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The Scottish Curriculum in transition: Curriculum for Excellence

1) Introduction

Unlike England, Wales and Northern Ireland, Scotland does not have a statutory national curriculum, but a set of 5-14 National Guidelines for local authorities and schools, standard grade courses and a national qualifications structure. Throughout 2009, schools are preparing to make the transition from the established 5-14 curriculum to a new Curriculum for Excellence. The curriculum review process, in common with other areas of education policy formation pre- and post-devolution, has been characterised by consultation.

This paper offers an account of the development of the engagement process and draws on a curriculum enactment perspective to ask:

- What are teachers’ responses to the draft sets of Experiences and Outcomes underpinning the Curriculum for Excellence?
- How does teachers’ ‘positionality’ interplay with curriculum reform (Kirk and MacDonald, 2001)?
- What factors are likely to support or impede teachers’ adaptation of the curriculum in the move towards full implementation?

2) Policy mediation and curriculum reform

Through the wide-ranging involvement of the profession in the consultation on the draft sets of Experiences and Outcomes, opportunities arose to consider the interplay of the craft discourses of practicing teachers with the new ‘official pedagogic discourse’ presented in the revised curriculum (Bernstein, 1990) (See figure 1, p. X). There is now an established literature that draws attention to the processes through which national education policy is mediated within local communities of practice (Ball, 1990, 1994; Swann and Brown, 1997; Hayward et al, 2004; Brain et al, 2006). The TLRP thematic seminar series, Changing Teachers’ Roles, Identities and Professionalism (C-TRIP) (January 2005-January 2006) (Gewirtz et al, 2009) and the DfES commissioned research project Variations in Teachers’ Work, Lives and their Effects on Pupils (VITAE) (2001-2005) (Day et al, 2007) direct attention to the interaction of national policy, the school context and teachers’ personal experience. Policy trajectory studies have shown how teachers re-work policy priorities in line with personal and professional values, prior experiences and the local context of implementation. Spillane (1999:159) emphasises the importance of teachers’ ‘zones of enactment’, defined as ‘the space in which they make sense of, and operationalise for their own practice, the ideas advanced by reformers’. Synder et al (1992) have aptly described curriculum reform as a process of ‘mutual adaptation’. Cuban (1998:453) reminds us, ‘schools change reforms as much as reforms change schools’. During the introduction of the English National Curriculum, Bowe et al (1992:120) noted that programmes of study were “not so much being ‘implemented’ in schools as being re-created”, not so much ‘reproduced’ as ‘produced’”. Whilst there are limits to the recursive possibilities for teachers’ creative mediation of curriculum policy within regulatory frameworks, such studies suggest the unpredictable outcomes of reform efforts on teachers’ classroom practice.

‘Teachers are the key agents when it comes to changing classroom practice: They are the final policy brokers. Local enactment depends in great part on the capacity and will of teachers’ (Spillane, 1999:144)
The literature on teacher responses to reform does not depict uniform responses to interventions on teachers’ work (Mac an Ghaill, 1992; Woods, 1995; Hatcher, 1994; Pollard, 1994; Troman, 1996; Osborn et al, 1997). More recently, Lance (2006) has described how primary school teachers work creatively to ‘embrace’, ‘extend’ and ‘appropriate’ policy at a grassroots level. Storey (2007) has suggested that recent entrants to the profession, including mature career-changers with experience of other occupational settings, demonstrate an entrepreneurial disposition. Storey suggests that rather than exhibiting ‘resigned compliance’ (Farrell and Morris, 2004) the emerging workforce may be more accepting of central direction and performance management, whilst retaining a commitment to creativity and innovation in their classroom practice. The insertion of the progressive elements of the revised curriculum within performance cultures may present new opportunities to examine discernible shifts in professional culture. Substantive changes to the school curriculum, such as those recommended in Curriculum for Excellence, reach from the ‘technical core’ of teachers’ day-to-day classroom practice (Elmore, 2000). Based on data collected and analysed as part of the recent curriculum consultation in Scotland, this paper identifies some of the ways in which teachers in different settings/sectors, with different previous experiences, subject identifications and positions of responsibility are responding to the reform of the 3-18 school curriculum.

3a) Scottish policy context – scene setting

Pre-devolution studies of the education policy community in Scotland stressed the close relationships between the various stakeholders and the inherent conservatism that sometimes appeared to ensue from this (Humes, 1999). It might have been anticipated that the removal of formal responsibility for education from the UK government in London to the Scottish Executive in Edinburgh would have unsettled such ‘cosiness’. Furthermore, under the first Labour-led Scottish governments, it might have been anticipated that the influence of New Labour approaches would be less prevalent in Scotland than in England. We have argued elsewhere, when discussing policy on teacher education and teaching (Menter and Hulme, 2009), that processes of change in Scotland appear to have been less radical and at a slower pace than in England; however, they have been achieved through a more consensual process and so in the long term are likely to be more embedded than those in England.

Although responsibility for education and training was formally devolved from the UK Government and Westminster Parliament to the Scottish Parliament and the Scottish Executive in July 1999, Scotland’s education system had long enjoyed relative autonomy from England. The professional status of teachers is more rigorously protected and the power of teachers’ professional associations/trade unions is stronger within the Scottish policy network. Scotland’s professional body for teachers, the General Teaching Council was established in 1966, some 35 years ahead of the other three countries (McIver, 2008); and the vast majority of teachers are represented by a single teachers’ union, the Educational Institute of Scotland (EIS), (Forrester, 2008).

Prior to political devolution, Scotland resisted the move to standardised tests implemented in England and Wales and developed national guidelines for its own broadly based 5-14 Curriculum through processes of consultation and gradual implementation; processes that continue to support the current development of a revised curriculum, A Curriculum for Excellence (Scottish Executive, 2004), as we shall see. A relatively stable policy community has mediated external influences on policy and commentators have suggested that the dissonance between the profession and central government evident in England is not a feature
of policy-making in Scotland (Arnott and Menter, 2008). Nixon et al. (2006: 279) suggest that Scotland was able to resist the powerful centralising tendencies experienced in England and Wales because ‘the deep “codes” of teacher professionalism north of the border reinforce many of the priorities and myths of central government.’

The report of the McCrone Inquiry into the conditions of service and pay for teachers in Scotland was published in May 2000. A tripartite Implementation Group representing teachers’ organisations, employers (through the Convention of Scottish Local Authorities) and the Scottish Executive was established the following September. This approach was in line with the generally consultative style referred to above. An agreement was reached in January 2001 with the publication of A Teaching Profession for the Twenty First Century (Scottish Executive, 2001). The introduction to this document makes reference to a ‘unique process of discussion and dialogue’ which signposts a new way of working: ‘We have agreed that, for the future, the working relationships between teacher organisations, employers and the Scottish Executive will be based on mutual respect and understanding, on shared responsibility and on the shared development of ideas and programmes for change’ (Scottish Executive, 2001:1).

A commitment to the development of teachers as autonomous professionals can also be identified in a number of policies, such as: the Chartered Teacher Programme; the formative assessment programme, Assessment is for Learning; the new school curriculum, Curriculum for Excellence (see below); Schools of Ambition; and the Applied Educational Research Scheme (see Christie and Menter, 2009, for further discussion of this point).

The above brief review suggests that the formation of teacher education policy in Scotland may be more consultative and premised on higher degrees of trust than may be found elsewhere in the UK. However, since the elections of May 2007, a minority government under the leadership of the Scottish National Party has been in charge. Education has been as high on their agenda as it was on that of their predecessors. Rather than sweeping all previous policy away, in somewhat similar fashion to the approach of New Labour when it came to power in England in 1997 after 18 years of Conservative rule, the new Scottish government has endorsed and indeed further developed many of the policies that were initiated by their predecessors. Curriculum for Excellence is a prime example.

It is perhaps in the structure and organization of public provision that the new government has been much more radical and decisive. During 2008 a new ‘concordat’ was established between the national government and the 32 local authorities. This involved considerable devolution of spending powers to local authorities, so that, for example, education budgets for staffing and for professional development would be held almost entirely by local councils (Arnott and Ozga, ?). This has raised significant policy questions about how any national policies can now be successfully implemented when responsibility for doing so falls to 32 different bodies, each of which expects to operate to some degree autonomously.

3b) Scottish policy context - Curriculum review process

Following the National Debate on Education (2002), the Scottish Executive Education Department (now the Scottish Government) convened a Curriculum Review Group (2003) to consider the aims and purposes of education for the 3-18 age range. The review process was informed by the following priorities identified in the National Debate:
• Reduce overcrowding in the curriculum.
• Make learning more enjoyable.
• Make better connections between the stages in the curriculum from 3 to 18.
• Achieve a better balance between 'academic' and 'vocational' subjects.
• Broaden the range of learning experiences for young people.
• Equip young people with the skills they need now and in future employment.
• Make sure that approaches to assessment and certification support learning.
• Offer more choice to meet the needs of individual young people (LTS, 2008). 

The work of the Review Group culminated in the publication in November 2004 of a proposed **Curriculum for Excellence** offering a single curriculum throughout the early years, primary and secondary school (across the 3-18 age range). The revised curriculum sought to:

- achieve clearly defined rounded outcomes for young people
- smoother transition between different stages of education, especially the entry to formal primary schooling
- offer new choice, space and time within the curriculum to teachers and schools to design learning to suit the needs of young people (SEED, 2004:14)

Through the progressive implementation of a **Curriculum for Excellence** all young people would be supported to become: **successful learners, effective contributors, responsible citizens and confident individuals**. Humes offers a cynical interpretation of the manner of the publication in 2004 of **Curriculum for Excellence**:

> The document was produced by a Curriculum Review Group, whose members were appointed on the patronage model which had been a feature of Scottish policy making since the 1960s... Very soon after it appeared, the report was endorsed in its entirety by the Scottish Executive; it was never subjected to parliamentary scrutiny or public consultation. It quickly became accepted within the wider policy community, and the four key ‘capacities’ which it recommended... soon became a kind of mantra to which ritual obeisance had to be paid. (Humes, 2008:73-74)

Whether this is a fair criticism or not, what followed from the publication of the document has been a serious attempt at public consultation. A Curriculum Review Programme Board subsequently embarked on a three-year development programme (2004-07) to map the overall architecture of the revised curriculum, a process that included small-scale practitioner engagement (2005-06). A **Curriculum for Excellence Progress and Proposals** was published in March 2006 (see the overall framework in Appendix 1). Draft experiences and outcomes for each curriculum area were released in stages from November 2007 until May 2008, accompanied by an engagement strategy to afford opportunities for feedback from the main stakeholder groups – teachers, parents, employers and representatives from local authorities, colleges and universities (November 2007-December 2008). The study on which we draw in this paper was commissioned by LTS during this period of the engagement strategy. Final versions of the Outcomes and Experiences were published in April 2009, having been

---

3 The draft experiences and outcomes for each curriculum area are available for download at: http://www.ltscotland.org.uk/curriculumforexcellence/outcomes/
modified and developed using the feedback provided by our analysis, as well as other input (see Appendix 2 for some extracts).

4) Terms of the commission - summary of methodology

Data were gathered between November 2007 and November 2008 as part of the engagement strategy in preparation for full implementation of Curriculum for Excellence. There were two main strands to this enquiry. The first related to data gathered to establish whether the draft experiences and outcomes were clear and could be used by practitioners to build on current good practice, contributing to the intentions of Curriculum for Excellence. Following the release of the draft experiences and outcomes, feedback was obtained via online questionnaires, school trialling proforma, feedback from CPD events and focus groups convened to discuss each of the 14 sets of draft experiences and outcomes. This strand also incorporated telephone interviews with local authority personnel, who provided additional information and feedback on the trialling process. Further contextual data were provided by a focus group involving LT Scotland personnel: team leaders from each of the areas of the curriculum.

A second strand of data gathering extended beyond school leaders and practitioners to encompass a wide range of other key stakeholders. A stated intention of the engagement strategy was to involve all those who have an interest in the education of Scotland’s children and young people. Additional feedback was sought through the development of a pupil engagement strand and a series of regional events and focus groups to elicit the perspectives of other interested parties including parents, employers, voluntary groups, further education and universities. However, in this paper we draw on data derived from teachers and LA staff.

So, a range of data was collected by a variety of mechanisms including online questionnaires, trialling feedback, focus groups and telephone interviews. These data were analysed using different methods including Excel and NVivo. Using a number of research instruments and processes for each set of draft experiences and outcomes afforded attention to a diversity of views and yielded a wide range of data on both the quantitative and the qualitative aspects of the research. The wide range of data sources and the availability of different types of data made the triangulation of findings possible.

One or more focus groups of ninety minutes duration were convened for each of the fourteen sets of experiences and outcomes in the Curriculum for Excellence (including four regional groups for both numeracy and literacy). The organisation of the focus groups, including participant selection, was managed by the university research team. In total, 242 participants took part in 20 curriculum area based focus groups. The questioning route opened with identification of participants’ current understanding and engagement with the draft experiences and outcomes; and developed to promote discussion of the extent to which the revised guidance was likely to support reflection on current practice, strengthen cross-curricular links and enhance pupil motivation and engagement. Participants were also asked

---

4 More complete details of the project methodology are included in the full report from the project, available at [http://www.ltscotland.org.uk/Images/GUfinalreport_tcm4-539659.pdf](http://www.ltscotland.org.uk/Images/GUfinalreport_tcm4-539659.pdf). In addition to the authors of this paper, the project team included our colleagues Alison Devlin, Dely Elliot, Kevin Lowden, John Hall and Stuart Hall. Numerous colleagues in the Departments of Curriculum Studies and Religious Education within the Faculty of Education at the University of Glasgow, also assisted in the analysis.
to identify any professional development issues arising from the proposed reform of the school curriculum and the implications of these in their current work context.

The engagement strategy sought feedback from local authority personnel. 32 local authority officers (and a representative of the Scottish Council of Independent Schools, SCiS) participated in telephone interviews between August and November 2008. One key informant in each local authority was invited to take part in a semi-structured telephone interview. Interviewees were identified and approached by LT Scotland. The interviews ranged from fifteen minutes to forty minutes duration. The interview guide was constructed in close collaboration with colleagues at LT Scotland. The questions made reference to issues emerging from analysis of trialling feedback and addressed the four guiding themes specified by the Steering Group: CPD, exemplification, elaboration and re-write/edit.

In addition to the three main sources of data from school managers and practitioners – questionnaires, trialling feedback and focus groups – the research team received a high volume of additional written feedback from a variety of sources. This included feedback from launch and CPD events (Area Adviser cluster events and specialist events) organised by LT Scotland to support engagement with the draft experiences and outcomes; and submissions from events arising from inter-authority collaboration.

Many organisations and individuals responded to positive encouragement to submit comments and feedback on Curriculum for Excellence. A wide range of interested bodies submitted feedback for consideration following the phased release of each set of draft experiences and outcomes.

Focus group discussions and interviews were audio recorded for full transcription with the informed consent of participants. Qualitative data analysis software, NVivo, was used to support analysis. The coding scheme applied to transcripts of the curriculum area focus groups was based on the four themes specified by LT Scotland, which provided a simple structure: CPD requirement, exemplification, elaboration and re-write/edit. Under each of these lead headings, subheadings emerging from the analysis were added.

To summarise, the engagement strategy encouraged participation from a wide range of stakeholders (see Appendix 3). As researchers working with the data from all of these sources our commissioned role was limited. Our primary tasks were to collate, analyse and report on the data that had largely been generated through instruments and communication channels that were established by LT Scotland, in consultation with the Scottish Government, rather than by us as independent researchers. This paper provides an opportunity for us to revisit some of the data and analyse it in the wider contexts both of education policy in Scotland and of curriculum reform processes elsewhere.
5. Themes in the consultation responses

The following section is organised in four interrelated themes that emerged from preliminary analysis of the teacher focus group and questionnaire datasets: teacher autonomy, accountability, subject identification, and teacher development.

5.1 Teacher autonomy
For some teachers, especially those working in the later stages of primary education, *Curriculum for Excellence* resonated strongly with their theories of practice and presented an opportunity to reclaim aspects of their professionalism. Many teachers within the focus groups welcomed what they perceived to be a move away from a prescriptive approach that they felt had constrained teacher creativity. The philosophy and principles informing *Curriculum for Excellence*, as expressed in the cover paper that accompanied each set of Draft Experiences and Outcomes, were broadly endorsed by teachers who participated in focus group discussions; (although a minority did not always see a close alignment between the cover paper and the content of the Draft Experiences and Outcomes). *Curriculum for Excellence* was associated by experienced primary teachers with a partial return to more integrated or holistic ways of working. It was suggested that the 5-14 curriculum was a ‘very rigid framework’ that encouraged primary schools to adopt the more subject-based orientation of secondary schools.

*It [Curriculum for Excellence] does allow staff to use their professionalism once again, which I think had been removed largely from the door of the primary teachers by dint of very prescriptive schemes of work which practically told the teacher when to breathe in and when to breathe out... didn’t allow for individual needs of children and I would be very glad to see the back of that.*

(Primary depute headteacher, Numeracy)

In describing the strengths of the Draft Experiences and Outcomes, focus group participants frequently used the terms ‘freedom’ and ‘flexibility’ and associated this with enhanced levels of professional autonomy. Senior managers in schools suggested that the revised curriculum afforded scope for professional discretion and would allow schools to be more responsive to particular local circumstances.

*I thought there was a great deal of flexibility in them, to allow me and my school to pursue things that we felt were relevant to our area and the kids in our school. Even looking at the Development Outcomes, to me there is not a great deal of nitty gritty, which I think is actually a positive thing. I am quite confident that we can develop courses that suit our needs at our different stages.*

(Principal teacher secondary, Social Studies)

*Its strength is the fact that it does not prescribe certain methodology. In actual fact, it gives a goal that leaves it open for an imaginative and varied approach which could be differentiated to different groups with different background experiences.*

(Class teacher secondary, RE denominational).

Within the transcripts, a tension was evident between a perceived welcome (re-)introduction of professional autonomy and the removal of secure and familiar frameworks to govern action within both primary and secondary schools. A recurring theme in the focus groups was the dilemma posed by affording a greater degree of freedom where the parameters of professional responsibility had shifted towards the management of learning resources and environments for learning (curriculum delivery), rather than curriculum design (curriculum building). A reported lack of direction left many teachers unsure of how to proceed.

*Many staff have lived through 5-14 and a lot of schools went down programmes of work. It is quite scary for teachers now to think that they have this freedom to plan. I want to give them that freedom, but I think we need some kind of skeleton there behind the skills progression.*

(Primary headteacher, Numeracy focus group)
We are so used to a set of guidelines for everything. We know them inside out and now that safety blanket is being taken away and we’ve been given this. I can see why. I understand it’s about vision. It’s about how you’re going to challenge youngsters for the future and prepare them. I can understand all that, but we do need some more specific framework. This is very general and it’s very vague. It’s very good but it isn’t as specific as we’ve been used to and I think it does pose problems for us.

(Principal teacher secondary, English and Literacy)

5.2 Teacher Accountability

Frequent references were made to the powerful influence of the schools’ inspectorate, HMIe, on school level policy and practice. Despite the revised approach to inspection, with its increased emphasis on school self-evaluation, many participants questioned whether there had been a significant shift away from what was described as a ‘narrow attainment agenda’. Concern was expressed about ‘getting it wrong’ and the dangers of moving too far from the ‘comfort’ of ‘the measure’ within a wider framework of public accountability.

Everything we do is measured all the time. Everything has to be measurable, so I’m wondering what the balance is between active learning, creativity and freedom and ‘the measure’.

(Primary headteacher, Numeracy).

It’s very refreshing going back to having some freedom, being able to have meaningful contexts for learning; but until we are really convinced that HMIe don’t want evidence and ‘tick boxes’, we’re still going to feel quite restricted.

(Primary headteacher, Literacy and English)

We have professional autonomy, we can be creative and innovative in the best sense of all of these words, and then you are still going to be measured in a quite narrow way. I find it quite paradoxical.

(Secondary principal teacher, Literacy and English)

There was some indication that teachers were able to identify effective practice promoted in the Draft Experiences and Outcomes and yet were reluctant to make changes that did not directly contribute to examination attainment. Teachers cited uncertainties around future arrangements for National Qualifications as contributing to their hesitance.

This new system looks very nice and the ideas behind it are very good but if I’ve got to get them through an exam, can I afford the time to do this approach which would be a much better approach? We are so exam driven now with targets that colleagues are very wary about going into this in detail when they don’t know what the end point will be.

(Principal teacher secondary, Maths group)

We shouldn’t teach for the exams but unfortunately that’s the way the futures of the kids are determined. I would love to have a looser curriculum where I could teach things in a more interesting way but until I know what form of assessment is involved, I do not really know how to approach this.

(Secondary class teacher, Maths group)

For some teachers there was an assumption that a wider range of methodologies would require an investment in time that was not available within the constraints of the assessment calendar. Whilst willing to engage with more ‘creative’ methodologies, it was assumed that this would be more time intensive. The demands of ‘getting through the syllabus’ was seen to limit opportunities for more active, inquiry-based learning.
I have staff who would be delighted to spend time exploring whichever thing the kids are keenest on, to spend time on investigative approaches, and we don’t do it because this weight of kids needs to be at that level by this time. The best way we’ve found to do it isn’t necessarily the best way in the long term, by exploring concepts, it’s by driving them through a particular set of work. Unless that is sorted for us, I can’t see how people are going to make the best use of the Outcomes as they’re given. I don’t think there’s any lack of willingness for them to do it, it’s just that they can’t see a way to reconcile the two.

(Principal teacher secondary, Numeracy focus group)

In summary, several teachers noted a tension between the aspirations of Curriculum for Excellence for new processes of learning and perceptions of an outcomes-driven system of assessment. Participants from primary and secondary schools talked of ‘double vision’ and ‘different worlds’ in describing the multiple and competing demands made of them. A primary headteacher commented that the Draft Experiences and Outcomes and the national assessments ‘totally contradicted each other’ (numeracy group). A secondary faculty head described how teachers were caught between ‘different philosophies’ and expected to deliver the agenda of both.

You have these two different worlds. People want results and they want the assessments done; and then you’ve got this other world saying we should be spontaneous, make opportunities for activities and experiences. The two things very often don’t marry at all.

(Principal teacher secondary, Expressive Arts)

Are we looking for relevance for achieving qualifications or are we looking for relevance to develop these four capacities? To me they don’t lie well together and somebody needs to make up their mind what they want at the other end of the school system...The teachers are going to be the piggies in the middle again, who are being asked to deliver two entirely different philosophies at the same time.

(Faculty Head, Expressive Arts)

There seems to be almost a double vision - one in which we are empowered and we are able to develop new things and we are professional enough to do that; and then somebody else with a slightly different agenda will come along and assess and evaluate us. There will have to be a change in the relationship between how we are assessed and evaluated by our colleagues in other professional areas.

(Secondary principal teacher, Literacy and English)

### 5.3 Teachers’ subject identification

Teachers in secondary schools commented that producing consistently high levels of pupil performance in external examinations was an important source of esteem. The professional identity of the secondary teacher, as subject specialist, is linked to pupil performance in subject–based examinations. High levels of attainment are associated with respect from parents, pupils and colleagues including senior managers. Given the currency attached to attainment, ‘successful’ teachers needed to be convinced of the value of moving away from ‘what works’ in terms of producing results.

In this department, there is great resistance to the idea of this when they are getting the results from the kids and that is what they are paid to do. What this is about, it’s about our changing role as a teacher and that [point] isn’t made overtly.

(Principal teacher secondary, English and Literacy)
One of the stated aspirations of *Curriculum for Excellence* is the promotion of interdisciplinary learning: “taking learning out of ‘silos’ to establish better connectivity in learning” (George Smuga, September 2008\(^5\)). Accounts offered by teachers in the focus groups frequently made reference to how different sectors/phases were differently placed to make connections across the curriculum. Practitioners in early years settings and special schools reported that the ways of working suggested in the proposed 3-18 curriculum were consistent with current good practice. The promotion of interdisciplinary learning within the Draft Experiences and Outcomes were generally welcomed in principle. Secondary school teachers were quick to identify potential benefits in cross-subject collaboration, including the identification of differences in modes of instruction.

> In the science department, there were three different methods of teaching equations, which were not the same as within the maths department. From that, we ended up getting together and agreeing a common methodology.

(Principal teacher secondary, Numeracy)

Greatest challenge can be anticipated where the boundaries constructed between discrete or specialised ‘subjects’ are strongest. It is not surprising that reservations were most likely to be expressed by teachers in the secondary sector, for whom subject specialist status is an important source of identity and whose daily work is organised according to subject differentiation. Reservations were related to the practical/operational dimensions of promoting cross-subject work – expressed in terms of workload and coordination issues; or identity issues between school subject communities – expressed in terms of defence of subject status vis-à-vis possible ‘dilution’. Responses offered in the focus group indicates that there was not a shared understanding of what constitutes ‘cross-curricular’ or ‘interdisciplinary’ work in secondary schools. Some teachers associated cross-curricularly with a planned ‘project’ or ‘one off event’. Others interpreted cross-curricular as a sustained commitment to the provision of experiences that connected learning across the curriculum. A secondary Maths teacher (Numeracy) commented that whereas the primary school is ‘understanding driven’, secondary schools are ‘product driven’: ‘the bottom line is we have to get children through exams’. Subject demarcations are defended and cross-curricular approaches were sometimes viewed as an encroachment, especially where the introduction of cross-curricular ‘topics’ or ‘projects’ appeared contrived.

Some concern was expressed about the willingness and capacity of secondary ‘subject hosts’ to embrace the core curricular foci of Numeracy, Literacy and aspects of Health and Well Being. A lack of specialist professional training and the need for additional support for non-specialists was frequently noted. Stepping outside subject boundaries raised anxieties in particular areas. Nervousness around handling sensitive or controversial issues was particularly noted in relation to implementation of the Draft Experiences and Outcomes for Health and Well Being.

### 5.4 Teacher Development

Participants noted the historic devolution of responsibility for the curriculum to local authorities in Scotland. The 32 authorities are charged with formulating appropriate local responses to nationally identified priorities for education. Equally, participants noted the double devolution of responsibilities to school professionals to ‘unpack’ and collaborate on the revised curriculum at the level of the school, school cluster and authority. Proponents of the revised curriculum advocated processes of change based on collaboration and partnership work through local networks, rather than the ‘roll out’ of more traditional top-down modes of change.

We don’t have a national education system in that it is not the responsibility of our national government to deliver education. It is the responsibility of the local authorities to provide education and it has been that way historically. I like the idea that the national Government is setting forward the things that really matter and are important. There are a lot of issues that need to be addressed but they need addressing by authorities and by teachers in schools working together.

(Secondary principal teacher, Numeracy).

The most depressing thing is when people say, ‘When will our local authority produce a new pack of resources?’ If a local authority produces a pack of resources it has entirely ignored the central point which was that each professional was going to reflect on what their individual school needed. CPD is not just required for school teachers, it is also required at a higher up level because in some areas of the country at local authority level they are already thinking ‘How do we do our collective response? What do we tell every school in our area they are going to do? How do we get a box set, a one size fits all approach?’

(Secondary principal teacher, Science).

The importance attached to collaboration with external partners at a local level was not always equally evident in descriptions of school level developments. There are clear implications for leadership in the enactment of Curriculum for Excellence. The focus group discussions contained references to a range of different approaches to professional learning and curriculum development in schools. Accounts offered by a small minority of secondary heads of department, suggest that changes to programmes of study and classroom practice may follow a conventional ‘cascade’ model, rather than develop from a process of school-led collaborative planning. A minority of comments retained the view that curriculum development was the responsibility of senior staff and could be ‘delivered through in-services’ to the wider teaching staff.

To me it’s like driving a car, you know. I drive a car but I don’t build an engine. I’m asking teachers in my department to teach lessons. I’m not asking them to write courses at the minute. If that comes, I can write the courses. I can tell them what to teach next.

(Secondary principal teacher, Maths).

Surely it is up to management and a coordinator to train accordingly and then do a presentation to the rest of the staff to make sure they are aware and that they know that within this context that’s what you are doing and then marry that off with the resources within the school?

(Secondary class teacher, Health and Well Being).

Other teachers described more collaborative forms of development that sprang from opportunities for dialogue with colleagues though a variety of channels and at different levels. These included inter-authority seminars, the activities of associated schools’ groups and the formation of in-school collegiate working groups. Enthusiasm was expressed for enhanced
opportunities to participate in such activities in preparation for full implementation. Teachers involved in the formal trialling process appreciated the opportunity to reflect on current practice and experiment and/or plan for change.

_It’s not just the new teachers coming out; everybody is out of the comfort zone. No matter where you are in the chain, it’s new, and we really need to have massive support to go back and pick up the best aspects from teachers who have the experience in thematics and the new teachers coming out; and getting together and putting programmes in place that can help us get through this because it is not going to be a five minute thing. You need to really have a plan and support for this._

(Primary depute headteacher, Literacy and English)

_I can see how much I have grown as a science teacher from getting the chance to get out of my four walls and see what is happening elsewhere. We all know what happens when you go on a course, you try it once, you come back and then little impetus for doing anything. It’s not that you don’t necessarily want to do, but you are then back and there’s no support there. We need to start supporting each other, cross-sector, cross-authority in order to make this work._

(Secondary classteacher, Science).

A minority of focus group participants voiced some concern about the readiness of the profession to undertake the pedagogical shift required by Curriculum for Excellence. Uppermost among teachers’ concerns was the need for time and space to support appropriate school-level development opportunities. This was frequently associated with ‘buy in’ or ‘ownership’ of expected revisions to practice. The credibility of proposed changes was associated with the degree of self-determination achieved by experienced teachers engaged in collaborative planning. Joint work was identified as a crucial element in working towards consistency in interpretation across the profession. Respondents identified opportunities for school-wide planning as key across the three sources of data – focus groups, trialling feedback and questionnaires.

_The vagueness of the outcomes, and a lack of exemplars, will not ensure consistency across schools. Individual departments and schools will determine the intent of each outcome (what and how to deliver) and therein lies the problem of consistency between the levels and across schools. Careful planning will need to be facilitated with adequate time allowances and funding for resource development. The outcomes alone will not provide opportunities to promote good teaching; quality professional development and the aforementioned time and budget will also be essential._

(Numeracy questionnaire response)

Throughout the accounts of school level responses to change offered in the focus groups, there was strong association of professionalism with planning. Several focus group participants reported that the publication of the draft sets of Experiences and Outcomes had evoked an audit response, wherein schools/departments were mapping current practice against the revised curriculum. The draft experiences and outcomes were being used as an audit tool to identify potential necessary revisions. However, this auditing of practice could have the effect of re-positioning the document as a new set of standards to conform to rather than as a stimulus for more engaged critical reflection. From this perspective, the revised curriculum in certain contexts might replace one ‘prescriptive’ framework with another, displacing re-professionalising aspirations.

6. Discussion
A number of points of tension are identified in this brief overview of teachers’ responses to the publication of the draft sets of Experiences of Outcomes for Curriculum for Excellence. Publication of the draft guidance, and the consultation that followed, opened up new spaces for deliberation on curriculum, assessment and pedagogy. Teachers’ responses were strongly influenced by their *positionality*: their previous experiences of curriculum change, length of service, subject/stage identification and status, approaches to professional learning, and their craft theories of teaching. The inclusion of teachers’ voices within curriculum consultation is warranted on the basis of teachers’ detailed knowledge of the local context of implementation. As principal agents of change, only classroom teachers have detailed knowledge of: (1) their students and locality; (2) the resources available to teachers; and, (3) the practicalities of teachers’ work, including issues of power and politics within schools as institutional forms (Kirk and McDonald, 2001). The interplay of teachers’ positionality with the proposed changes to the curriculum extended further opportunities for recontextualisation.

The inclusion of teachers’ voice within curriculum consultation is warranted on the basis of teachers’ detailed knowledge of the local context of implementation. As principal agents of change, only classroom teachers have detailed knowledge of: (1) their students and locality; (2) the resources available to teachers; and, (3) the practicalities of teachers’ work, including issues of power and politics within schools as institutional forms (Kirk and McDonald, 2001). The interplay of teachers’ positionality with the proposed changes to the curriculum extended further opportunities for recontextualisation.

A number of seemingly opposing positions are identifiable in the accounts presented above. These tensions can be organised using the two axes of autonomy and control. Returning to Bernstein’s (1996) work on recontextualised knowledge, responses from the profession during the consultation period contained elements of both competence and performance models of practice (see Table 1 below). There was a strong pre-occupation with support for planning, monitoring and assessment (of learner progress and teacher/school performance) across the transcripts. However, many participants also demonstrated awareness that enactment of Curriculum for Excellence would require a more complex conception of the teachers’ professional role – as curriculum builder. The professional challenge facing teachers is to blend demands for innovative and creativity pedagogies with continued demand to raise standards evidenced through conventional ‘hard’ performance indicators. School leaders and local authority officers involved in the trialling process were attuned to the organisational and cultural challenges of changing classroom practice and the considerable demands involved in re-thinking and unsettling established practices. Significant tensions were identified between a need for detailed exemplification and a commitment to exploration and imaginative use of the draft Experiences and Outcomes. Some local authority officers and school leaders were able to resolve apparent contradictions by identifying a need for elaboration through collaboration.

The circulation of multiple discourses and opposing modalities - performance culture, models of school leadership based on ‘linearity and control’ (MacDonald, 2003), teacher cultures of compliance, economistic models of education with and against counter narratives of devolved leadership, personalisation, collaboration, creative and inquiry-based learning – present a confounding mix for many school professionals. Bernstein (1996) describes a pedagogic pallet where the blending of these narratives takes place. The hue, brightness and saturation created in the pallet mix are the unpredictable outcome of mediation processes. As official pedagogic discourse becomes more weakly classified, contestation intensifies as alternatives are presented. The disturbance and high-level anxieties experienced by some among the profession, reflect the insertion of progressive elements of Curriculum for Excellence within performance modes. The response of education authorities to these vocal concerns has been to frame the classification of the new discourse more strongly.

‘I have been considering these models and their modes as discrete and as giving rise to distinct forms. It is crucial to understand that this may not always be the case. The models and modes may give rise to what could be called a pedagogic pallet where mixes can take place. A therapeutic mode may be inserted in an economic mode,
retaining its original name and resonances, whilst giving rise to an opposing practice’ (Bernstein, 1996: 56)

Table 1. Recontextualised Knowledge
(Adapted from Bernstein, 1996:45)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competence models (therapeutic)</th>
<th>Performance models (economic)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pedagogic discourse</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weakly classified pedagogic spaces.</td>
<td>Strongly classified pedagogic spaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects, themes, range of experiences.</td>
<td>Hierarchic specialisation of subjects, skills and procedures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope for personalisation.</td>
<td>Less control over selection, sequence and pace.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active inquiry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pedagogic control</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implicit</td>
<td>Explicit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-regulation</td>
<td>Rule bound, regulatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pedagogic autonomy</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources constructed by teachers.</td>
<td>Pre-packaged. Fidelity/transfer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local deliberation, devolved.</td>
<td>Cascade model, centralisation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to understand the position of teachers in relation to the trialling and implementation of Curriculum for Excellence and the response of education authorities to their concerns, it is useful to revisit the development of the 5-14 Curriculum and Assessment guidelines and some of the unintended consequences, or departures from policy intentions, that followed. Developed on a broadly similar model of consultation involving teachers, local authorities, higher education and the inspectorate (within a pre-devolution context), the introduction of the Curriculum and Assessment 5-14 Programme (1991-94) reduced the role of local authorities in relation to the school curriculum (Hayward, 2007; Adams, 2003). Non-statutory national guidelines, attainment targets and programmes of study were published and national monitoring of attainment developed through the introduction of national tests in reading, writing and mathematics in P4, P7 and S2. Although distinctive in adopting a ‘lower stakes’, ‘test when ready’ approach, the availability of tests progressively came to ‘stand in’ for teachers’ own interpretation and assessment. In addition to teacher administered tests, enhanced monitoring and accountability was sought through the introduction in 1998 of the National 5-14 Survey of Attainment. The introduction of SQA new national qualifications (Intermediate, Higher and Advanced Higher) in the late 1990s contributed to perceptions of an increasingly assessment-driven culture within secondary education.

‘National tests soon became high stakes. There was little incentive for teachers to consider a wider range of evidence, or to challenge as test result on the basis of their own judgement, especially when their perception that what mattered was test results appeared to be confirmed by their experiences. HMI, promoting the government policy that tests should form part of the assessment arrangements in a school, pressed for test results as confirmation of teachers’ judgments. In these circumstances, the perception that national test results were what mattered developed and became ingrained’ (Hutchinson and Hayward, 2005:229)
Concern that testing was displacing teachers’ professional judgments led to the formation of the 3-14 Assessment Action Group (AAG) in 1999 and the subsequent development of the influential Assessment is for Learning (AifL) programme. Despite the considerable successes of the AifL programme, its principal architects reflect that it was a mistake to limit the work of AAG to pre-national examination stages. Parallel issues related to the separation of curriculum and assessment guidance re-emerge in local authority officers’ accounts of the difficulties of encouraging senior schoolteachers to engage with the draft sets of Experiences and Outcomes of Curriculum for Excellence whilst the outcome of the concurrent national review of qualifications is not known. Whilst publicly positioned as an integrated 3-18 curriculum, Curriculum for Excellence at present ends at level four (see appendices).

A formal public consultation on the Next Generation of National Qualifications in Scotland was commissioned by the Scottish Government and conducted between 10 June and 31 October 2008. The stated aim of the consultation was ‘to ensure that National Qualifications fully reflect Curriculum for Excellence and prepare young people for the demands of the 21st Century’. Access, Higher and Advanced Higher qualifications will be retained and work concentrated on the use of Standard Grade (minimum age 15 ½ years) and Intermediate qualifications (minimum age 16 ½ years) in providing a ‘unified structure that reflects Curriculum for Excellence’ (Scottish Government, 2008b).

From interview transcripts and trialling feedback gathered in the engagement year, it appears that many teachers connected this consultation with the earlier Higher Still model of change, which included the provision of units of work for national qualifications. Many participants reflected favourably on the high level of central direction given in this earlier reform. Thus, even a cursory review of policy over the previous decades suggests that the professional space for pedagogic and curriculum innovation and leadership has contracted, leaving many within the profession, especially in secondary schools, ill placed to respond to the new opportunities extended through a degree of curriculum flexibility.

7. Conclusion

This paper has outlined the consultation process undertaken to support the development of the Experiences and Outcomes for the revised school curriculum in Scotland, Curriculum for Excellence. In doing so, an attempt is made to counter de-historicised and de-personalised accounts of policy. As Broadhead (2002:47) notes,

> When documentation is complete, human involvement seems to be erased. Text seldom conveys the emotional, intellectual and ideological endeavours, the arguments, debates, experiences and decisions of participants involved in its creation.

The consultation undertaken to refine the draft sets of Experiences and Outcomes was extensive. It involved partnership work across a range of education authorities and the involvement of large numbers of practitioners and, to varying degrees, other key stakeholders. Feedback to the Management Board and the Writing Teams was an iterative process, involving monthly reporting and concluded with the publication of the Final Report and finalised Experiences and Outcomes in April 2009. However, as Placier, Walker and Foster (2002:304), writing of the contribution of teacher writing teams to curriculum reform in a North American context, note ‘Policy making continues long after the construction of a policy
text’. Teachers’ practice does not ‘live’ in the policy texts of Professional Standards documents or curriculum texts.

In reviewing the development of the Curriculum for Excellence and teachers’ initial response to the draft documents, this paper highlights the complexity of moving between models of change premised on ‘linearity and control’ (MacDonald, 2003) and more consultative models open to iterative review. It suggests that as schools move from trialling to full engagement there is a need for sustained ‘across-boundary collaboration’ (Fullan, 1999). Teachers’ reading of the revised curriculum is heavily influenced by their beliefs about teaching and learning, and the institutional contexts and accountability frameworks in which they work. Opportunities offered by the (re-)introduction of a less prescriptive curriculum, with the flexibility to exercise professional judgement, need to be supported by conditions conducive to collaborative planning, critical reflection and review. As full implementation of Curriculum for Excellence proceeds, it will be interesting to see how partnerships initiated through the consultation phase develop in the longer term.

The review of the consultation process reported here highlights the importance of a situated perspective on curriculum reform. It emphasises the interrelationship of curriculum reform and teachers’ professional learning and draws attention to the need to sustain the depth and breadth of professional engagement prioritised in the design and trialling stages of the reform process following ‘implementation’ or ‘curriculum enactment’ by teachers as the principal agents of change. In doing so, it connects with the growing body of literature on workplace learning that stresses the need to promote schools as ‘expansive’ learning environments (Hodkinson and Hodkinson, 2005). There is a need to foster and support inquiry-based curriculum development within and between schools/school clusters, with the support of local authority, regional and national teams. There is much to learn from the models of change that underpinned the AfL and Schools of Ambition⁶ programme (2006-2010) in Scotland (although we acknowledge the limits of pockets of practitioner research in national reform strategies). As we have commented elsewhere (Baumfield et al, 2009), simply inviting comment without an investment in the resources to enable teachers to engage in active curriculum development (that exceeds curriculum planning) will play into the hands of those cynics who queried whether any real change between the draft and the final Experiences and Outcomes would occur.

---

⁶ For further information on Schools of Ambition see: [http://www.ltscotland.org.uk/schoolsofambition/index.asp](http://www.ltscotland.org.uk/schoolsofambition/index.asp)
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Appendix 1. Curriculum levels and the ‘Curriculum at a Glance’

**Proposed achievement framework**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Experience and outcomes for most children or young people</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>early</td>
<td>in pre-school and in primary 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>first</td>
<td>by end of P4, but earlier for some</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>second</td>
<td>by end of P7, but earlier for some</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>third</td>
<td>in S1 – S3, but earlier for some</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fourth</td>
<td>fourth level broadly equates to SCQF 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>senior</td>
<td>in S4 – S6, but earlier for some</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A schematic guide which presents a summary of the components used to build the 3-18 curriculum, with the learner at the centre.
Appendix 2. Examples from the final sets of Experiences and Outcomes for Science, Social Studies and Literacy and English.

### Energy sources and sustainability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Early</th>
<th>First</th>
<th>Second</th>
<th>Third</th>
<th>Fourth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Learners explore types, sources and uses of energy and develop their understanding of how energy is transformed and conserved. They consider the relevance of these concepts to everyday life.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I have experienced, used and described a wide range of toys and common appliances. I can say what makes it go, and say what they do when they work.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCN 5-04a</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I am aware of different types of energy around me and can show their importance to everyday life and my survival.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCN 6-04a</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>By comparing examples where energy is conserved, I can identify the energy source. How is it transferred and ways of reducing wasted energy.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCN 6-04a</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Through exploring non-renewable energy sources, I can describe how they are used in Scotland today and express an informed view on the implications for their future use.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCN 2-04b</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I can investigate the use and development of renewable and non-renewable energy to gain an awareness of their growing importance in Scotland and beyond.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TCN 3-02b</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### People, past events and societies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Early</th>
<th>First</th>
<th>Second</th>
<th>Third</th>
<th>Fourth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Learners use evidence to understand the importance of historical events and their impact on the world today.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I am aware that different types of evidence can help me to find out about the past.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOC 6-07a</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I understand that evidence varies in the extent to which it can be trusted and can use this in learning about the past.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOC 7-01a</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I can use primary and secondary sources selectively to research events in the past.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOC 2-07a</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I can use my knowledge of a historical period to interpret the evidence and present an informed view.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOC 5-01a</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I can evaluate conflicting sources of evidence to sustain a line of argument.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOC 6-01a</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I can make a personal link to the past and explore links or images connected with important individuals or groups of personal interest.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I can make a personal link to the past and explore links or images connected with important individuals or groups of personal interest.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOC 8-02a</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>By exploring places, investigating artefacts and locating them in time, I have developed an awareness of the ways we use to remember and preserve Scotland’s history.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOC 6-02a</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I can interpret historical evidence from a range of sources and help to build a picture of Scotland’s heritage and my sense of ownership.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOC 2-02a</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I can make links between my current and previous studies and show an understanding of how people and events have contributed to the development of the Scottish nation.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOC 5-02a</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I have developed a sense of my heritage and identity as a British, European or global citizen and can present arguments about the importance of respecting the heritage and identity of others.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOC 4-02a</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Listening and talking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Early</th>
<th>First</th>
<th>Second</th>
<th>Third</th>
<th>Fourth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Learners explore the features of spoken language and can use this knowledge to understand others and their own spoken language.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I am exploring new ways of communicating and share my experiences with others.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I am exploring new ways of communicating and share my experiences with others.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENG 3-05a</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I can recognize how the features of spoken language can help in conversations and I can use this knowledge to understand others and their own spoken language.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENG 2-05a</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I can recognize how the features of spoken language can help in conversations and I can use this knowledge to understand others and their own spoken language.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENG 3-05a</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I can recognize how the features of spoken language can help in conversations and I can use this knowledge to understand others and their own spoken language.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENG 3-05a</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I can recognize how the features of spoken language can help in conversations and I can use this knowledge to understand others and their own spoken language.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENG 3-05a</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tools for listening and talking**

- **To help me listen effectively and engage with others:**

  - When I listen, I can understand the speaker’s intentions and frame of reference.
  - When I listen, I can respond appropriately to questions and feedback.
  - When I listen, I can respond appropriately to feedback and questions.

  **LIT 1-02a**

- **To help me participate in discussions:**

  - I can contribute to discussions by asking relevant questions and providing my own contributions.
  - I can participate in discussions by asking relevant questions and providing my own contributions.
  - I can participate in discussions by asking relevant questions and providing my own contributions.

  **LIT 4-02a**
### Appendix 3: Sources of data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaire responses (individual and group): experiences and outcomes</td>
<td>1,107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trialling questionnaires from schools</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trialling visit proforma from LT Scotland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practitioner focus group participants: experiences and outcomes</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus group participants: other main stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Pupils</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Parents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Employers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Voluntary groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Further education colleges</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Universities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local authority telephone interviews (and SCiS)</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non standard documents (submitted on behalf of individuals and organisations)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This document was added to the Education-line collection on 22 January 2010*