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Following the report of the Civics Expert Group (AGPS,1994), "Whereas the people...", at the end of 1994, the Australian Commonwealth Government budgeted $25 million dollars over four years in its May 1995 budget for civics and citizenship education. At a conference in Parliament House, Canberra, in July, 1995, it was announced that $16.9 million of the total had been allocated to the School Sector, $10.6 million for the development of curriculum materials and $6.3 million for professional development of teachers.

At a recent conference on Civics and Citizenship Education organised by the Australian College of Education, Susan Pascoe (1995), who had been a member of the Civics Expert Group, outlined the recent history of concern with this area of schooling. She mentioned a 1989 Report of the Senate Standing Committee on Employment, Education and Training in which the authors had commented on the gap between theory and practice in civics and citizenship education, and went on to mention a report of the Republican Advisory Committee which drew attention to ignorance in this area and expressed "disquiet about shortcomings in the teaching of political and constitutional history and the lack of opportunity for participating in democratic processes" (1994, p. 12). The Civics Expert Group itself had gathered evidence of inadequate teaching in this area over a 30 year period and that school teachers' knowledge and understanding was at no higher level that that which typified the general public, which had been revealed to be disturbingly ignorant.

Policy decisions at both state and federal levels make it clear that syllabuses in civics and citizenship education will soon be developed and implemented on a wide scale throughout Australia's school systems. How much do teachers know about civics and citizenship education? How do they acquire such knowledge? How will they use their knowledge in teaching their pupils?

Previous Research

One of the most active areas in research on teaching and teacher education in recent years has been teacher knowledge: its nature, ways in which it is acquired, and ways in which it is activated in classrooms. The last of the three has been researched least and yet is crucially important in establishing the nexus between teaching and learning. Stanford University has led the field in the study of the nature of teacher knowledge through the Knowledge Growth in Teaching and the Teacher Assessment programs (Shulman, 1986; Shulman, Haertel, & Bird, 1988). Michigan State University has led work on the acquisition of teacher knowledge through its Knowledge Use in Learning to Teach program (Feiman-Nemser & Buchmann (1987) at the National Center for
Research on Teacher Education. No clear leadership has emerged concerning the third subject. Indeed, Kagan (1990) complained about the lack of empirical evidence linking teachers' conceptions to their interactive behaviours and their effectiveness in classrooms. Artiles, Mostert and Tankersley (1994) and, locally, Butcher (1990a, 1990b) have made important progress recently in establishing empirical connections between teacher knowledge and classroom performance but these are small beginnings.

The relationship between teachers' subject-matter knowledge and their pedagogical knowledge was explained by Brophy (1991), thus:

Except in the most basic sense that teachers cannot teach what they do not know, teachers' subject-matter knowledge does not directly determine the nature or quality of their instruction. Instead, how teachers teach particular topics is determined by the pedagogical content knowledge that they develop through experience in teaching those topics to particular types of students. Guided at least implicitly by the goals that they seek to accomplish with the students, teachers draw on their pedagogical content knowledge to decide what aspects of a topic to teach, how to represent these to the students, and how to develop the intended understandings using a combination of instruction, activities, assignments, and evaluation devices... (p. 350)

Brophy went on to point out that expert teachers put such knowledge to good use in using highly developed and quickly retrievable "scripts" for teaching it, thus enhancing their efficiency by reducing preparation time and avoiding confusion in the classroom without losing flexibility and responsiveness to unusual pupil behaviour.

Teachers also draw upon their knowledge of pupils' interests and preferences to facilitate attainment of curriculum goals. Decisions as to what is worthwhile teaching and the best ways to represent selections to be taught are often based on this type of knowledge.

Teachers not only have knowledge of subject-matter; they also adopt particular orientations concerning the aims and objectives of schooling and the work of teachers (Kliebard, 1987; Grossman, 1991; Grossman & Gudmundsdottir, 1987).

On the basis of research such as that summarised above and Brophy's conclusions, it seems that the study of teachers' knowledge and beliefs regarding the teaching of civics and citizenship and the ways in which they implement them in their classrooms might begin by focusing on the exploration of four types of variables: (1) teachers' orientations to the teaching of civics and citizenship; (2) teachers' pedagogical knowledge and beliefs concerning the teaching of civics and citizenship; (3) teachers' classroom practices when teaching civics and
citizenship; and (4) pupils' responses and reactions to their classroom experiences during civics and citizenship lessons.

The Present Study

As part of the Teacher Knowledge into Practice (KIP) program in the School of Teacher Education at the University of New South Wales, it was decided to conduct a pilot study with the specific purposes of exploring as follows:

(1) the types of orientations teachers have, and that they develop, towards the objectives and subject-matter contained in a syllabus for civics and citizenship education:

(2) teachers' pedagogical content knowledge as it develops during the implementation of the syllabus;

(3) teaching strategies employed by teachers while implementing the syllabus:

(4) the responses and reactions of pupils to teachers' attempts to implement the syllabus; and

(5) the relationships among the above teachers' orientations, pedagogical content knowledge, teaching strategies and pupil responses and reactions.

Procedures

The study commenced with the development of a four week (90 minutes per week) unit of work for year 5/6 classes. This unit was developed by a working party consisting of a curriculum development consultant as convenor and chair (Bob Phillips of Epictetus Educational), an academic with expertise in the K-6 Human Society and Its Environment Key Learning Area (Rhonda Craven), an academic with expertise in secondary school History (Alan Merritt), an expert in the area of civics and citizenship education from the NSW Department of School Education, who had assisted the Civics Expert Group (Lynne Goodwin), and two highly experienced primary school teachers (Wendy Lewis and Greta Evans). It had been intended that both teachers would participate fully in the planning and implementation phases. Unfortunately, however, Greta Evans had to withdraw before the end of the planning phase for personal reasons. The group met over a five week period and produced a draft unit of work entitled "The Needs, Rights and Responsibilities of Children."

At the beginning of the development of the unit of work the two teachers participating were interviewed to explore their orientations
to the teaching of civics and citizenship. Wendy Lewis was interviewed again at the end of the development of the unit to explore any changes that might have occurred in her orientation and to obtain her reactions to the planning processes. In addition, at this time, three other teachers, who were not involved in the unit planning phase, were recruited and were interviewed to determine their orientations to the teaching of civics and citizenship. They were Wilma Carter, Therese Dawson and Stephen Johnson3.

The four teachers implemented the unit of work over four weeks, averaging approximately 90 minutes each per week. Each lesson was videotaped by a research assistant (Anne Welch). At the end of each week, stimulated recall interviews using the videotapes as stimulus material were held with each teacher to explore teachers' thinking underlying the lessons and to explore teachers' reactions to the lessons.

At the end of the four weeks, all teachers participated in final interviews to seek their reactions to the implementation phase and four pupils (2 boys and 2 girls) from each class were interviewed as a group to sample their reactions to the lessons. These pupils were selected on the basis of their gender and their participation during the lessons. Participation criteria applied were willingness to engage in discussion, attendance at all lessons, and representativeness of the ethnic composition of the class.

Case studies on each of the teachers are being developed. To date two have been completed, those of Wendy Lewis and Therese Dawson. This paper is confined to the case of Wendy Lewis.

Case Study: Wendy Lewis

The first case study, that of Wendy Lewis, is of particular interest because she participated in both the planning and implementation stages of the project. It was, therefore, possible to trace possible effects of being engaged in the curriculum planning process on Wendy's thinking about teaching civics and citizenship, as well as her experiences in actually teaching to the unit of work on "The Needs, Rights and Responsibilities of Children."

Wendy Lewis was a teacher of a Year 5/6 composite class in a school in Sydney's south. She was 40 years old and had been teaching for about 20 years. Wendy said she had no special qualifications for teaching civics. Her first degree was in science and currently she was studying for a Masters in Creative Arts. Civics was not even a special interest of hers, but just "an integral part of teaching." She did not think that she knew more about civics than the average primary school teacher. "I'm very acutely aware of current issues and things like that, possibly, but ... I just think I have the standard general knowledge, I suppose."
Wendy revealed that 92 percent of her school's population was of "Anglo-Saxon" background and that "... the community I work in, I have to say, is racially prejudiced" (Working Party, 1st Meeting, 30/5/95). Wendy's Year 5/6 composite class apparently was representative of the school, in that only two of the 30 (6.5%) were of non-English speaking backgrounds (First SR Interview, 28/7/95). Somewhat alarming was her revelation that seven of the pupils had serious learning difficulties and that 15 of the 18 boys in the class were taking some form of medication for Attention Deficit Disorder (First SR Interview, 28/7/95).

Wendy's Initial Concepts and Teaching Approach

Upon entry to the project, Wendy thought civics education meant the teaching of government, history relating to government, people involved, not necessarily in government, but in bringing it into being, and issues relating to that, such as suffrage and civil rights. This included the role that government plays, and its structure. In addition, it involved looking at the historical perspectives of other countries, for example, recent events in what was formerly Yugoslavia, and South Africa. Belief systems, as well, were seen to be part of the study of civics.

Wendy considered that civics' importance today is very limited:

It's not exciting; it's very dry. I think we need to bring the excitement back into it, so it's vibrant and it's something which is practical and which is experiential... a living thing, ... a real, distinct part of their life. (Initial interview, 29/5/95)

She went on to say that she did not think civics was a very important part of the Year 5/6 curriculum, but was a "complementary" part of it.

She considered that she had not had a great deal of experience in teaching civics, that it was confined to the Australian parliamentary system and such topics as people who have brought about change, such as Lord Shaftesbury, who was subsequently to be a topic of discussion in her lessons implementing the unit of work. She said a lot of spontaneous teaching occurred in this area as a result of discussing current affairs. Government seemed to her to be a very popular thing to teach in Years 5 and 6. She said that she had taught civics right across both junior primary and senior primary grades.

She had spent "a lot of time" looking at South Africa at the time of Nelson Mandela's release and coming to power, and had devoted time to considering the topic of politics and war, especially with Year 6 and Year 7 boys who, she thought, had a fascination with war. Things that
are happening in the world today to which children relate and understand more readily were among the topics she had taught as well as government at federal, state and local levels.

Wendy thought that one of the important things for teachers in this area was to be "really confident of their own background knowledge." Preparedness in this regard was probably the most important thing. She had developed a "kit" for her "team" of teacher-colleagues which contained an accumulation of resources, photocopies of readings, books, posters, jottings suggesting activities and procedures and maybe some little pointers for developing ideas:

If we're going to cooperatively plan what we're going to do, we can't do that now until they've done preparation. They've got to be confident that they have the knowledge to share and they've also got to see themselves not just as knowledge imparters but they are also going to learn from the experience as well, and that they're growing and that their knowledge is accumulative. (Initial Interview, 29/5/95)

The main thing she was trying to achieve in civics lessons was that the children have an understanding of how and why the country runs at local and higher levels, as well as within the school they attend at a grass roots level, for example, in a school parliament. Children, she said, "really do need to come to terms with" such knowledge as the houses of parliament and the differences between them.

She said she tried to be as creative as she could. She usually asked focus questions and had the children investigate them. Sometimes she might set up a role play or a moral dilemma in which a decision had to be made, for example, a situation involving land rights in which the government has made a decision that a particular place is not a sacred site and thereby has over-ruled the tribal laws. The question of who controls what and why such laws are in place. Why do we have rights?

With cooperative groups and things like that you go into discussions and your small huddles and your brain-storming and then you have to supply the information - this is how this has come about, because the Australian government, which has been elected, put these laws into place. (Initial Interview, 29/5/95)

To her, this led to such questions as, "What is government?" Usually, she said, she planned on the basis of where her class was, and where the pupils' understandings were at that moment.

I'm a great believer in using what's available, hunting up whatever I can. I always get the librarian's task....It would be nice actually to have things that you could put your hands on and pull them out. But I think that tends to be really restrictive. If you do that you don't
give yourself scope to flow and go in other directions as well. It tends to get too prescriptive after a while. (Initial Interview, 29/5/95)

As was to emerge later in the project, prescriptiveness emerged as one of Wendy's pet aversions.

When asked whether there were any topics that pupils found particularly difficult, Wendy said that

the whole structure of federal government is very difficult for them to understand, and the states. Local government they have no problem with, I think because it's very much relating to them.

They understand democracy and they understand voting. But they just have a lot of trouble coming to terms with the different structures and levels of government - federal government especially. I often wonder if we're trying to teach it too early. (Initial Interview, 29/5/95)

As for other difficult topics, she said, "I wouldn't dream of teaching Federation." Pupils disliked federal politics and Federation most, she said: "I actually have only tried to teach Federation once. I found it very difficult, very dry."

The most important things for Year 5/6 pupils to learn in civics were difficult to specify, she said, depending on whether one was looking at content that you want them to learn, or the roles and responsibilities of them as learners, or whether one is being objective or subjective. She said she was very impressed by cooperative learning approaches ("I'm really into it in a big way") and that from pupils' perspectives it was the process that was most important.

I personally would like them to be aware of the fact that there are different systems of government in the world - they do not all operate in the same way. Some are democracies; some are not. Some are tyrannies. Those sorts of things rather than be acutely aware of exactly how the Australian system of government works...I think the most important thing for them at this age is to see the global picture and then to see Australia as a part of the global picture, and we have a system of government based on a democracy and perhaps go on from there if they're ready. (Initial Interview, 29/5/95)

She had worked with a group developing a curriculum unit before. She helped develop an environmental education unit with a officer at the Royal Botanic Gardens and a departmental computer consultant. She enjoyed that and found it stimulating and challenging.

When asked to bring together her ideas for a curriculum unit in civics
for Year 5/6, Wendy repeated the focus on the world and Australia's place in it and the historical factors behind the right to vote, especially in Australia, where it is compulsory and where it is very easy to be dismissive of that. She said it was important to look at power - for that is what politics comes down to. She thought children of that age "really relate" to power "in a big way because they see power structure all around them." As a starting point, she said that she would look at who has the power, or where does the power come from, how people are empowered and then how did people get the right to make decisions, whether we have always had those rights and go back to looking at what is suffrage, what is female suffrage, and aboriginal suffrage, which issues she saw as the basis for going on to "the bigger issue" of what actually is government, people's rights, and what is a citizen.

At first, Wendy said she had no "clue" as to the role she would play on the working party at this stage, but she went on to say:

Just as a classroom teacher who would really like to see how this has been planned, what the ideas are behind it, what the rationale is, what the outcomes are, the powers that be, more or less, because I know there's a political agenda that goes hand-in-hand with it, and just where that's going to. (Initial Interview, 29/5/95)

and she added that she might help to make the unit "more realistic than idealistic." As will be seen, Wendy played a much more influential role than that.

Finally, when asked whether she was looking forward to being involved in the project, Wendy said: "Yes, I am actually. Yes, I'm very excited. It's daunting, very daunting, I think, and it's very awe-inspiring, yes, because I think it's very challenging."

In summary, Wendy had quite a broad concept of the nature of civics and citizenship education, certainly one that recognised the importance of history, of international perspectives, of civil rights, of belief systems, and not just the structure and function of government. Although she did not attribute major importance to this area of education, Wendy had had considerable experience of teaching it, was confident in her own ability to teach it and believed in nonprescriptive and cooperative approaches. She valued flexibility and creativity and eschewed "nuts and bolts" approaches focussing on the structures of government. She knew some topics which were difficult to teach and pupils did not enjoy, but she expected her pupils to acquire a knowledge and understanding of how they were governed in comparison with other parts of the world. She had developed ideas as to the appropriateness of various teaching strategies from experience. She was particularly interested in questions of power and rights and she
approached involvement in the project with pleasure and enthusiasm.

Wendy's Role in the Development of the Unit of Work

Wendy's experiential knowledge of teaching in this area was exhibited, and her concern with making it interesting was expressed, in the first meeting of the working party when, following another member's description of the teaching of government at another school, she said:

I'll throw a spanner into the works. I actually, in preparation for this, have spoken to over 20 [pupils]. They were 10, 11 and 12 year-olds, and the concepts are too difficult. That's something I've always thought when I've taught it. And I've done everything but hang from the chandeliers to teach it and make it interesting and exciting ... I really believe we should be looking at things like world governments and what is a democracy? what is a dictatorship? what is a monarchy? and things like that, which then lead into then looking at our own government system. (Working party meeting, 30/5/95)

Wendy's concerns about teaching about Federation, as expressed in the initial interview, were apparently not with the importance of that topic but with its suitability for children in Years 5/6. She explained this in the first meeting of the working party, thus:

I think it's such an important issue for Australians to know about where we come from and where we're going and things like that. I think Federation and all those sorts of issues are so very very important. But I think we also need to look at the kids we're teaching. Are they mature enough and ready? (Working party meeting, 30/5/95)

Wendy reacted to a statement made by another member of the planning group about the importance of history, thus:

One of the interesting things is that when my kids ask me, "How did we get the right to vote?", not we, but the people, and then we went into suffrage and that whole thing, and, I tell you what, that was the best thing I've ever done. That was about three years ago ... That whole concept of Aboriginal suffrage and things like that. I didn't care what else we'd use, as far as I was concerned, they had enough from that to go beyond it. They were totally absorbed. They loved it. (Working party meeting, 30/5/95)

Her successful experiences with topics involving concepts of rights and with historical approaches seemed to have prepared Wendy well for what was to follow.

But Wendy expressed concern about the demands made upon teachers. She said they would have to have "the right approach" and "be secure" and that "mega-inservicing" would be required to supply teachers with the content knowledge required. She said, "If I don't know enough I'm not
going to do it," but then intimated that perhaps the demand on her knowledge would not be insurmountable: "You don't have to know a lot to be a facilitator to bring it about."

This expression of opinion on Wendy's part stimulated some concern on the part of the history specialists on the working party, one of whom replied:

... You actually have to have some clear knowledge outcomes you want the students to achieve and be sure at the end of it they've achieved them, which is where we haven't been as rigorous as we might have been.

We've been very much process/skills oriented, which is fine, but I think the way the world is now moving, it's moved in English to a much more functional, rigid model and you know, back to grammar and so on. I think it's the same in history. HSIE is going to be clear knowledge outcomes and content - structures that we want them to be able to demonstrate they understand. (Working party meeting, 30/5/95)

The other history specialist agreed: "And I think the climate's moved that way very quickly. Very quickly." Not surprisingly, Wendy did not make a rejoinder.

If there was an indication of disagreement in the above exchange, it did not last long, for several minutes later one of the history specialists objected to a "tokenistic" approach to the teaching of civics and citizenship, and asked: "Are we going to do something that's more deep seated about understanding what it means to be an Australian citizen and maybe looking back in time?" Wendy replied, "... I really believe that's more appropriate ... The Australian Identity over Time ... Yes, yes, yes. That's exactly the place to start."

Later, after the working party had agreed not to select government as the basis of the unit of work because that had already been taught in the classes involved, Wendy expressed interest in topics involving rights and freedoms of women, Aboriginal people, and children, and said, "When you look at working conditions of children and things like that at the same time, the kids relate to that ..." This, too, was an important statement in the light of choices subsequently made by the working party.

In preparation for the second meeting of the working party, members were asked to prepare notes on two or three themes and the outcomes to which they might contribute. They were urged to use materials included in the report of the Civics Expert Group, "Whereas the people ..." as a guide in these preparations. Wendy took "The Australian Identity" as one theme and in explaining it, argued that women had had to fight for their rights, unlike men, historically. She did, however, agree that discrimination could be examined for both men and women and went on to
emphasise the rights of children.

Between the second and third meetings of the working party the two teachers conferred with each other about topics that might be included in the unit of work. The topics they listed included "The Australian Identity," and "The Rights and Responsibilities of Children." At a special meeting they held with the convenor of the working party (13/6/95), it was the former topic which attracted most discussion but it was realised that the other topic could be approached within the context of "The Australian Identity."

Another topic discussed at this meeting was "Australia as a Multicultural Society." Twice Wendy expressed reservations about this topic. On the first occasion she said: "We've got to be careful it's not history. That's the thing. You've got to be really careful." On the second occasion, a few minutes later, after she had been assured that the present and future would need to be considered and not just the past, she said:

I don't want to do it. I can tell you right now that I don't want to touch it with a barge pole. It just seems too historical to me. I don't want to get into the history for this... I just think it’s too big, too big.

It was clear that at this stage Wendy was ambivalent about history. On the one hand she had reported elation at the adoption of an historical approach to the teaching about suffrage for Aboriginal people but now she was eschewing the idea of an historical approach to teaching about multiculturalism.

In discussion with her teacher/colleague on the working party, Wendy foreshadowed a reaction she was later to give to one of the modules within the unit of work, when she said in relation to one of the resource materials concerned with European settlement in Australia that she was inspecting: "See this book. This is one thing that I have trouble with, because I refuse to teach it as 'invasion'."

Although most of the consideration given by the two teachers concerned the topic of "The Australian Identity," which at one stage was selected as their theme for the unit of work, Wendy also continued to display an interest in the rights of children, explaining her ideas as follows:

I'd look at giving children power, like empowering children. Why are we so set on giving children rights and empowering them? Because - well that would probably be my starting question - why do we want children to be empowered ... what have they had in the past? And then go back to look at child labour, injustices, the role of the family and those sorts of things. (Meeting of the two teachers, 13/6/95)
At the beginning of the third meeting of the working party (20/6/95), in a major development in the process of choice of a theme for the unit of work, it was reported that "The Australian Identity" would not be a suitable theme because that was part of the Year 7 syllabus. Wendy had discussed this problem with her secondary grade colleague at school, who, she reported, had said that she "really liked the idea of looking at children and the changing role of the child's life and the emphasis on childhood and those sorts of things." Wendy had accepted the suggestion of her colleague, which, incidentally, was consistent with an interest Wendy had shown previously in her involvement in this project. She had then prepared a paper on that theme for this third meeting of the working party, which quickly accepted that theme. In the discussion which followed, it was significant that when one member suggested that the condition of indigenous children be included under the theme as part of the unit of work, Wendy had responded enthusiastically, pointing out that there was a third world culture within Australia that should be studied and referring to the separation of Aboriginal children from their parents.

Subsequently, after other members of the working party had presented possibilities for inclusion in the unit, Wendy expressed concern about teachers' knowledge of the history required in those suggestions. She said:

What I'm saying is that, perhaps we need to, perhaps, look at, perhaps, sections rather than, but - I would find that if I didn't have the basic history, I think, very daunting ... (Working party meeting, 20/6/95)

Soon afterwards, Wendy revealed that she had not "done" Australian history until she had left school, making it clear that she lacked confidence in giving historical treatments to topics.

As the third meeting of the working party elaborated plans for a unit on the theme of the "Rights and Responsibilities of Children," in tabular form on a white board, Wendy expressed further enthusiasm, "I actually think you could take that and you could do your whole stuff - your whole civics this year using that" (Working party meeting, 20/6/95).

Subsequently, however, when an academic member of the working party mentioned the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Children, Wendy responded unenthusiastically, but soon afterwards she pointed out that the earlier declaration of human rights during the French Revolution had ignored children. When another member stated that boys over 12 were conscripted into the armed services in Australia in the early part of the 20th Century, Wendy said,
That is something my kids, I know, are really interested in, because when we were doing ANZAC Day and British Imperialism, they got so angry ... The righteousness that came out of these little kids ... (Working party meeting, 20/6/95)

When asked if she agreed that "The Rights and Responsibilities of Children" should be the theme, Wendy agreed. Later she said that she thought the appropriate starting point would be the Year 2000 and the Republic and that, then, one would go back. When, after subsequent discussion, the title was elaborated to "The Needs, Rights and Responsibilities of Children," Wendy responded unenthusiastically, saying that it needed to be more than that, that some "Whiz! Bang!" was needed to appeal to children, but concluded that she, as an adult, liked it.

At the end of the third meeting of the working party, the above theme was adopted, and it was agreed that the theme would be developed across three areas: the historical perspective, including modules on three "slices of time", the period of initial European settlement, the period surrounding Federation, and the period of the 1950s; the Aboriginal perspective; and the international perspective. Wendy was to provide a preface to the unit including material on attitudes and values and assessment of pupil learning. Before the fourth and last meeting, Wendy had provided the preface and a pro forma for the unit, following the model set by the NSW Department of School Education.

At the beginning of the final meeting, while Wendy was explaining her preface, one member expressed the thought that there would also be reference to the "pre-invasion" and "invasion" periods in the history of Australia. Another member commented that this was "a grey area" and a third said that changes could be made to allow for that. Wendy did not comment on the specific reference to "invasion", although, in the light of a comment she had made earlier and another one she made in a later interview, it was likely that she had views about the use of that terminology. When the module on Aboriginal perspectives was discussed, Wendy commented that there was "so much" in it that people could choose from a wide range of possibilities what they really wanted to do, but she expressed no reservations about the content of the module.

Wendy's main contributions to the discussion of the "slice of time" modules were to point out the conventions regarding the use of terminology concerning stages and levels, to react to ideas regarding teaching strategies and ideas, which she described at one point as "excellent", and to mention a source of information about the Magistrates' and Children's Courts she had discovered. Again, she commented on the volume of possibilities included in the modules, reminisced about her own childhood experiences relating to Australia as part of the British Empire and gave information about resources she knew of, for example, about the Baby Boomers in Australia. She said it
would be a relatively easy thing to pick out two or three things in each era and that there were "really exciting" ideas. She said,

If they've got the confidence to say, "Well, I know this. I know this and this and this and this and this and I can make this flow," because there's such a wealth and such a diversity there. I think that's the thing - if they have got so much to choose from then it gives them the freedom to really develop something that they're confident to teach. (Working party meeting, 27/6/95)

It was clear that Wendy regarded teacher confidence in the knowledge of content as a very important influence on their use of the unit of work. She went on to say, "I'm getting very excited again. I must admit I was getting really weighed down a couple of weeks ago."

In relation to the module on "... children around the world," Wendy saw an opportunity to use a statement in one of the resources in formulating the introduction to the unit, referred to a recent television program about the damage being done to children in Cambodia by land mines, and the number of destitute and homeless children living within a kilometre of the White House in Washington, DC. She mentioned that her class actually did research with an hypothesis, and said that the type of group work suggested in the teaching and learning strategies of this module were very common in primary schools and should not present a problem. She also suggested that the "nuclear issue" would be a suitable topic to treat in this module.

Wendy's Reactions to the Unit Planning Process

After the final meeting of the working party, a draft document was prepared containing the introduction, modules, and resources chosen to be included in the unit of work. Wendy received a copy of the document and was interviewed to sample her responses to that document and to gauge her reactions to the whole planning process.

Wendy said that she had been very enthusiastic about the planning meetings, particularly the exchange of ideas that flowed within the group. She said that people would pick up an idea and run with it, yet, if it was felt that something would not work, there was a whole change of direction. She found the opportunity to listen and accept others' ideas and points of view was very beneficial. She had felt "very relaxed with the whole situation" (Interview, 19 July, 1995), although initially she had felt hesitant in stating her own ideas because she was not familiar with the background and did not share the same historical perspective as some of the others in the group. In time, however, she came to feel quite comfortable.

Wendy said that her view of civics and citizenship education had changed as a result of being involved in the development of the unit.
She said that she had come to look more at the citizenship aspect, whereas her previous understanding was from an historical perspective guided by parliamentary and government concepts. She now considered the broader concept and thought more about the world agenda and all the related other issues, such as racism. She commented that, although she had expressed interest in a "global view" in her initial interview, the focus on children and material produced by UNICEF had influenced her strongly and had opened up a whole new area of understanding for her. However, her view of the importance of civics and citizenship education had not changed. It remained for her an important component, but not a major focus of education.

When invited to comment on the draft unit of work, Wendy responded that it was very comprehensive and that there appeared to be a wide variety of topics to choose from. As she had been personally involved in the development of the unit, she felt that she had an understanding of it but felt that another person who had not been similarly involved might be overwhelmed by it. She surmised that if she were to present the unit to her own colleagues, they would say, "I'll think about that." She suggested that, because there was so much information within the unit, there was a need to be more explicit, perhaps in the introduction, in explaining that teachers were not expected to cover all of it but, rather, to select from the unit.

When asked whether she would be more likely to choose some modules than others, Wendy replied that she would choose so as to follow a line of continuity. She thought that she would focus on living conditions through a "slice of time". This would involve not only living conditions through the different periods of time but would also involve the indigenous culture module as well. Wendy said that there were some problems for teachers in the modules, as follows:

1. A lot of teachers would not have the background knowledge of history and would not have the time to do the research and preparation required to implement some of the modules;

2. Many teachers would be reluctant to use the indigenous people module because they disagreed with the concept of "invasion" associated with white settlement in Australia.

Concerning the second of the above problems, Wendy said that she taught this material from both white and Aboriginal points of view and recommended that approach to other teachers using that module.

Wendy's Plans for Implementing the Unit

At the end of the first week's lessons in the implementation phase of the project, Wendy participated in a stimulated recall interview
concerned mainly with her teaching of the unit during that week. At the beginning of the interview, however, she was asked about her plans for the four weeks. She replied that she had "just about" decided on her program. She intended to begin by concentrating on definitions concerning the needs, rights and responsibilities of children, then to look at the historical concept of children in the past, then focussing on some other historical concepts which she had not fully decided upon. For example, she said the boys would be particularly interested in children at war, but she was unsure of the availability of resources on that topic. Then she would want to look at several countries concerning child labour. Here she mentioned that she had a missionary friend who could provide her with resources about child labour in Pakistan and who might even speak to the class. She said that the module on indigenous children would be left till later in the year when it had been decided to have a whole school focus on that topic for a whole week at the beginning of Term 4.

Wendy referred to the role of teacher knowledge and the amount of preparation teachers need to do. She said that once the teachers had read the sources it was very easy for them to convey the "oral history" to the children through reading and story telling.

When asked whether her reservations about the use of terms such as "invasion" in relation to Module 4 had anything to do with the delay in treating it, Wendy said:

Oh no! No! Because I would teach both. I teach it as a term. I say that "invasion" is the term used by some people, "settlement" is the term used by others, and then talk about what the two concepts are and how differently people view them and that is what the situation is.

(Interview, 28/7/95)

In summary, Wendy said she tried to choose subjects which linked well together and omit things which she thought could stand alone independently and could be taught separately. The main things she was looking for were flow and continuity. She said she thought she had "sparked the kids' imagination" with the week's lessons on what children had to do in the past and that they were more than willing to explore that topic. She repeated that she hoped to have completed the whole unit by the end of the term.

Rather than being deterred in her selection by the lack of her own knowledge, Wendy said she had chosen "the things that I know least about" in the hope of acquiring knowledge. She said that the nature of the class she taught did not influence her selections:

They're a really good group of kids who latch on to anything really - they'll run with anything - as long as it is presented in a way that
sparks their imagination, basically. It takes them a little time to warm up but once they get going you just can't stop them. (Interview, 28/7/95)

Neither did the school's resources nor prior experience in teaching those topics affect Wendy's selections. She was disappointed with the school's resources and would have to look outside the school for many of those she would need. She said that she had not taught those topics before.

Finally, in describing what she would need to know to implement her plans, Wendy said she would need to know "heaps".

Basically I've got to start from scratch. To know a little about everything is so different to knowing a lot about a little, which is what I've got to come down to. Having a good general knowledge, which I do have ... but when it comes down to all the finer details and the depth of the history and the knowledge I've really got to read on that and it really is, it's literally a lot of work ... A lot of it is hidden history, or it's ignored or it's brushed over because in the general picture it's too time consuming or it's something we really don't want to know about so we'll just shove it aside. (Interview, 28/7/95)

Wendy's Lessons

In the first lesson, Wendy began with the words "needs", "rights", and "responsibilities" and asked the pupils to "brainstorm" the meanings of the three. After 16 minutes, she formed the pupils into groups of three to make lists of their perceptions of "needs for children", "rights for children" and "responsibilities for children" around the world. The latter were divided into two categories, "children's responsibilities for someone else, and someone else's responsibilities for a child."

While the groups completed this task, Wendy moved among them helping to expand ideas, asking questions about the items in the lists, and using examples to explain concepts. For example, to one group she explained the difference between "wants" and "needs" thus: "You might want to have a hot pie at recess, but do you need it after you've had a big breakfast?" After 22 minutes of small group work, reports from four of the groups were presented for approximately eight minutes, at which stage Wendy interrupted the reporting and announced that the remaining reports would be heard in the following lesson. She then read a summary of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Children and made a few comparisons between the UN list and those listed by the groups. The lesson finished after 56 minutes with congratulations to the pupils for their good work.

In the second lesson, which lasted 32 minutes, reports from the
remaining seven groups were received for 20 minutes, with a three minute diversion about killing and guns. A little over 21 minutes into the lesson Wendy changed her focus to a topic from Module 1, conditions for children in England in the early 1800s. Wendy informed the class about child labour and read from a report by Lord Shaftesbury, before asking, "Could it happen today?" as a way of stimulating a class discussion, during which comments were made about the strength of child labourers, the loss of their childhood, and their lack of enjoyment and education. Wendy asked, "What is happening to your body at this age?" eliciting comments about inhibition of growth, poor health, and the lack of medical care. The dependence of families on working children, and the employment of women more cheaply than men were also mentioned, and the suggestion was made that a girl interview her English grandfather in preparation for next week's lessons.

Wendy's third lesson lasted 64 minutes. It began with the pupils sitting on the floor at the front of the room while two children read their notes on interviews with grandparents for approximately six minutes. Then, Wendy described books from the local library which were to be put into the class collection for research. These books were entitled "Victorian Factory Workers", "The Industrial Revolution", and "Child Labour". Next, Wendy explained more about child labour and the Industrial Revolution, making reference to Stevenson's steam locomotive and its contribution to industry. This was followed by the projection of overhead transparencies depicting chimney sweeps, cotton mills, coal mines and brick pits.

After about 18 minutes, Wendy explained a small group task in which the groups of three were to discuss illustrations of children working, with the guidance of focus questions on distributed sheets. Pupils were asked such questions as, "What could have been done to prevent this happening?" "What sort of laws would you make to protect these people?", "Where do you think he [a boy coal miner] might have worked?", and "Estimate his age" before Wendy consolidated by reiterating such aspects of children's lives as absence of leisure, formal education, need to work to support families, the Shaftesbury reforms, and the difference between the rich and the poor. The groups of three were then set to work again on answering questions about an overhead transparency depicting more child victims of the Industrial Revolution. Again, focus questions as follows were provided: "Do they look happy?", "Do they look well-fed?", "Do they look clean?", "Why is he being whipped?", "What would her job have been?", "How much space have they got?" This group work took almost 24 minutes.

After approximately 50 minutes, Wendy projected a transparency and read out the rules of a cotton mill and drew and explained a bobbin. She then read the story of the Coulson girls, three girls who worked in a mill under appalling conditions. Then, she announced that group work during the lesson would be displayed on the walls, before asking the class to contemplate ways in which children's lives have changed, with
focus questions being, "What was a big turning point?" and "How did schooling come into place?" She then recapitulated on the work of Shaftesbury, the ages at which children could be employed, the hours they worked and the jobs they did.

This third lesson concluded with Wendy preparing for the fourth lesson by introducing the concept of child convicts, the crimes of children, and the punishment of transportation to Australia.

The fourth of Wendy's lessons occurred very soon after the third, with only a short recess between the two. In this lesson, which lasted for 36 minutes and began with the pupils again sitting on the floor, the first six minutes were spent with Wendy reading from "The Lady Juliana", a book about the Second Fleet. The reading included details of the convicts and their crimes. At the end of the reading, Wendy handed out worksheets and while they were passed around she read to the class about convicts' crimes and punishments. Then she explained the tasks on the worksheets, the first of which contained information about conditions in coal mines in England. In turn, a boy, a girl and then Wendy read. The second sheet contained questions based on the first sheet and the pupils were to work in pairs to answer them. While the pairs worked, Wendy moved from pair to pair. After about 13 minutes, the seatwork was halted and Wendy summed up in terms of three focus questions: "Where are we up to in looking at what's happening with children?", "Where are we now in our journey through time?", and "What country are we heading out of?" The last few minutes were spent preparing for lesson 5 which was said to be about the experiences of convict children as they arrived in Australia. Pupils were urged to consider the differences between conditions in England and Australia, and how the children would have felt.

In the third week, Wendy focussed upon arriving in Australia and what faced children. The fifth lesson lasted for 45 minutes and was followed immediately by the sixth, which lasted 41 minutes. Lesson 5 commenced with the pupils sitting on the floor while Wendy gave a brief review of convicts being sentenced to transportation to Australia. Then followed a whole class discussion for five minutes on the various types of punishments meted out to criminals, ranging from flogging to drawing and quartering. Next, there was a brief discussion of the principle of the punishment fitting the crime, focussing on the seven year transportation sentences and the alternatives following expiration of the sentences. The living and working conditions of convicts in Australia became the focus, with special consideration for a little over five minutes of child convicts, during part of which Wendy read some information about the number of children with the First Fleet, 13 of whom were convicts. After 30 minutes, Wendy passed out information sheets and read from "The Convict Era - How They Lived". Then pupils read from the sheets and a picture of a female factory was displayed.
and Wendy resumed reading until the end of the lesson.

The sixth lesson began with the children sitting on the floor. After a brief introduction about life in early Sydney, during which mention was made of street children, juvenile crime, the rapid increase in the number of taverns, and drunkenness in men, women and children, she distributed copies of a book entitled "My Place" written by Nadia Wheatley, about the history of a house from 1788 - 1988. The class was set to reading the book in pairs and was asked to think about changes in the street and in the lives of children in the area, street, and house. At the end of about 25 minutes, pupils reported on the changes they had read about. Then Wendy read about Sam, an 11 year old boy in London who was transported to Sydney for stealing a jacket he was too poor to buy. The lesson concluded with the class being set homework involving finishing the reading of "My Place" and answering questions about changes in the lives of children depicted in the book.

In the fourth week the lessons began with a pupil's report of an interview of her grandmother. The rest of the time was spent on pupils' inspecting several artefacts from earlier times in Australia. These included a commode chair, an electric copper, a meat safe lined with an old newspaper, a meat mincer, a pan toilet, a kerosene lamp, a wooden cabinet, and a dressmaker's rule for measuring the length of skirts. Their investigations were guided by an inquiry sheet. At the end of the last lesson, Wendy provided the answers to the questions raised on the inquiry sheet, identifying the objects and their uses.

Stimulated Recall Interviews about Wendy's Lessons

Four important and closely connected themes emerged during the stimulated recall interviews at the end of each week. They provided valuable insights into Wendy's beliefs about the nature of good teaching. The first had to do with the management of time, the second concerned the cluster of concepts including exploration, discovery, directiveness and prescriptiveness, the third concerned content knowledge and resources, and the fourth dealt with the types of learning outcomes aimed at during the lessons.

Management of time

In view of concern Wendy had expressed about the lack of time there was to do justice to the unit of work, she was questioned about the size and number of small groups formed during her first lesson. There were, in fact, 11 groups nearly all of which had only three members. When it was pointed out that 11 separate reports from the groups took up much time, Wendy was asked if she ever saw that as a problem, she replied:

No, I don't because I really want the kids to feel they have a right to
speak; they have a right to their opinions and I find that if it is a large group someone usually feels that they haven't been able to express their opinion, and I think it's worthwhile sacrificing that time for them to have the opportunity to express their own opinion. It doesn't worry me about the fact that it took time because everybody was listening ... when they were reporting and lots of good things came up even though there was a lot of repetition. (Interview, 28/7/95)

Wendy expressed great dissatisfaction with the second lesson, saying that "it was probably one of the worst lessons I've ever taught". Then later, she reiterated her disappointment, thus:

It was absolutely appalling ... I felt it was the worst lesson I have ever taught in my life. I came away from it and I thought, "That achieved absolutely nothing ... I've rushed it, I haven't summarised what the kids said today ... I haven't given them the opportunity to comment on my summation," which I normally would always do. And so I found that very frustrating. (Interview, 28/7/95)

She went on to say that lack of time was the cause of the problem.

She was disappointed with the distribution of time between the two lessons, for this week, because she had decided that one lesson would be only 30 minutes long, a length she otherwise never used. She thought the pupils found the 30 minute duration very difficult because they were so used to having time to "talk, think, ..., throw the ideas around, like a basketball match." Because of the time she found herself "talking at them, which I hated doing."

In her general evaluation of this first week's lessons, Wendy said that she initially wanted her pupils to understand the differences among the three words, "needs," "rights," and "responsibilities" as a broad introduction. She found that the class did not really understand the difference between rights and needs and so was pleased that she had spent more time than she had planned on those concepts. However, as this objective took so much time to achieve, she was not able to spend as much time as she had planned on historical material on children in the near distant past, in particular, child labour. She had planned to look at child labour in mines, factories and other contexts but got only as far as mines. Nevertheless, she was happy because, as she said, she could not really have expected to achieve more than "awareness raising" in such a short time as two lessons totalling approximately 90 minutes.

By the end of the second week of teaching from the unit of work, Wendy expressed concern about running out of time to implement her plans for the four weeks. This would mean postponing her plans for Module 5 of the unit until "further down the track". She had really wanted to "be
in Australia" by the end of this week. Had she the chance to teach the
two lessons again, she said she did not think she would teach them
differently. "Even though we started going somewhere else, [and] we
came back to where we were before, I don't think it was totally
unrelated." She found that teaching the lessons in isolation from the
rest of the curriculum was very difficult. She was now expecting not to
get beyond looking at Australia up to the present day.

It's just like the tip of the iceberg, because there's so much. It's as
if [I have an] overwhelming sense of frustration ... knowing that it's
only four weeks and there's so much I want to do. But then I just
accept the fact that this is only just a little tiny part of my whole
thing that I'm doing and it doesn't matter ... (Interview, 4/8/95)

Then, at the end of the third week, when Wendy was asked whether she
intended to mention the different types of convicts transported to New
South Wales, she replied:

I only wish I had more time, but, no, not now ... When you stop
videoing, then I can do it at my own pace. I'll go back and visit all
of this stuff and do that but because I'm trying to plough through so
much. Like, all I'm doing is imparting knowledge. I'm not really
teaching the way I would normally teach. All I'm doing is just
ploughing out knowledge to try and get through as much as I can.
(Interview 11/8/95)

When pressed about her priorities concerning conveying knowledge and
putting that knowledge into practice, Wendy suggested that part of the
problem of managing time was that she felt constraints arising from
this project that stopped her from integrating the material with other
subjects in the curriculum:

I don't think you can separate the two. That's what's so difficult ...
The thing is, very few teachers would teach like this and would teach
it as a straight subject. It would be totally integrated, so, with your
total integration, in a week you'd get through so much, so much more
because it permeates everything you do, and the kids are so focussed on
it and it just becomes basically the centre of your reading and
writing, so when you're doing reading you're just extending it and
you're exploring so many other things ... (Interview, 11/8/95)

She then went on to describe ways in which she might have attempted to
integrate the material of this unit of work with lessons in subjects.
It is not clear why Wendy felt inhibited in doing that. One impression
that emerged from her frequently stated and quite deep concern with
time allocation was that, as a result of having to teach material which
she had not taught before, particularly the Australian history
material, with inadequate resources, the skills she had developed over
20 years in programming and managing instructional time deserted her,
and she was reduced to the status of a novice in these regards.
The discovery process

Wendy trod a fine line regarding these principles. While, generally she adhered to the discovery/freedom philosophy of teaching and learning, she was prepared to acknowledge that direction was sometimes required, at least for some pupils. When she was 32 minutes into the first lesson she explained the distinction between wants and needs to one group of three boys. She was asked whether she thought the other groups understood the difference and said:

No, I think it was something that I discovered as I was going around that I should have clarified beforehand, perhaps not with every group, but those three boys there all have severe learning difficulties ... But, yes, it was something that I felt afterwards that perhaps I needed to clarify to a greater extent beforehand. (Interview, 28/7/95)

A few minutes later, a boy from another group asked Wendy if needs and rights were the same. Instead of giving a direct answer, Wendy had said merely said that that was not easy. When asked to explain her response, Wendy said: "... [B]ecause I wanted them to actually differentiate themselves, to work out why they were different ..."

Then, about half way through the second lesson, Wendy referred to the distinction between wants and needs, again without explaining it. Again she said, when asked why she did not explain the difference, "I don't want to tell them; I want them to work it out". When pressed on whether there would be a culmination to the exploration of these concepts, she said:

I'm hoping that when we do the final brainstorming and we're comparing that it's going to come out. If it doesn't then I will actually do it - I will actually say "This is the difference between the two. Did you see this and is it there or have you not been able to explain it." I'll try and find out whether they're actually seeing it but they can't actually express it, 'cause it is quite a difficult thing for them to have to express. (Interview, 28/7/95)

In the stimulated recall interview at the end of the second week, Wendy recounted that she had discovered "The Lady Juliana" by chance in the school library and that, although she knew quite a lot about convict times in Australia, this was "Just flying by the seat of my pants basically." Wendy explained that she had departed from using groups of three children to using pairs because she was not satisfied with the results achieved from the former and she wanted to be "a little bit more directed. I just felt that there were kids who were sitting on the outer." When asked why she had returned to conditions in England, Wendy replied, "Just side-tracked." She went on, at first sarcastically:
"What I need is a written-out statement, step by step by step. I don't teach like that; I can't teach to a miniscule plan."

The reason for her desire to include this activity was that it involved the pupils in using primary source material to gather evidence. In discussion about the connection between this lesson and the first week's lessons concerning wants and needs, Wendy said that she had not tried to make a conscious link:

I just want it to be a thread, a thread that's following through... It loses its impetus if you're always hammering it ... whereas if it's just this very subtle thread running through it they come to the realisation ... rather than just "Whack - this is what it is". (Interview, 4/8/95)

She commented on this week's lessons as follows, attributing the perceived directiveness to the need to convey historical information: 
"[It] seems to be very directed. There's, you know, lots of me talking and lots of listening because there's that historical aspect where the kids can't draw on their own experience."

Several times during the interview at the end of the third week Wendy reiterated her commitment to discovery approaches and eschewed didacticism which she regarded herself as having been forced to adopt for the purposes of this project. Then, when asked how satisfied she was with the last two lessons, during which the pupils inspected artefacts from earlier times, she replied that she "loved" the last session "because that's the way my kids always learn and they feel very relaxed and it's the way I always teach through learning through investigation." However, she recognised the possibility of limitations in this approach by stating that she should not have used so many objects for the pupils to explore, as that stopped them from progressing to other activities that she had planned.

Content knowledge and resources

Wendy had trouble locating resources for the section on 19th century England, saying that she had used a textbook she had as a school student more than 20 years earlier to glean information about Lord Shaftesbury, and Grolier's Encyclopedia on CD Rom which was in her school's library, thus going from one extreme of resource sophistication to the other.

During the stimulated recall interview at the end of the second week, Wendy said she had spent a whole day at a local library seeking resources for this week's lessons, which led her to recommend that a resources booklet containing the type of information teachers needed to teach about such topics as the Industrial Revolution be developed to
accompany the unit of work. Wendy described her knowledge of these topics as follows:

I had a thumbnail sketch. I mean, I had enough probably to sit down and talk about it but without authority, saying, "This is what I know" ... I knew from my reading, like, I read a lot, I read all the time, and I've got a very good memory for the trivia ... the things like the mines and the children, I remember that. I’ve read it before and it's always something that's stayed with me because it was something that really jarred ... It's more putting it together as a whole and relating it in a time-line, I think, and knowing where you’re heading ... I like to be sure of what I'm doing.(Interview, 4/8/95)

In the stimulated recall interview at the end of the third week, Lesley reported that the diary she had been keeping had been mislaid. She then said that she had found it very difficult to find specific examples for what she wanted to do in the lessons for this week. In a week of searching, she had found only one book that specifically mentioned convict children and that was about the children's prison in Port Arthur.

In the interview at the end of the third week, Wendy displayed considerable knowledge of British influence on colonial architecture. It also became clear at this point that much of Wendy's knowledge had been acquired through the necessity to prepare lessons that she was about to teach. She explained several aspects of the substance of this lesson in terms of content she had acquired for the purposes of this project. Her insight into the economic aspects of the transportation system were especially revealed in the following comments:

... They came as basically slave labour. If they were doing the equivalent work in England they would have been paid for it ... When they came to Australia, because they were convicts, they weren't paid for it - They were slave labour. (Interview, 11/8/95)

When probed further, she showed that she knew that, in fact, some convicts were paid. She said:

We actually said that ... I actually read that ... I think it might have been in that thing on children and it said that they had Saturday and Sunday off, which was more than they had in England ... and that they could work at their own jobs and be paid for it. (Interview, 11/8/95)

Throughout this interview, Wendy indicated that she had acquired a comprehensive knowledge of this period of Australian history. She also indicated that the present project may have influenced her when she said that since she had become involved in it she had acquired
knowledge from the "Open Learning" programs on Australian Broadcasting Corporation television on Saturday mornings on which "They're doing this fantastic series on the youth of Australia and the beginnings of Australia." As a further example of recently acquired knowledge, she said: "Mrs Macarthur was the famous wool grower and not Mr Macarthur ... She did all the experimental work with the sheep and the wool," and soon after,

I think Bligh, who had such incredible plans for the colony, is so hard done by, and when you look at what he tried to achieve, it's so different from what any other Governors tried to achieve, because he upset the Rum Corps, he was packed off ... he was, in fact such an incredible man and he's got this black name in history ...(Interview, 11/8/95)

Wendy mentioned another source of her information. It was a book called "Australian History Heritage" mentioned in HSIE Learning Materials, from which she discovered that when the First Fleet sailed from England there were 32 children on board. Wendy also mentioned another resource which she thought was called "Convicts of Australia" or "Sydney Convicts".

Wendy's final comments on the unit of work were, "It's very difficult to teach. It's far too big. It covers far too much." While she appreciated the flexibility and freedom in the unit, and understood that it was never expected that the whole of the unit would be covered in the four weeks, she thought the modules needed to be made smaller.

You've got to do a lot of work. Like, it's really got to be fully resourced. I don't think you can just say, "Here it is." I think what needs to be done now is to sit down and either write abstracts to go with it or handbook-support materials for everything that's there as well as, like, your bibliographies and your films and your appendices and things like that. But I really do believe it needs written support materials to go with it. (Interview, 29/8/95)

Understanding and empathy

Wendy pursued both cognitive and affective learnings in her lessons and many insights into her thinking regarding them were obtained in the weekly interviews, as illustrated in the following.

Her early focus on all three of the concepts "needs", "rights" and "responsibilities" prompted a question asking her if she thought the children understood them. She replied that the exercise was more in the nature of an assessment of their understandings on the basis of which she would plan future learning experiences. Later on, however, when she
was asked if she thought the pupils had understood a distinction she had explained between the responsibilities adults had for children and the responsibilities children themselves had, she commented that many of the groups did not get as far as responsibilities because "they were so tied up with their rights and their needs," especially the Year 5 children.

Eight minutes after the second lesson began, a pupil made reference to "the right to obey" which seemed to indicate a misconception of the meaning of "right". However, Wendy explained it as follows: "Well, I think it comes down to the right to say `No!'", and that it probably arose from the lessons on child protection she had been giving in the another Key Learning Area.

Wendy explained that her objective for the discussion following the reading of the excerpt from Lord Shaftesbury was that she wanted to see if the pupils had any empathy at all with the child labourers. She was pursuing an affective rather than cognitive outcome:

I really wanted them to have the feeling of what was happening and to develop a righteous anger, if possible - not even necessarily a righteous anger but an indignation so there was an emotive response. (Interview, 28/7/95)

When she was asked for her reaction to one boy's response expressing surprise at the physical strength of the child labourers, Wendy said:

Actually, I thought, well that's true, because ... these kids don't see themselves being strong and having that strength and it was mind-boggling for him to think that they actually sweated and carried those loads and I thought he was being empathetic in a way because he was looking at the ... strength that was involved in the labour ... It was an understanding of the fact that they'd suffered ... I don't know, maybe I just interpret things in a different way. (Interview, 28/7/95)

Wendy's conclusion about whether the class did understand that child labourers and their families had no choice was:

They didn't talk about anything else for the whole day ... I still don't think that they understand the suffering ... I think it's more they're incredulous that it happened and, "How could that have happened to children?" (Interview, 28/7/95)

Wendy expressed her aim for the activities in the third lesson as being, again, to stimulate empathy and also to encourage the children to see the needs of child labourers and that the needs would be met by the laws. She did not think that at this stage the time was ripe for a return to the concepts of rights and responsibilities. She thought that these concepts were better postponed to a stage at which the pupils had obtained sufficient knowledge of living conditions of child labourers.
and would then reflect upon it, placing the concepts into historical contexts, "because the rights, needs and responsibilities have changed over time."

In the second week, Wendy had followed on with the historical concept of children as a labour force. She had given them "an opportunity to linger a little bit longer" on this concept. She said the class's level of interest had been maintained, with much discussion out of class and that the earlier week's concern with needs, rights and responsibilities had been "absorbed" - "just like osmosis."

Early in the fifth lesson, when various types of crime and punishment were being discussed, reference was made to drawing and quartering and whether it was used at the end of the 18th century and Wendy mentioned the portrayal of this punishment in the movie, "Braveheart" which was then showing in Sydney. It was pointed out that that was several centuries before transportation to Australia, and it was asked whether the pupils might have been confused about the chronology of these events. Wendy replied:

I wasn't worried about chronology really. I was just more or less looking at various forms of punishment. I guess if I was really worried about the chronology, yes, it would stuff it up ... They actually know the punishments that were happening in Australia. (Interview, 11/8/95)

Wendy explained that the class would have known about those punishments through excursions to places such as Old Sydney Town. She said, half-seriously, "Anything that's cruel and nasty they like." She said that she was keen to make clear that there was "a marked difference" between the punishment the convicts would have received if they had not been transported and if they had, and claimed that the difference was often between the death sentence and transportation for seven years. "You can't parallel the punishments because they're so different. There's no equality between the death sentence and then after seven years being allowed to go free because you've served your time."

Subsequently, Wendy said that she did not know about changes that had occurred in England in laws affecting such aspects of transportation as the time to be served.

Wendy began the final interview, on the fourth week's lessons and on the project overall, by saying that so much had happened that she had trouble remembering what those lessons and those of the week before were about. When it was put to her that there did not seem to be anything in these two lessons related to the needs, rights and responsibilities of children, Wendy replied that questions concerning the artefacts on the inquiry sheet asked how they would have been used by children and what children's family responsibilities related to the objects would have been. At the previous interview, when she described
her plans for this week's lessons, Wendy said that the link between these objects and the unit of work was to be found in the realisation that the objects were responses to needs. Furthermore, she said that although these were the final lessons in the four week life of the implementation phase of the project, she was going to carry on until the end of the term and in later lessons would establish links with the theme concerning the needs, rights and responsibilities of children. She also revealed that the class was to undertake a Active Citizenship Project to collect school materials for Fijian school children and that they were setting up a correspondence relationship with a school in Soweto, South Africa.

Reactions of Wendy's pupils

At the end of the four weeks implementation phase, four pupils, John, Emily, Dianne and Fred, were interviewed as a group to gauge their reactions to the lessons based on the unit. The interview began with questions asking the children to recall the substance of the lessons and went on to the children's reactions. The first week's lessons were remembered as having been about child labourers in coal mines. One of the boys said he was not sure about the first week but mentioned children's rights. One of the girls recalled being in groups of three and writing down children's rights, needs and responsibilities. Concerning the second week, one of the boys said, "Miners probably. We done that for a fair while." Others added to this recollection with details about children in mines. When asked about the third week's lessons one boy mentioned learning about Lord Shaftesbury but was not sure in which week that was. A girl then added more information about Shaftesbury's reforms. The other boy mentioned "the machinery age." Mention was again made of child labour and the Industrial Revolution. The fourth week was remembered for "all the artefacts." It is interesting that nothing from the third week's lessons was recalled. No mention was made of the convict period in Australia, not even the discussion of punishments. When asked which was the most interesting feature of the lessons, three of the pupils agreed on the artefacts explored in the last week, while Fred chose the material on child labour in coal mines. The least interesting parts of the unit were said by Fred to be the artefacts, whereas Dianne and Emily nominated the pictures depicting scenes which had to be interpreted. Emily would have preferred to talk about the pictures rather than write about them, for the latter was harder. John said he liked everything and "didn't have a least favourite part". All but Fred, who said, "Sort of and sort of not," were keen to have more lessons on those types of topics. However, when the children were asked the types of topics on which they would like to have lessons in the future, none volunteered topics relevant to this unit. One wanted lessons about war, two about endangered species of animals, and one about the environment and space.
The pupils were also asked if there were particular activities in which they would have liked to have been engaged. Only one suggestion was made and that was that they might have role-played being a child labouring in a mine for a day. When invited to make suggestions for the improvement of the lessons, one mentioned having some colouring-in for their books, and another mentioned exploring more artefacts, but the predominant response was that they were satisfied with the experiences they had had.

Conclusions

Wendy's long experience as a teacher, but somewhat less experience as a teacher of civics and citizenship, provided her with an orientation which was consistent with many aspects of her roles as planner and teacher in this project. She entered the project having had experience in teaching about Lord Shaftesbury and the conditions in England which provoked his reforms. She was very interested in power, civil rights and citizenship. She had had unsatisfying experiences teaching about Federation in Australia. She was committed to teaching methods involving investigation, discovery and cooperation and she believed in the importance of teachers' background knowledge. This orientation could be seen to have influenced Wendy's role in the deliberations of the working party which planned the unit of work, but that involvement also revealed more about her orientation. In particular, it exposed her concern about an historical approach to civics and citizenship education and about the "invasion" perception of European settlement.

These aspects of Wendy's orientation clearly influenced her role on the working party and in implementing the unit of work. She enthusiastically participated in, and agreed with, the decision to adopt the theme of the needs, rights and responsibilities of children for the unit. She emphasised the Shaftesbury reforms and their context in her lesson program. She used discovery and small group methods, although perhaps not as much as she would have liked, in her teaching, and was prepared to let them dominate the distribution of time over the four weeks implementation phase. She avoided the module including Federation and spent a minimal amount of time in direct explanation of concepts such as needs, rights and responsibilities, preferring to let the pupils arrive at these concepts inductively, and spent relatively little time on Australian history.

Wendy's pedagogical knowledge and beliefs were most clearly exhibited during the stimulated recall interviews. It has been seen that they could be classified into four main categories: management of time; the discovery process; resources and knowledge; and understanding and empathy, and that all four were intertwined. She was especially concerned with the constraints placed upon her by the four week duration of the implementation phase. Her commitment to non-didactic
teaching methods, and the perception of a barrier to integration of the project lessons with lessons in other Key Learning Areas led to her disappointment with the amount of the unit of work covered. The difficulty she reported in locating resources, particularly for the historical components probably limited her ability to treat such issues as the conditions for children in the convict period as fully as she would have liked. However, she seemed to acquire quite a sound knowledge of Australian history through the process of preparing the lessons she taught.

The teaching methods adopted by Wendy were, on the whole, consistent with those she had espoused at the beginning of the project. There were, however, occasions when teacher-centred methods were adopted, perhaps unwillingly, through lack of resources, or even lack of confidence in the possession of required substantive knowledge. Thus, she read from a text or, as she put it, "talk[ed] at them."

Finally, there were the pupils' reactions to the lessons. It should be kept in mind that only four of the 30 pupils were interviewed and that they might not have been representative of the class. As mentioned above, their responses were generally positive, but the fact that they made no mention of the lessons of the third week and that none of the topics they said they would like to pursue in the future were directly relevant to this unit of work might indicate two things: (1) that either they learnt little about the conditions of children in Australia during the convict era of European settlement or they were unimpressed by what they had learnt, and (2) their interest in learning about the needs, rights and responsibilities of children had been satiated before they had encountered material from at least two of the five modules in the unit of work, those concerned with Aboriginal children and children around the time of Federation.

It is to be hoped that the other three case studies in this project are as rich in information about teacher knowledge and its implementation as this one has been.
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