of national identity in an increasingly superdiverse nation (Harris, 2013), and a globalized and interconnected world. The perceived tension, and too-easily assumed contradiction, between issues of diversity and equality, on the one hand, and civic conformity and social cohesion on the other – most recently played out in the Trojan Horse furore in Birmingham and its ripples elsewhere – has seen a significant shift away from the established multicultural consensus in education (as in other policy arenas) towards, rather ironically, a strongly elitist and top-down (even personality-driven) agenda. It is striking, for example, that the Department for Education's 2013 Framework document makes only a rather terse passing reference to the legal obligations on teachers to 'take account of their duties under equal opportunities legislation' (Department for Education, 2013: 4.2) and seems to reduce 'race, religion or belief' to the needs for English language support for pupils for whom English is a second or additional language (Department for Education, 2013: 4.5).

Whether and how increasingly autonomous schools and overstretched teachers 'take account of' these duties remains to be seen – a picture muddied further by the proliferation of different statuses and remits across the education sector in England, between private and public institutions, academies, free schools and the shrinking state-school sector to whom, alone, the new national curriculum applies. This not only raises questions about what constitutes 'the nation' in the national curriculum, but how truly 'national' the reach of the national curriculum really is. This question becomes more urgent given the concentration of poorer and ethnic minority communities in the state school sector, and the increasing popularity of free schools amongst BME and minority faith communities who no longer feel that state schools cater to the needs of their children (Berkeley and Vij, 2008; Stokes, 2014; Weekes-Bernard, 2007). The national curriculum can, then, be seen as partial – in terms of reach (what nation?) and content (whose nation?) – as well as, perhaps, in terms of ethos/ethical vision (whose values?).

Of course, these questions are not new and Britain's schools have been a key site of struggle for race equality for over 50 years – from the early campaigns against 'sin bins' and SEN (special educational needs) (Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies, 1982) units to contemporary school exclusions, 'gangs' and the spectre of extremism. The issue of diversity in the curriculum too can be traced from the radical anti-racist interventions of supplementary schools, through the ambiguous containments of 'sari, samosas and steelbands' multiculturalism (Rattansi, 1992) and the institutionalization of Black History Month, to the Trojan Horse furore and the recent retrenchment of 'zombie' Britishness at the heart of the school system. Whether posited as a compensatory mechanism for fostering 'self-esteem' and ameliorating 'identity crisis' or as part of a broader and inclusive politics of recognition and enrichment for *all* pupils in an increasingly multicultural and globalized world, the curriculum – both in terms of content and method – has undergone substantial transformation in the 30 years since the Swann Report insisted on 'Education for All'. This landmark report recommended: 'Britain is a multiracial and multicultural society and *all pupils* must be enabled to understand what this means' (Swann, 1985: 770). It noted further:

i) 'Education has to be something more than the reinforcement of the beliefs, values and identity which each child brings to school';

ii) it is necessary to combat racism, to attack inherited myths and stereotypes and the ways in which they are embodied in institutional practices';

iii) 'multicultural understanding has to permeate all aspects of a school's work. It is not a separate practice that can be welded onto existing practices' (Swann, 1985).

The 2000 Race Relations Amendment Act offered the opportunity to 'mainstream' issues of race equality, requiring schools and other public institutions to actively promote race equality, and was followed by the 2010 Equality Act which required schools to have due regard to the elimination of unlawful discrimination, advance equal opportunities and foster good relations. Nevertheless, 30 years after Swann, in the wake of the backlash against multiculturalism and 'political correctness' and with the new national curriculum in place, it seems these issues remain as important as ever, and as unresolved.

History 2014

> *We all now teach migration as part of British history, but it's not good enough, it seems to me, to teach the history of the world when Britain happens to interact with it, when Britain happens to colonise it or when the people from the rest of the world happen to come to Britain. Our idea of diversity is the history of the whole of the world.* (Mandler, 2014)

The Department for Education's initial 'island' vision for the history curriculum underwent significant revision in the wake of both the public and political protest described above, and a strong critique from within its own advisory group, comprised of leading academic historians, and the wider history academic community. Professor Peter Mandler, President of the Royal Historical Society, and a member of the advisory group, reported to the Runnymede Expert Roundtable that the original draft curriculum was too narrow in scope and was overly focused on British political institutions and political democracy – a 'politician's curriculum' as he termed it. The RHS has been campaigning for many years for more diversity in the curriculum and a broadening of scope, in particular to include more world history. Professor Mandler told us 'We wanted all kinds of history to be available to all ages. And some world history everywhere'. The focus on British history in the revised curriculum was reduced to 'a minimum' of 40 per cent at GCSE level, and 20 per cent at A-level. Under public pressure, such as the OBV campaign, space was also made for key black historical figures, such as Olaudah Equiano, Mary Seacole and American civil rights campaigner Rosa Parks, and for a more critical engagement with issues around Empire and slavery. As Professor Justin Champion, President of the Historical Association, commented, 'Black history is good for everybody'.

The Curriculum launched in September 2014 for Key Stages 1–3 reflects some of these amendments in scope, content and method. The purpose of the study of history, the guidance asserts is to:

> *Help pupils gain a coherent knowledge and understanding of Britain's past* ***and that of the wider world.*** *It should* ***inspire pupils' curiosity*** *to know more about the past. Teaching should equip pupils to ask perceptive questions,* ***think critically,*** *weigh evidence, sift arguments and develop perspective and judgement. History helps pupils to understand the complexity of people's lives, the process of change,* ***the diversity of societies and relationships between different groups, as well as their own identity and the challenges of their time.*** (Department for Education, 2013: 204, our emphasis)

While retaining the original emphasis on 'the history of these islands as a coherent, chronological narrative from the earliest times to the present day' (Department for Education, 2013), the revised curriculum points to a broader global humanist agenda – including the charmingly opaque 'achievements and follies of mankind' – balancing British-centred and world histories from Ancient Egypt to Ancient China, and offering modules on Islamic, Chinese, Mayan and African civilisations (KS2), and Mughal, Russian and Chinese Empires alongside the study of British Imperialism (KS3). The curriculum guidance insists on the contextualization of historical knowledge and concepts, the links between local, regional, national and international history. There is space too, at each key stage, for an exploration of local spaces and histories and an emphasis on developing an understanding of the contested methods of historical enquiry, combining both overview and depth analyses. Some key elements – and issues – are worth emphasising here:

- The new curriculum offers a number of places or points of intervention where teachers can focus on diversity, particularly at KS3. The focus on ancient civilizations and non-European societies and histories provide some excellent opportunities for engaging with 'world history' and outside of the usual Euro-American trajectories.
- In contrast, there is less explicit emphasis on racial and ethnic diversity, particularly within Britain itself. Whilst the previous curriculum included a stated focus on diverse social, cultural and religious identities, the new curriculum downplays the internal diverse histories of 'our Island story', placing them as 'out there' rather than 'in here' and of relevance 'then' rather than 'now'.
- While there is some stated commitment to depth research and critical analysis, the focus on 'the long arc of development' necessarily militates against more detailed and critical exploration of key issues. Moreover, the shift away from project work and coursework to examination assessment suggests the focus on 'facts' over contested narratives and the sifting and weighing of historical evidence.

- The chronological structure means that modern history only appears at KS3, while KS1 (primary) and KS2 pupils engage with very little modern history. This may be of particular significance given the declining numbers of young people selecting GCSE History and further study.
- There is a strong emphasis on individual teachers and schools in selecting their preferred modules. Rather than insisting on the incorporation of world and diverse histories at the core of the discipline, this means that schools can 'select out' courses deemed to be irrelevant to a monocultural or less diverse student body.
- Similarly, while the focus on local history can both provide an excellent opportunity to explore multiculturalism and migration in depth, it can also reinforce a dominant monocultural and teleological narrative about social change, with BME and migrant groups positioned as outsiders and latecomers to a previously homogeneous nation. The opportunities and challenges posited by a focus on local histories are explored in more detail below.
- The emphasis on individual teachers and schools in choosing the components of their history curricula also raises issues around the extent to which teachers are willing and able to teach the diverse options available and access appropriate resources to support less mainstream modules (Historical Association, 2011). Research has shown that many teachers are often uncomfortable, and ill-equipped to deal, with questions of racial and ethnic difference (Cannadine et al., 2011; Harris and Clarke, 2011; Mirza 2015),[2] although there are signs that this is changing with newly qualified teachers. It is also important to recognize that a preparedness to teach pupils from all ethnic groups is not the same as being able to teach about cultural diversity or diverse histories to a high standard.
- Moreover, those established and new teachers who are keen to incorporate diversity within the curriculum may find it difficult to gain institutional support, time and teaching resources to develop these components, which are poorly represented in textbooks and mainstream online resources, such as the *Times Educational Supplement* (TES) website.

These issues cover three main areas: i) content; ii) method; iii) teaching, support and resources. The new curriculum offers both constraints and opportunities in each for thinking about issues of racial and ethnic diversity and equality. While the new curriculum has been greeted with some cautious optimism, and certainly offers some flexibility, however circumscribed, its success or failure will depend very much on how it is put into practice 'on the ground'. While the 'British' elements of the course pay, in our view, insufficient attention to the diverse (hi)stories of our migrant nation (Parekh et al., 2000), there are ways in which the focus on local spaces and the connection between local, national and international dimensions can be levered open to offer a more inclusive view on what and who constitutes 'British history'.

About the Project

It is these opportunities and constraints which constituted the focus of our recent AHRC funded History Lessons project.[3] Building on our previous projects focused on oral and family histories, (www.banglastories.org, www.makinghistories.org.uk), and our *Making British Histories* (Alexander et al., 2012) publication, our aim here was to take the new curriculum, and Michael Gove's stated commitment to local histories and new and digital technologies in 'bringing the past to life' (*The Guardian*, 2012), at face value – if not, perhaps, the face Mr Gove had in mind. Where we focused previously on personal, family and community history as a way of engaging a superdiverse group of young people in history (Alexander et al., 2012; Harris and Reynolds, 2014), the emphasis here was on local histories and the idea of place and 'heritage' as offering a space for multiple journeys and forms of belonging.

One aspect that emerged from our earlier work was the way in which young people from all backgrounds strongly identified with the place that they lived. Our current project shifted the focus from family to local histories, from people to the idea of 'heritage' and to the places that surround us. We wanted to explore both the ways in which the very grand houses and estates, monuments, palaces and museums come out of a more diverse set of histories and encounters than we are usually taught (Dresser and Hann, 2013), and to also think about the ways in which the ordinary places where we live – our houses or estates, or streets, our shops or schools, factories or parks, or local churches, temples and mosques – are also part of what makes Britain in the past and today. Our focus too, was to work closely with teachers in the classroom and outside and to make connections with the resources that surrounded them – people, archives, institutions – to enrich their understanding of historical method, and explore how these resources can be brought into the classroom and the curriculum.

Importantly, we wanted to explore not only how diverse histories *can*, and perhaps *should*, be taught, but how they *are* being taught in classrooms by teachers working with the new curriculum since September 2104, to consider the challenges and opportunities they face on a daily basis, and what broader lessons can be learned. Based on intensive case study work conducted in classrooms in three schools – Tower Hamlets and Greenwich in London and Moss Side in Manchester – from January to July 2014, the History Lessons project brought together teachers and young people with local historians, archivists, academics and filmmakers to undertake local history project work to explore the diverse histories of their neighbourhoods.[4] The areas were selected because they each provide rich, but very different, points of access to Britain's imperial and multicultural history – from the central role of the Imperial Docks and the British Navy in the formation of Empire, and the two-way traffic of the trans-Atlantic slave routes and the trading routes to China and India, to the heartland of the Industrial Revolution and its imbrications with the global trade in textiles, which itself provided a conduit for post-war migration.

Each area also has very different post-war local histories and contemporary demographies: Tower Hamlets has long been a staging post for waves of migration to Britain, which have inscribed themselves on the landscape and architecture of the area, from the Huguenot silkweavers of Spitalfields, the Lascars from across the Empire, and the Jewish refugees fleeing the pogroms of Eastern Europe to the post-migration from Bangladesh and the more recent arrivals from Somalia and Eastern Europe (Wemyss 2009; Alexander, 2011). According to the 2011 Census, nearly 70 per cent of the inhabitants of Tower Hamlets are from a minority ethnic background (55 per cent BME,14 per cent White Other), comprising 32 per cent Bangladeshi, 7 per cent Black African/Caribbean, 3.2 per cent Chinese and 1.2 per cent Somali residents, and with nearly a quarter of residents under 20 years of age.[5] The Royal Borough of Greenwich has been dominated by the might of the British Imperial Maritime tradition, the Greenwich Observatory, and its palaces, but has a more fraught engagement with issues of multiculturalism and racism, through its association as the birthplace of the BNP and the murder of Stephen Lawrence in 1993, and more recently the murder of Lee Rigsby. Nearly 53 per cent of the Borough's population defined themselves as White British in 2011, with 19.1 per cent Black and Black British (13.8 per cent Black African and 3.2 per cent Black Caribbean), nearly 12 per cent Asian or Asian British and nearly 10 per cent Other White or Irish.[6] Moss Side, in central Manchester, was swept up in the mass expansions of the Industrial Revolution and has a long history of labour migration from Ireland, and is an iconic place of settlement for post-war Caribbean migrants and more recent African and Somali migrants, with a somewhat chequered past including urban unrest

and 'gang' violence in the 1980s and 1990s. Moss Side in 2011 was the most superdiverse ward in Manchester, with 26 per cent of the population identifying as White British, 17 per cent African, 10 per cent Caribbean, 7 per cent Pakistani, 7 per cent Other Black and 5 per cent Other White.[7]

We worked with classes in a school in each of these areas, all of which were ethnically diverse, reflecting the migrant and settled communities in each geographic location. The schools responded to initial approaches to participate due largely to the fit between the History Lessons project and work that the history teachers involved were already planning to conduct with their pupils. In Greenwich, we worked with a group of 30 Year 8 (12–13 years of age) pupils from Thomas Tallis, a school located in Kidbrooke, situated in a ward with proportionately more White British residents than are found within the borough as a whole (69.6 per cent, with 16.9 per cent of residents BME, the largest being Black African at 3.4 per cent). Located close to an iconic, and notorious, housing estate[8] which had recently been demolished and redeveloped, the class itself was relatively diverse, though less so in comparison to the schools in both Moss Side and Tower Hamlets. Langdon Park School in Tower Hamlets included a much higher proportion of Bangladeshi children than is found within the borough – 70 per cent of pupils here are from this background, 61 per cent are Somali and 39 per cent are White British. Here we worked with a group of 26 Year 8 pupils to follow on from work that the group had recently conducted on World War II. Manchester Academy in Moss Side again serves an extremely diverse pupil population – 20.8 per cent of pupils are Somali, 14.1 per cent Other Pakistani, 9.7 per cent White British, 8.8 per cent Arab, 6.5 per cent other Black African and 6.1 per cent Black Caribbean. The 33 Year 9 pupils in the class we worked with here, in which just over a third of pupils were Somali, were due to begin a section of work looking at immigration, so the project was an easy fit with these plans.

Across all three schools children took part in a number of museum and archive visits in their local areas – to the Ahmed Iqbal Race Relations Centre situated in the newly refurbished Central Library in Manchester, the Museum of London Docklands in east London and the Greenwich Heritage Centre in Woolwich, south east London. Pupils also took part in local history walks around Blackheath and the East India Docks in London, met archivists and local historians on their visits outside of the classroom, and participated in classroom workshops led by historians and statisticians from the University of Manchester and University of East London and from the Maritime Museum in Greenwich. The pupils were also taught how to make local history films by a film making company, Feedback Films. This intensive programme of work, including historical information about the presence of Lascars on ships that docked in England, the reading of archives showing the presence of Black people in 19th century Woolwich and film clips noting the waves of settlement of those from the Caribbean in central Manchester, demonstrated to the pupils the raft of historical sources that could be drawn on to build a historical picture of places they had grown up in.

At the end of the project a number of dissemination events were held locally for each school in universities – the University of Manchester, Queen Mary University of London and Goldsmiths, University of London – which not only provided opportunities for pupils to share what they had found with the research team and project advisory group members, but also allowed them to find out where learning about, and enjoying, history at school could take them. They met history undergraduate and doctorate students and history lecturers who talked to them about learning the subject at university – something which addressed the discipline's concern around the lack of diversity amongst university students studying the subject, and engaged with Runnymede's broader policy interests in increasing diversity at leading universities (Alexander and Arday, 2015).[9] Not only did we generate increased engagement in the subject for students not previously interested in the subject, but we provided a window into post-16 study, influencing aspiration and, hopefully, future academic choices and pathways.

We interviewed all participating teachers, recorded the workshops that the pupils took part in, as well as all the dissemination events. The discussions that pupils had with each other and with the experts they met provided fruitful material, as did the presentations they put together themselves about what they had learned and why history was important. As the pupils below commented:

> *History was never one of my favourite subjects. I never really liked it partially because I struggle with writing. I don't really like talking about world war[s] and the Tudors. This project has shown me that if you strip it past that, it's actually really fun.* (Reuben, Year 9, Thomas Tallis School)

> *We think more history lessons should be like this project as students were allowed to choose what topic to do and to create presentations rather than essays. This help[ed] us to learn, to realise that*

history is valuable to us. (Shueb, Year 9, Langdon Park School)

We've lived our whole lives in Moss Side which made [the project] better. Growing up in a place that's changed, it's more in our hearts basically. (Shahid and Syed, Year 10, Manchester Academy)

We combined these findings with the views of 23 history teachers across the primary and secondary school spectrum recruited via open calls via Teachfirst, the Historical Association and the Schools History project. We also held interviews with three (humanities trained) teachers from an Alternative Provision Academy in Essex. At the end of the project, we also brought together an expert roundtable of archivists, researchers, historians and historical associations, voluntary organizations, teachers and teacher trainers, to explore the challenges and opportunities that shape the way young people in schools are able to learn, research and critically analyse historical source material about diversity, and to place this in a broader institutional and policy context. While the value and importance of teaching a diverse curriculum was broadly recognized, the picture that emerges, however, is not an entirely positive one – the pressures and constraints of changed curricula and the new demands this makes on knowledge acquisition for all teachers, particularly those teaching the early key stages, raises significant issues for the teaching and learning of diverse histories. While our project sought to provide teachers and students with some of the skills necessary to integrate an exploration of migration and ethnicity into the way history is studied, via the local history element included across key stages 2 and 3, it is clear that there are both possibilities and barriers for such work to be conducted in schools in Britain.

Our earlier research focused primarily on the views and experiences of young people (Alexander et al., 2012), and these findings were largely echoed by the participating pupils in this project. Rather than rehearse these perspectives again, crucial though they are, the focus here is on the institutional and organizational issues, opportunities and barriers that the research highlighted, and the views of the teachers at the leading edge of curriculum implementation and innovation. The research, interviews and the expert roundtable gave rise to four areas of particular interest and concern: 1) recognizing the value of diverse histories; 2) curriculum changes and institutional support; 3) teacher recruitment and training; and 4) Joining-up History': resourcing diversity in the curriculum.

1. Recognizing the Value of Diverse Histories

Even little bits of history have affected me, for example, immigration. That's what has made this place so diverse. (Maju, Year 9, Langdon Park School)

As a teacher of history I really enjoyed participating in the Making Histories project. The students were able to lead their own learning and create accounts of history which were important to them, their class mates and their families. (Rose Hastings, Manchester Academy)

Previous research has shown that history teachers are often uncomfortable in teaching topics dealing with diversity, and in particular with confronting 'sensitive' or 'difficult' issues such as slavery and Empire (Cannadine et al., 2011; Historical Association, 2011; Ofsted 2011). As we discuss further below, while teacher training deals with issues of teaching in diverse classrooms, and the majority of teachers are committed to diversity, they are less certain in articulating *why* and *how* diverse histories matter (Harris and Clarke, 2011). As Richard Harris, of University of Reading, noted at our expert roundtable, 'a vast majority of people… don't know why we do history. There are courses about "what *is* history" but not "*why* history". And without that it's very difficult to be committed to something'. Diversity is seen as controversial and "personal", and freighted with emotional baggage which they feel they lack the subject expertise to deal with. Aisha Forbes, the Director of Every Voice, similarly commented that her organization's research into the barriers to teaching diversity found that teachers lacked confidence, subject knowledge (especially at primary school) , time and resources and a clear understanding of why diverse perspectives were important and how they should be taught from alternative standpoints.

These findings were reflected in the responses from the teachers we contacted. All the teachers who responded recognized how important the teaching of diversity was, for interest and engagement among all pupils, for valuing diverse contributions and for understanding the present through the past:

We approach it, not as diversity of race or culture, but just showing that within all groups, people do and believe different things; look beyond stereotypes. Make pupils understand that it isn't just about skin colour. It's quite easy. [It] should be incorporated into everything – every part of the

curriculum. It's a very natural thing to do.(Female history class teacher, NQT, Secondary, East London)

[Pupils] enjoy understanding how Britain has been affected by immigration. They also like to discuss modern immigration and considering who is British and why. They like that it's from the past but could be modern. They like studying people. (Female history class teacher, Secondary, Merseyside)

Young people are eager to be fair and learn from prejudice unlike adults who have more fixed mind-sets. (Female history class teacher, Secondary, Wirral)

Several teachers noted the way in which history came alive to their pupils through this more personal lens and instilled a sense of wider belonging:

Many are new arrivals to the UK and it helps them to see the longer history of migration to the UK. (Female head of history, Secondary, West London)

They can see themselves reflected back in the history classroom. (Male head of history, Secondary, North London)

They can directly relate to it! Some are immigrants, about half have parents who were born outside of the UK and the huge majority have grandparents born outside the UK. However, I feel it is the children from areas with little or no immigrant population and with few if any non-white faces in school who need this education the most. (Female deputy headteacher, Primary, East London)

As this headteacher notes, however, diversity should not simply be a reflection of personal experience, and is, perhaps, even more crucial in more ethnically homogeneous environments. Importantly, then, there was a recognition that this was not a simple case of building on the relevance of the subject for those from minority ethnic backgrounds but an aspect of history teaching that should be taught to all. As Professor Peter Mandler commented at our expert roundtable:

The complementary roles that history plays, in engaging people and relating the past to their own life but also in showing them the lives of others, are both important and a truly diverse curriculum serves both of those purposes. I wouldn't want to have a curriculum that was primarily designed to tell you who you are because … we also need a lot of information about who other people are and that's what history provides. It tells you 'these are all the different ways to be human'.

This is a long recognized concern – indeed, as far back as 1988 (and again in 1995), Chris Gaine reflected on the views of teachers in schools with a high proportion of White British children, in which it was felt by some that there was little need to talk to pupils about diversity (Gaine, 1988, 1995). It is unfortunate that for some the ethnic make-up of a school is seen as a barrier to the effective teaching and learning about diversity. However, only two of the teachers in our research felt their children responded poorly to the teaching of diversity in view of the ethnic make-up of the class and school which was largely White. One teacher in a 'very White Catholic' school, for example, did not feel her students responded well when being taught about diversity in the subject. However, another teacher in a school which he described as 'generally a little diverse', found that his pupils respond well to learning about diversity because:

Most pupils are genuinely interested in something different. (Male history class teacher, Secondary Academy, Suffolk)

Other teachers in schools or areas which lacked diversity pointed to the important role of teaching diverse histories to promote greater social cohesion and understanding and were determined to address these silences. However, support to conduct work of this nature beyond the efforts of singular members of staff is crucial to its success. As Damien Quigg, one of our project participants, noted:

We work in the borough where Stephen Lawrence lived and I work in a school that is about a mile away from where he was murdered and we don't even talk about it. We're surrounded by these issues in Greenwich and we don't even tackle it in school in any real way.

2. Curriculum Changes and Institutional Support

In view of the recent changes to the curriculum, teachers have, perhaps unsurprisingly, mixed views about their roles and the impact on the discipline they teach. These teachers had concerns around the ideological underpinnings, and perceived narrowing of the new curriculum – and its practical implementation in the classroom. These concerns reflect those expressed in the annual survey of The Historical Association, which reported that 81.5 per cent of history teachers expressed discontent with the number and quick succession of changes to the curriculum (Burns and Harris, 2014). One history teacher told us:

I think the change in curriculum is largely a result of Michael Gove and his world view as well as his prejudices and misunderstanding about school history teaching. It reflects a mistaken view that teachers don't care about the history of Britain and spend their time simply pushing a liberal agenda. (Female history teacher, Secondary, East London)

Amongst those teachers who responded to our research, the new guidance from which teachers have been working since September 2014 has provoked a mixed response. Many thought that the new curriculum is far too narrow in scope, and criticized its over-celebratory and political agenda:

[It is] pro-White, British and male. Where is the appreciation of gender, ethnic, religious diversity? Also need history to help generations learn from past and acknowledge Britain's imperial role was not glorious despite the Conservative's interpretation. (Female history class teacher, Secondary, Wirral)

Too prescriptive, too much overt political interference. [It's] too easy to fall back into a dead White male Whig interpretation of history. (Male head of history, Secondary, North London)

Others, however, felt that the curriculum facilitated some creativity, certainly at Key Stage 3, with the option to teach both world and local history:

We have the scope to cover topics that we feel are very important to students living in a largely White area, for example Britain's role in India, migration to Britain from the Ancient times to the 20th Century and the impact of the British Empire. In the end it's given history teachers freedom to assess how they deem fit within their school context and given a much firmer framework for content. After much pressure on the government we believe we have a good national curriculum for history for the years ahead, if politicians can leave it alone now! (Male history class teacher, Secondary, Derbyshire)

Such freedom can raise particular problems for teachers in the classroom, however. For example, the four primary school teachers whose views we collected, and notably those teaching key stage 2, were worried about the impact of the new curriculum on their abilities to generate interest in the subject of history among very young children. Importantly the chronological aspect, which was raised as a positive aspect by some secondary school teachers, was seen here as particularly problematic. Despite the reforms to the original proposals so that 'the new curriculum is not organized as a chronological route march through two thousand years of English history' (Taylor, 2013), concern about this aspect remains. One teacher noted:

On the surface teaching things chronologically sounds great, but when dealing with very young children they have no concept of what goes where – it is either now or old. Plus dealing with events BC is the equivalent of teaching negative numbers – too advanced for many year 3 children…
The youngest children struggle to understand events and the way of life a very long time ago. It is difficult to balance facts versus skills and I think the emphasis on chronology is somewhat counterproductive. It would make more sense for the youngest children to start with the most recent events. (Female history class teacher, Primary, Essex)

Another agreed:

[Some] periods of history are difficult for primary aged children to grasp. Feels more like shoving loads in to prepare children for the curriculum once they reach secondary. However, by the very nature of being young, they may not retain knowledge nor pick up on key points. Too much to cover in any meaningful way….

What our children have enjoyed the most year on year was learning about WWII, what life was like for children like them in the streets they live in. The period is close enough for empathy. The curriculum now seems much drier which may not ignite interest. However – the secondary curriculum may be able to do that – but I have very little knowledge of secondary history now. (Female deputy head teacher, Primary, East London)

There were practical concerns raised too, with some expressing their frustration with a lack of clarity in the guidance and the increased expectations placed on teachers:

How we [teach history] has changed a lot; a lot more top down, less freedom, lots of contradictions – on one hand there's lots of guidance from Ofsted, but on the other they supposedly still want you to have your own ideas. There's relentless pressure to produce results. You're always being de-skilled as a teacher. No time to build relationships with the kids or to treat them as human beings.(Head of year, male history teacher, Secondary, South London)

In spite of the commitment demonstrated by the teachers who took part in our survey, they raised several practical concerns. While most had attempted to address diversity in their teaching, many were concerned about the time needed to continue to do this work, given the increased training in either skills or knowledge content they would

need to engage in to meet the new curriculum requirements. Almost half of teachers felt that they needed to learn from the good practice of other teachers, or the sharing of planning ideas in order to be able to adapt to the new curriculum, with another half feeling they needed more training in the topics to cover, with just under a third requiring support with skills acquisition. However a third of teachers felt that they would need more space in the curriculum to teach diversity effectively with just over a third saying that they had had to change what they were doing to teach diverse histories or not.

Some noted the multiple pressures faced by teachers often militated against innovation in the classroom. As Emma Campbell, one of our participating project teachers explained:

> *It's always the new teachers who are asked to change and reshape curriculum or projects. But as the new teachers we're also the ones who are struggling most with marking, lesson plans, learning the system etc. As a new teacher, I'm looking at diversifying key stage 3 history, but I have maybe a week to complete all the courses for years 8, 9, 10. University's helping is great, but we need time to engage with it.… We don't have time to allow them lessons and lessons to investigate research.*

Importantly any focus on the curriculum also has to acknowledge that it is only incumbent upon teachers in local authority controlled schools to follow it. The increasing numbers of schools that are 'independent' combined with the continuance of this trajectory given that it is a central plank of government education policy, has been argued by some to render concern about the national curriculum redundant. Teachers working in academies and free schools report a reluctance to work from the new curriculum, citing the freedom to be gained from sitting outside the state apparatus (Burns and Harris, 2014):

> *We do need to encourage diversity in British history. Good thing about academies is you don't have to subscribe to the national curriculum. Our academy trust will develop their own model to assess students.* (Female head of history, Secondary, Suffolk)

> *I've ignored the new curriculum and I teach what I think interests and is relevant to my pupils.* (Female history class teacher, Secondary, Wirral)

However, drawing on academy status to develop curricula that are more culturally inclusive, and teach a more creative, engaging set of history classes, can create broader inconsistency across both what is taught in schools and the view of history that children ultimately gain. As one of our participating teachers noted:

> *There's a question to be asked not just of the content of the history curriculum but in terms of politically what's happening in education. There might be lots of suggestions about how to change the content but is anyone holding anyone to account in terms of the academies programme allowing schools to opt out? We're in danger of segregating education into schools that are [teaching] diversity and schools that are just doing their own thing. I work alongside academies, we're not even teaching the same curriculum. How do we address the issues if we're all working in different ways?*

The lack of prescription, therefore, while seen by some as an opportunity to teach engaging diverse curricula could ultimately allow those schools that have no desire to diversify their teaching practice and subject content, to actively avoid doing so.

3. Teacher Recruitment and Training

One key issue raised by the research is the way in which new teachers entering the profession can, or should, be encouraged to engage with Britain's increasingly diverse classrooms and the need for diverse curricula. As discussed above, research shows that many established and new teachers are often uncomfortable with addressing diversity both in the pupil body itself and in their subject areas (Harris and Clarke, 2011; Mirza 2015), reflecting a comparative lack of diversity within the teaching profession more broadly. Mirza and Meetoo (2012), for example, note that only 12 per cent of student teachers on Initial Teacher Education courses are from BME groups and that they are twice as likely to drop out or fail to qualify as their White counterparts. Mirza (2015) points to a culture of 'privileged White spaces' in training teachers which excludes diverse voices and perspectives – a concern which can only be compounded by the absence of compulsory dedicated diversity training for teachers, as reflected in the QTS standards (Yvonne Thomas, University of Roehampton, Runnymede Expert Roundtable).

History teacher training – along with other arts and humanities subjects – faces particular issues around lack of diversity. For example, in 2013, 543 students were accepted to study postgraduate teacher training courses specializing in history, but the proportion of these successful applicants who came from a minority ethnic background was very low –

only five Bangladeshi and four Pakistani descent students, and only two from Indian, Black African and mixed race backgrounds (Graduate Teacher Training Registry 2014). No Black Caribbean applicants were accepted.[10] These appallingly small numbers have caused much concern among professional bodies such as the Historical Association, academics and teachers alike.[11] Indeed while we encouraged many to respond to our consulation[12] all of the views we collected, including those of the teachers who worked with us during both phases of the Making History project, were provided by teachers describing themselves as White British or White Other.

This lack of diversity amongst teachers and in teacher training, particularly in history (Graduate Teacher Training Registry 2014), is underpinned by a 'pipeline' issue, with comparatively small numbers of BME students learning history at university. For example in 2012/2013 only 8.7 per cent of those studying historical and philosophical subjects at undergraduate level were from a minority ethnic background, subjects which were in the bottom three of those being studied by students in this group.[13] This, together with the often highly traditional and monocultural nature of these courses themselves (Mandler, 2014), suggests that the future of history teaching is one in which BME individuals and perspectives simply do not feature, and which can have dire consequences for future generations of BME school pupils, students and historians. This can have huge implications not simply for engendering an interest in the subject of history among BME pupils, particularly when they do not see others like them represented within the history profession, but also in view of the benefits a diverse workforce can have not just for prospective history undergraduates, but for the profession as a whole (Mirza, 2015).

The lack of a diverse history teaching workforce therefore requires policy attention, but the process through which teachers themselves are trained, both initially and as part of their continuing professional development is itself an issue. Increasing moves by the government to diversify teacher training has resulted in a move away from university based courses to school based teaching through, for example, School Direct.[14] The broad training that student teachers could potentially receive through a university course, including the teaching of diverse curricula, is replaced by classroom based training, and the associated time pressures reported by some of the teachers we spoke to. Furthermore, the lack of confidence to teach material that is beyond their own experience results from a lack of exposure to information and support while training. As those reporting to our expert roundtable commented:

> *[There was] a case of a White teacher from a non-urban environment and she'd moved into London, into an inner city multicultural classroom and she was not confident about teaching diverse histories in a way that was not patronising.* (Aisha Forbes, Every Voice)

> *Diversity is often seen as controversial, teachers lack subject knowledge and they're concerned about pupil's emotional baggage. For trainee teachers, there's a concern about pupils, about how they're going to respond to certain topics and real concern about upsetting people, not just kids but also parents.* (Richard Harris, University of Reading)

Teachers also largely work in isolation and sharing good practice was certainly cited by many we consulted as a way of enabling more confident teaching around issues of equality and diversity to take place. There is a need then not only to create a history curriculum that is engaging and reflective of the changing nature of Britain's classrooms, but to generate and nurture a teaching profession both willing and confident enough to teach the discipline in a varied and inclusive manner.

4. 'Joining-up History': Resourcing Diversity in the Curriculum

Across both phases of the Making Histories project we worked with 210 pupils from a range of ethnic backgrounds in schools and community centres across Britain. Our primary aim was both to render the subject relevant and interesting to those from BME backgrounds through relating it to their own personal and local histories (Harris and Reynolds, 2014) and also to demonstrate to all pupils the ways that migration as a concept and historical process has touched the lives of all individuals living in modern Britain, shaping families and neighbourhoods in important ways. The focus was to bring invisible and marginalized histories to the fore, and to bring history to life in the classroom, through 'hands-on' project work and primary historical research. To date, however, these aspects of British history – or indeed, of world history – have been largely absent from the new curriculum. It is worth noting, for example, that the new curriculum eradicates all project and coursework from assessment, replacing this with examination only, reinforcing the emphasis on facts rather than discovery or critical engagement, and opening an intellectual gap between the study of history in schools and the expectations of academic historians in leading universities (Mandler, 2014).

Similarly, while there may be some flexibility and choice, the place of diverse histories remains marginalized, with comparatively low take up of options such as OCR's groundbreaking African Kingdoms module, due to the pressures on teachers and a lack of specialist knowledge and supporting resources.

> *I was more hopeful about the national curriculum, less hopeful about GCSE and A level because we see lots of great new curricula like what OCR is producing and no one will teach it because it requires too much investment – new resources, new training. The problem is that teachers are very hard pressed and in default they will keep on doing what they've always been doing or what comes easiest for them. (*Mandler, 2014)

This relative absence points to a(n) (infra)structural weakness in the revised curriculum: for topics to be recognized as valid and significant in classrooms and by schools necessitates validation from exam boards and a multi-tiered supporting structure involving textbooks, online resources and easily accessible materials and lesson plans. Martin Spafford, Schools History Project, commented at our expert roundtable:

> *[We have] very hard pressed teachers, the majority of whom will not be familiar with these histories, either Black British history or more global history. If they haven't studied this themselves at university and are not trained in content on the PGCE, they will need easy ways to access these. How do most teachers access that kind of information? It is still mostly through textbooks and increasingly online.*

Aisha Forbes, the Director of Every Voice, echoed this need:

> *Teachers need signposting, topic opportunities for each area of study, how to make it relevant to a school demographic. [We need] richness of resources and need to make it accessible to teachers who are not confident and don't have the time to trawl through this stuff.*

As one of our participating teachers, pleaded, 'Teachers go to the TES website. Please put stuff there!'.

External validation is crucial too to ensure recognition and buy-in from schools, teachers, parents and pupils. Syreeta Cumberbatch, from Black Cultural Archives, commented at our expert roundtable:

> *Black students often don't recognize what they're taught at home as history as the same as the academic discourse. They don't see their parents' stories in museums and galleries and archives, but when they see it there, they get excited about history.*

In December 2014, the OCR (Oxford, Cambridge and RSA Examinations Board) announced the launch of two new modules on migration for the new History GCSEs to be available to students from 2016, but they are currently the only examination board to include this dimension (TES, 2014). One particular concern, as reflected in one of our teachers' comments above, is the need to support initiatives such as this through making resources for teachers readily accessible. The issue here is not one of availability per se – indeed, as our Making History and History Lessons projects illustrate, there is a wealth of academic and archive material available in universities, national and local museums and archives, and in online and digital resources, as well as in the family and local histories of schools and pupils, that can inform and support teaching around many aspects of British, BME and world history. There is rich expertise too in cultural institutions and archives which have developed relevant lesson plans to support teaching diverse histories, some of which we have brought together in our accompanying teaching resource pack (Weekes-Bernard, 2014). Rather, there is a need to link academic research, cultural institutions and resources together to provide materials for teachers for use in the classroom – to generate a 'joined-up' history curriculum that brings previously marginalized voices and perspectives into all classrooms.

As Justin Champion of the Historical Association stated at our expert roundtable, the challenge is to link universities with secondary and primary schools to provide accessible resources which bring leading edge research into our classrooms, and our universities into their local communities. The OCR's African Kingdom's module is one excellent example of how primary research, in this case from Toby Green at King's College London, can be brought into the curriculum (Martin Spafford and Peter Mandler at the Expert Roundtable), while our Banglastories website (www.banglastories.org) or the Runnymede/ University of Reading's Romans Revealed site aimed at primary school children (www.romansrevealed.com) provide other illustrations of how academic research can be translated – through the use of expert intermediaries – for use in classrooms. The work from pupils featured on the *Making Histories* site shows how valuable such 'joined-up' teaching can be (www.makinghistories.org.uk).

Conclusion

The History Lessons project was first and foremost an exploration of how diverse histories might be taught in the multicultural classrooms of contemporary Britain. While the project was small scale and resource intensive – drawing on the expertise, time and goodwill of local experts, institutions and, of course, teachers and pupils – it does offer a template which could be rolled out more extensively. Like other exciting initiatives, such as the Full Colour History Project run by Every Voice, the project testifies to the potential of history to engage young people of all backgrounds in understanding Britain and their part within it. While such initiatives require resourcing – in terms of money, time, textbooks, website and resource development, and curriculum expertise – our experience suggests both an appetite for a more ‘hands-on’ and diverse approach to history amongst teachers and pupils, and tremendous goodwill from researchers and cultural institutions to bring this to fruition. What is needed most of all is co-ordination of the wealth of resources available, and support for both new and established teachers to access and make use of these resources. We have begun work in this area, collecting a diversity of lesson plans and resources from university lecturers, museums and archives to provide guidance for teachers wishing to support their students in learning about diverse histories. There remains however much more than can be done in this space.

Perhaps most important of all, however, is the need for a strong steer from government about the value of a diverse history curriculum, that places diversity at its core, rather than its margins, and that reflects a more inclusive sense of what Britain is, and how we – all – got here.

Recommendations

There remain huge opportunities (and challenges) for children and young people to learn about diversity in schools, be this through recognizing the multitude of historical stories – British and global – that exist, or the raft of other curricula subjects taught in schools that are beyond the scope of this paper. However, opportunities, by their very nature, can often be missed or ignored, and below we outline suggestions both at the level of policy and practice, for addressing the gaps and silences raised in our discussion. These are focused on: 1) schools and the national curriculum; 2) teacher training and diversity in the profession; 3) the need to develop a 'joined-up' approach to curricula and resources.

1. Schools and the National Curriculum

• A truly national curriculum

While many criticisms levelled at the early incarnations of the history curriculum included concern at its prescriptive nature, it is clear that teachers require clear and unequivocal guidance. A national curriculum which applies to an increasingly smaller number of schools cannot, in our view, be considered truly 'national' and will result in content, skills acquisition and assessment that is inconsistent and patchy. Teachers, governors and administrators should be required to teach diversity in *all* schools, not left to choose or 'opt out' of doing so in a curriculum that applies *across* the school spectrum.

• Diversifying 'the nation'

As we concluded in our paper *Making British Histories* (Alexander et al., 2014), it is both possible and necessary to re-imagine the notion of the 'nation' in a way that incorporates ethnic, cultural and religious diversity and better reflects the rich and complex tapestry of the British nation and identity historically and in the 21st century. Narratives surrounding Britishness have once again dominated discussions about what should and should not be taught in schools and the concerns about curricula were certainly central to political and societal reaction to Birmingham 'Trojan horse' schools. These highly charged debates clearly reflect the limits to diversity – or 'acceptable' forms of diversity – that politicians and their policy counterparts envision and seek to enforce on particular groups. As the Runnymede report on *The Future of Multi-Ethnic Britain* (Parekh et al., 2000) notes, national history and identity can be imagined and narrated in either exclusive or inclusive ways, and this has serious repercussions for the kind of society we live in, and the future of its diverse citizenry.

• Mainstreaming Diversity in Schools

30 years on from the Swann Report (Swann, 1985), it is clear that issues of equality and diversity have been sidelined in schools, rolling back from the statutory duties imposed on all public bodies in the 2000 Race Relations Amendment Act. Echoing the recommendations of Swann, education *must* place issues of equality and diversity at the core of its mission, and this should be reflected across its curriculum, irrespective of the ethnic diversity, or lack thereof, of its student body. Only then can schools meet their statutory duties under the current law, and truly claim to provide its pupils with 'the essential knowledge that they need to be educated citizens'.

2. Teacher Training and Diversity in the Profession

• Diversity training for teachers must be compulsory and co-ordinated centrally

Provision of good teacher training in equality and diversity is patchy and while there is evidence of good practice in this area[15] this is not in existence everywhere. Diversifying the routes into classrooms and the process through which teachers are trained, to include universities and increasingly school based training (as with the expansion of School Direct), also provides less rather than more scope for consistent training to occur. We recommend that equality and diversity training be a compulsory element in teacher training, ensuring that all new teachers are able to teach not just in diverse classrooms but with diverse materials and perspectives. This training should be enforced, monitored and evaluated centrally, as with other elements of school governance and practice.

• Recruitment of a diverse history teaching workforce

There are ongoing concerns about the lack of access to the study of history at undergraduate and postgraduate levels for BME, and especially Black, applicants and, consequently, the pipeline into

teaching for graduates from BME backgrounds. This partly reflects a lack of engagement in schools, and particularly at GCSE level.[16] Nevertheless, further work on the engagement of minority ethnic students with history at degree level and entry into the history profession is necessary. This involves challenges to university admissions offices and history departments to consider strengthening their practices regarding access and widening participation schemes, particularly in subjects, like history, where BME students are under-represented, and where curricula may need to be broader and more inclusive than is currently the case[17] (see Andrews, 2015; Harris, 2013) Further research on this subject is to be recommended.

3. A 'Joined-up' Approach to Curricula and Resources

- **'Joined-up' history: linking universities, civil institutions and teachers to develop resources.**

We recommend a joined-up approach to providing diverse curricula for schools, which links university research, historical societies and academic institutions, civil society institutions (museums, archives, etc.), exam boards, schools and teachers in bringing together and developing sources on diverse and alternative histories in accessible ways for use in the classroom. Multiverse,[18] a now archived website designed for teachers and teacher educators interested in teaching diversity, included resources and academic research. A resource bank of this nature, including research, schemes of work and resources from museums, archives and community based organizations, would provide the 'one stop shop' that all teachers could access, add to and use.

- **Revisiting assessment/developing project work**

Finally, we strongly recommend a revisiting of the retreat towards assessment by examination only, to reintroduce an element of project work into history teaching at all levels. Such work not only more closely encourages and reflects the kind of in-depth critical engagement sought and expected by universities, but also facilitates a more creative set of transferable skills amongst pupils and a more personal engagement with the subject and methods of history (Harris and Reynolds, 2014).

Notes

1. 'We've won!' page, Operation Black Vote website. Available at: http://www.obv.org.uk/news-blogs/we-ve-won-mary-seacole-olaudah-equiano
2. In 2014 66 per cent of primary trained NQTs were pleased with the training they received as regards being prepared to teach pupils from all ethnic backgrounds (up from 65 per cent in 2013) and 57 per cent highly rated their training to teach pupils with English as an Additional Language (EAL). For secondary trained NQTs 73 per cent highly rated their training to teach all ethnic groups, up from 66 per cent in 2013, and 66 per cent were pleased with the training they received to teach children with EAL.
3. History Lessons: Teaching Community, Heritage and Diversity in the National History Curriculum (AHRC: AH/L009420/1).
4. The project work produced by the young people can be viewed, along with the earlier *Making Community Histories work* at www.makinghistories.org.uk
5. Diversity page, Tower Hamlets website. Available at: http://www.towerhamlets.gov.uk/lgsl/901-950/916_borough_profile/research_and_briefings/diversity.aspx
6. Population data, Royal Borough of Greenwich website. Available at: http://www.royalgreenwich.gov.uk/info/200088/statistics_and_census_information/114/population_data/2
7. Ethnic mixing in Manchester, The University of Manchester website. Available at: http://www.ethnicity.ac.uk/medialibrary/briefings/localdynamicsofdiversity/ethnic-mixing-in-manchester.pdf
8. The Ferrier Estate located in Kidbrooke was home to a large number of often ethnically diverse residents living in around eleven 12-storey towers.
9. While the number of school pupils studying history at GCSE has risen in recent years, there is concern that teacher selectivity often discourages advanced study in the subject (Burns and Harris, 2014).
10. Recent statistics show that in 2013 none of the Black Caribbean applicants to study a postgraduate teacher training course specialising in History were accepted and that the numbers of applicants from across minority ethnic groups were low. See: https://www.ucas.com/sites/default/files/gttr-annual-statistical-report-2013.pdf
11. A group of academics and teachers have written to HEFCE (Higher Education Funding Council for Education) requesting they investigate the low numbers of Black students studying history both at undergraduate and postgraduate level.
12. Links to our short questionnaire were posted on online forums and websites by TeachFirst, the Schools History Project and the Historical Association.
13. Indeed only 1.9 per cent of historical and philosophical studies students were Black and 2.5 per cent British Asian; Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA) *Student Introduction* 2012/13. See: https://www.hesa.ac.uk/stats
14. School Direct is a government initiative in which schools are involved in the selection and training of prospective new teachers.
15. Teacher training courses at Roehampton University, London South Bank University, the Institute of Education and University of Reading involve either courses that expressly focus on equalities teaching or teacher trainers/academics conducting research on the teaching of diversity.
16. While approximately a third of White British children take history at GCSE, slightly less than a third of students from minority ethnic backgrounds do so, whilst attainment for Black children in GCSE history is low in comparison to other ethnic groups (Chris Skidmore (2010) Parliamentary question on GCSE History entries and attainment. See: http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201011/cmhansrd/cm110719/text/110719w0005.htm)
17. A number of organisations, including the Historical Association, the Royal Historical Society, the Schools History Project, Runnymede and various academics and researchers led by Professor Hakim Adi, have expressed concern about the poor numbers of Black teachers of history.
18. Multiverse website. Available at: http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20101021152907/http:/www.multiverse.ac.uk/

References

Alexander, C. (2011) 'Making Bengali Brick Lane: claiming and contesting space in East London' *British Journal of Sociology* (Vol.62, No.2, pp201-220)

Alexander, C. and Arday, J. (eds) (2015) *Aiming Higher: Race, Inequality and Diversity in the Academy*. London: Runnymede Trust. Available at: http://www.runnymedetrust.org/uploads/Aiming%20 Higher.pdf

Alexander, C., Chatterji, J. and Weekes-Bernard, D. (2012) *Making British Histories: Diversity and the National Curriculum*. London: Runnymede Trust. Available at: http://www.runnymedetrust.org/uploads/publications/pdfs/MakingBritishHistories-2012.pdf

Andrews, K. (2015) 'The Black Studies Movement in Britain: Addressing the Crisis in British Academia and Social Life', in Alexander, C. and Arday, J. (eds) *Aiming Higher: Race, Inequality and Diversity in the Academy*. London: Runnymede Trust.

Berkeley, R. and Vij, S. (2008) *Right to Divide? Faith Schools and Community Cohesion*. London: Runnymede Trust. Available at: http://www.runnymedetrust.org/uploads/publications/pdfs/RightToDivide-2008.pdf

Burns, K and Harris, R. (2014) *Survey of Schools in England 2014*. London: The Historical Association.

Cannadine, D., Keating, J. and Sheldon, N. (2011) *The Right Kind of History: Teaching the Past in 20th Century England*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies (1982) *The Empire Strikes Back: Race and Racism in 70s Britain*. London: Routledge.

Centre on Dynamics of Ethnicity (2012a) *How has Ethnic Diversity Grown 1991–2001–2011?* Available at: http://www.ethnicity.ac.uk/medialibrary/briefings/dynamicsofdiversity/how-has-ethnic-diversity-grown-1991-2001-2011.pdf

Centre on Dynamics of Ethnicity (2012b) *Does Britain Have Plural Cities?* Available at: http://www.ethnicity.ac.uk/medialibrary/briefings/dynamicsofdiversity/does-britain-have-plural-cities.pdf

D'Avray, D., Eales, J., Fulbrook, M., McLay, K., Mandler, P., and Scott, H. (2013) 'Plan for history curriculum is too focused on Britain' *The Observer* letters page, 16 February. Available at: http://www.theguardian.com/theobserver/2013/feb/16/history-curriculum-letters?guni=Article:in%20body%20link

Department for Education (2013) *The National Curriculum in England: Framework Document*. Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/210969/NC_framework_document_-_FINAL.pdf

Department for Education (2011) *The Framework for the National Curriculum*. Available at: https://www.education.gov.uk/publications/…/DFE-00135-2011

Dresser, M. and Hann, A. (eds) (2013) *Slavery and the British Country House*. Swindon: English Heritage. Available at: http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/publications/slavery-and-british-country-house/slavery-british-country-house-web.pdf

Gaine, C. (1988) *No Problem Here*. Cheltenham: Nelson Thornes.

Gaine, C. (1995) *Still No Problem Here*. Stoke-on-Trent: Trentham Books.

Graduate Teacher Training Registry (2014) *Annual Statistical Report 2013*. Cheltenham: UCAS

Harris, R. (2013) 'The place of diversity within history and the challenge of policy and curriculum', *Oxford Review of Education* 39(3): 400–419.

Harris, R. and Clarke, G. (2011) 'Embracing diversity in the history curriculum: A study of the challenges facing trainee teachers', *Cambridge Journal of Education* 41(2): 159–175.

Harris, R. and Reynolds, R. (2014) 'The history curriculum and its personal connection to students from minority ethnic backgrounds', *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 46(4): 464–486.

Historical Association (2011) *Submission to National Curriculum Review (History)*. Available at: http://www.history.org.uk/file_download.php?ts=1302796747&id=8031

Mandler, P. (2014) 'How do we make academic research on diverse histories accessible to all?', presentation to *History for All: How Diverse and Broad will the New Curriculum Prove to Be?* Expert roundtable, Runnymede Trust, King's College London, 3 November 2014.

Mirza, H.S. (2015) 'Respecting Difference: Widening Participation in Post-Race Times', in Alexander, C. and Arday, J. (eds) *Aiming Higher: Race, Inequality and Diversity in the Academy*. London: Runnymede Trust.

Mirza, H.S. and Meetoo, V. (2012) *Respecting Difference: Race, Faith and Culture for Teacher Educators*. London: IOE Press.

Ofsted (2011) *History for All*. Available at: http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20141124154759/http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/resources/history-for-all

ONS (2011) *Population Estimates by Ethnic Group 2002-2009*. Available at www.ons.gov.uk/ons/taxonomy/index.html?nscl=population+estimates+by+ethnic+group

Parekh, B. et al. (2000) *The Future of Multi-Ethnic Britain*. London: Profile Books.

Rattansi, A. (1992) 'Changing the Subject? Racism, Culture and Education', in Donald, J. and Rattansi, A. (eds) *'Race', Culture and Difference*. London: Sage Publications.

Stokes, E. (2014) *Free Schools, Equality and Inclusion*. London: Race on the Agenda/NASUWT. Available at: http://www.rota.org.uk/webfm_send/258

Swann, Lord (1985) *Education for All: The Report of the Committee of Inquiry into the Education of Children from Ethnic Minority Groups*. Available at: http://www.educationengland.org.uk/documents/swann/swann1985.html

Taylor, T. (2013) 'Shh this new primary history curriculum is really rather good', *The Guardian*, 16 July. Available at: http://www.theguardian.com/teacher-network/2013/jul/16/new-primary-history-curriculum

TES (2014) 'History of immigration to be included in new GCSEs', *Times Educational Supplement*, 1 December 2014. Available at: https://news.tes.co.uk/b/news/2014/12/01/history-of-immigration-to-be-included-in-new-gcses.aspx

The Guardian (2012) 'Gove tells schools to think local in history lessons', 27 February.

Weekes-Bernard, D. (2007) *School Choice and Ethnic Segregation: Educational Decision-Making among Black and Minority Ethnic Parents*. London: Runnymede Trust. Available at: http://www.runnymedetrust.org/uploads/publications/pdfs/School%20ChoiceFINAL.pdf

Weekes-Bernard, D. (2014) History Lessons: *Making British Histories – A Guide for Teachers*. London: Runnymede Trust. Available at: http://www.makinghistories.org.uk/for-teachers

Wemyss, G. (2009) *The Invisible Empire: White Discourse, Tolerance and Belonging*. Aldershot: Ashgate

Runnymede Perspectives

Runnymede Perspectives aim, as a series, to engage with government – and other – initiatives through exploring the use and development of concepts in policy making, and analysing their potential contribution to a successful multi-ethnic Britain.

About the Editors

Claire Alexander is Professor of Sociology at the University of Manchester. She has researched and written widely on race, ethnicity and youth identities in Britain over the past 20 years. She is Vice-Chair of the Runnymede Trust and Chair of the Runnymede Academic Forum.

Debbie Weekes-Bernard is Head of Research at Runnymede and a member of the editorial board of the British Journal of Sociology of Education. She has researched and written widely on issues addressing race inequality in education and has written and developed many educational resources for schools and teachers

Joya Chatterji is Reader in the History of Modern South Asia at the University of Cambridge and a Fellow of Trinity College. She edits the journal Modern Asian Studies. Her publications include *Bengal Divided: Hindu Communalism and Partition, 1932–1947* and *The Spoils of Partition: Bengal and India, 1947–1967*

Runnymede
St Clement's Building,
London School of Economics,
Houghton Street, London WC2A 2AE
T 020 7377 9222
E info@runnymedetrust.org

Registered in England 3409935
Registered Charity 1063609

www.runnymedetrust.org

RUNNYMEDE