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ABSTRACT

The inclusion of prehistory on the national primary curriculum was the culmination of many years lobbying by archaeologists. This paper looks at the history of that campaign and at why prehistory deserves its place on the curriculum. It goes on to look at how a selection of museums and heritage sites are responding by developing educational sessions relevant to the Changes in the Stone Age to the Iron Age topic specified on the curriculum, as well as the provision of continuing professional development programmes designed to assist teachers and museum educators in learning about prehistory. Special attention is given to the prehistory education programmes at the Pitt Rivers Museum in Oxford, and the Rollright Stones heritage site near Chipping Norton in Oxfordshire. The benefits of different types of learning are considered along with suggestions for the provision of prehistory learning in the future.
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INTRODUCTION

‘HOORAY!!! At long last we are going to have Prehistory on the National Curriculum!!!’ (Pryor, F. 2013). Thus the eminent archaeologist and excavator of Flag Fen, Francis Pryor, greeted the news that from September 2014 primary school children in England would have the opportunity to learn about life in Britain prior to the Roman invasion of 43 AD. ‘We’ve absolutely got to make the most of this new opportunity,’ he continued. ‘We mustn’t let it pass by.’

Two years down the line, this paper aims to examine whether those responsible for museums and heritage sites in England have indeed made the most of this opportunity. It will consider the different ways of introducing a subject that is not always straightforward to both teachers and pupils, and it will look particularly closely at how the Pitt Rivers Museum in Oxford and the Rollright Stones near Chipping Norton in Oxfordshire have responded to the issue. Firstly however, there will be an examination of how prehistory in education has been tackled in the past, what can be learned from it, and why it is deemed important to have prehistory on the curriculum at all.

For the purposes of this paper the terms ‘prehistory’ and ‘archaeology’ will, to a certain extent, be interchangeable. By its very nature, prehistory (any time prior to written records, usually considered in Britain to be marked by the Roman invasion of 43 AD) can only be learned about through the process and findings of archaeology. In other words,

‘Everything we know about the prehistoric past must be derived from mute remains which, largely by chance, have survived the ravages of time. What we have is an archaeology which exists in the present representing a residue of what once was.’ (Darvill, T. 1987, p.7).
Archaeology could therefore be said to be the process of which prehistory is the product. It is understood, however, that archaeology can be used to find out about and enhance our knowledge of people living in Britain after 43 AD, right up to the present day, and indeed has been used as part of the evidence based delivery of history on the curriculum for some time. It is further understood that, ‘rather than accumulating more and more truth, archaeology carries out an ongoing negotiation between past and present through the study of material culture.’ (Swain, H. 2007, p.9). In many respects, the more that is unearthed by archaeologists, the harder it becomes to establish prehistoric truths – the picture is constantly shifting.

The ‘national curriculum’ refers specifically to England (Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland follow their own curricula). It ‘is a set of subjects and standards used by primary and secondary schools so children learn the same things. It covers what subjects are taught and the standards children should reach in each subject.’ (GOV.UK 2016). The area of the curriculum under consideration here is specifically the Key Stage 2 primary curriculum for children aged from 7 to 11 (Years 3 to 6), concentrating mainly on the curriculum for history, and specifically on the Changes from the Stone Age to the Iron Age topic. (See Appendix 1).

From a methodological point of view the research is varied but, being largely interview-based, can generally be said to be qualitative and narrative. Research has consisted mainly of personal observation and semi-structured interviews, conducted, where possible, face-to-face. Some interviews were recorded and are therefore quoted verbatim while for others notes were taken and are therefore more general. Transcriptions of all interviews are available on request. Some people responded by email, copies of which are also available on request. Both primary and secondary documentary evidence has been taken into account, and I am particularly grateful to Pam Meecham and Annie Davey of UCL, and to the Pitt Rivers Museum for allowing me to use their primary research as evidence.
It is not the purpose of this paper to produce an exhaustive list of which museum/heritage site is doing what, where and when. There is an excellent list available on the *Schools Prehistory and Archaeology* website which does exactly that (schoolsprehistory.co.uk). Its intention is to look at how a small selection of different museums and heritage sites have been developing Stone Age to Iron Age programmes, and how they have tailored them to suit their own particular collections and circumstances.
What is prehistory and why does it matter?

The term ‘prehistory’ refers to our human past before the introduction of the written record. In the case of British prehistory this is usually taken to be the time prior to the Roman invasion of 43 AD, a span of years which accounts for ‘over 99% of human activity, during which world-changing discoveries and advances were made.’ (Corbishley, M., 2011, p.114). When one considers the myriad of technological advances made by humankind in just the last fifty let alone two thousand years, one might be justified in asking whether what happened before the Roman invasion really matters. Indeed, the lack of history, of a written record which enables us to read people’s thoughts and to understand their purposes and motivations, could be argued to render prehistory a dry and sterile area of study: as Sir Mortimer Wheeler commented: ‘Dead archaeology is the driest dust that blows.’ (Wheeler, M. 1956, p.13). However, if one knows how to look, using the archaeological record (which becomes easier to read with each advancement in the science of archaeology), the distant past with all the daily concerns and strivings our ancestors had to contend with can spring sharply into focus.

People in the distant past lived and died just as we do. Their lives were complex and interesting. The fact that they left no written evidence actually makes their study more intriguing: inevitably we will place our own individual interpretations upon what is found, and while some
theories can be proved archaeologically, many remain speculation which allows for a degree of constructivist interpretation perhaps less present in the consideration of historical documentation, and thus more engaging.

While sometimes hard to bring vividly to life, our ancestors left behind so much, both above and below the ground, their impact cannot be ignored. Our whole landscape is shaped by prehistory. However ‘the English landscape is not simply the product of people in the past, but, like all history, is an integral part of the present, something continually “made” and “re-made” which can never be finished.’ (Barker, K. and Darvill, T. 1997, p.6). It is this mutual involvement in the constant creation of our own physical and cultural landscapes that makes the study of prehistory so relevant. However distant, what we regard as the past was once our ancestors’ present, just as, for our descendants, our present will one day be seen as the past; its study can help lead us to a better understanding of the multicultural world we inhabit today and the hope that:

‘people from different cultures will no longer view the past exclusively as a record of their own culture, or in what is considered a neutral or “objective” way, but in a way that recognizes a plurality of pasts, each incorporating subjectivity and bias.’ (Stone, P.G. and MacKenzie, R. 1994, p.12)
A brief history of prehistory

Enlightenment historians, raised as they were on a diet of classical history and culture, took little notice of Britain before the Romans. ‘All human creative expression, indeed all that one said and did in polite society of the eighteenth century, was informed by the classics.’ (Jenkins, I. 2003). Enlightenment investigations into the deeper past were shaped by religious belief and the accepted chronology of the time: ‘Throughout the seventeenth and much of the eighteenth century the world was thought to be no more than six thousand years old’ (Cook, J. 2003, p.179) with the Bible and Greek and Roman written records providing the framework. ‘There was no concept of unknown, extinct peoples, or periods of unwritten time, and, consequently, no concept of human prehistory.’ (Ibid.).
Nevertheless, the growth of antiquarianism had commenced prior to the Enlightenment and continued during it. Antiquaries such as William Camden (1551-1623) had started the process of recording antiquities in Britain – his *Britannia* was published in 1586 in Latin and in 1610 in English – but it was John Aubrey (1626-1697) ‘who first really began to assign particular sites and monuments to the pre-Roman period.’ (Darvill, T. 1987, p.3). In spite of the generally held view that the world began in 4004 BC, and prehistory’s dismissal by historians, the interest in ‘Ancient Britons’ grew apace with regular meetings in the Bear Tavern on the Strand in London leading to the eventual formation of the Society of Antiquaries in 1717. (*Ibid.*).

However, ‘It was the intellectual climate of the early nineteenth century that really changed the face of prehistoric studies’ (*Ibid.* p.4) with much of the impetus coming from Scandinavia. Here, in 1837, C J Thomsen of the Royal Museum of Nordic Antiquities in Copenhagen, devised what is:

‘widely considered archaeology’s first paradigm … that said prehistory could be subdivided into three parts, based on technological advances in weaponry and tools: in chronological order, they are Stone Age, Bronze Age, Iron Age.’ (Kris Hirst, K. 2015).

In addition to this Three Age system, the Stone Age was later subdivided into the Palaeolithic, the Mesolithic and the Neolithic. (See Appendix 3).
Around the same time huge, if somewhat erratic, advances were being made in the science of excavation by the likes of Richard Colt Hoare (1758-1838), William Cunnington (1754-181) and particularly General Pitt-Rivers (1827-1900), which, combined with new theories of geology and evolution, and together with ‘the accumulated evidence of associations between early stone tools and the bones of extinct animals led to the proposition that prehistory was of a very considerable duration.’ (Darvill, T. 1987).

It is not this paper’s intention to go through an exhaustive list of how prehistory has changed in the hundred years or so since then. Suffice it to say it is a science that continues to change and grow with every new discovery, and with modern building and infrastructure developments these are coming thick and fast. The popularisation of archaeology through television programmes (such as Time Team, Meet the Ancestors and Digging for Britain), and blockbuster exhibitions (such as Ice Age art: arrival of the modern mind in 2013 at the British Museum), mean that more and more people are interested in prehistory, have access to it and want to be involved in it. Doubtless all these enthusiasts will share Francis Pryor’s sentiments, quoted at the opening of this paper, on the inclusion of prehistory on the primary curriculum, and will be delighted that their children will have an opportunity that they, generally, were denied.
A brief history of archaeology on the curriculum

In his book *Pinning Down the Past: Archaeology, Heritage and Education Today*, Mike Corbishley gives a lucid summary of the position of archaeology in education at the time of its publication in 2011. This was just prior to the announcement that prehistory was at last to be included on the primary curriculum, and he documents the long struggle to achieve this.

As early as 1884, General Pitt-Rivers stated that one of a museum’s ‘chief functions should be the instruction of the public’ (Corbishley, M. 2011, p.79). In many ways Pitt-Rivers was ahead of his time showing both constructivist and post-modernist tendencies when he opened his museum in Farnham, Dorset:

"I hold that the great desideratum of our day is an educational museum in which the visitors may instruct themselves … It is to the larger and smaller tradesmen that such things as museums appeal but they must be supplemented by other inducements to make them attractive."
Within a short distance of the museum I have formed a recreation ground …” (Pitt-Rivers 1892) (Ibid. p.79).

The appeals to include archaeology in formal education came early in the twentieth century when O. G. S. Crawford ‘argued the case for more respect for the archaeologist and the inclusion of the archaeologists’ results in the history syllabus.’ (Ibid. p.83). The call was repeated over the years by, among others, Stuart Piggott, Sir Mortimer Wheeler and Colin and Jacquetta Hawkes, culminating in 1956 in a one-day conference, organised by the Council for British Archaeology, (CBA) on Archaeology and Schools. ‘A very large number of teachers attended and the programme covered archaeology’s place in the curriculum, field survey work and excavation for schools.’ (Ibid. p.83). Opinion was mixed as to the value and practicality of including archaeology in an already over-crowded curriculum, and, ultimately, ‘the attempts to establish archaeology as a school subject failed.’ (Ibid. p.83).

In the 1970s and 80s the situation began to change. The emergence of Britain’s burgeoning Heritage industry provided ‘opportunities to experience the past through visits to historic sites, museums, theme parks and involvement in historic re-enactments.’ (Harnett, P. 2000, p.35). These visits could be made further sense of through the official history curriculum which offered ‘opportunities to critically interpret the past, to question, reflect and make judgements on what has happened before.’ (Ibid. p.35). While it was accepted by the CBA Education Board that archaeology, or prehistory, would ‘never be a subject in its own right in the National Curriculum [it believed] it should be part of specific subject areas (such as history) and of the wider curriculum as a whole.’ (Stone, P. G. and MacKenzie, R. 1994).

During this time considerable efforts were made by the CBA and other archaeological organisations to provide teachers with resource material. ‘Archaeology in Education’ ran for twenty years from 1980-2000 and provided teaching packs, air photo packs, artefact kits,
replicas, slide sets and videos. Similarly, the Hampshire based ‘Archaeology and Education’ operated a successful programme starting in 1985 to embed archaeology and prehistory into local primary schools (Corbishley, M. 2011 p.85). Pre-project teacher training was a vital part of the programme, with classroom work ‘setting the scene for the project and team members [to work] alongside classroom teachers to introduce contemporary understanding of prehistory.’ (Ibid.).

Projects such as these were exemplary in many ways and should, perhaps, have provided the necessary impetus to get archaeology included on the curriculum, but still it did not happen. Swain suggests that:

‘One reason why archaeology … failed to have the influence it should on formal education is that archaeologists seem primarily interested in promoting their own concerns: agendas concerned with preserving and managing sites, rather than in helping teachers deliver their programmes and agendas.’ (Swain, H. 2007, p.269)

When archaeology was finally included on the Primary curriculum in 2014, it was as ‘prehistory’ rather than as ‘archaeology’. In part, the move from Michael Gove and the Department for Education for a chronology of English history must be responsible for this. However, as mentioned in the introduction, the two words are often used interchangeably, with archaeology describing the process, and prehistory representing the product. As a process, archaeology has long been referenced in children’s history textbooks as part of the evidence based delivery of history specified in the last curriculum, and, in pre-curriculum days, some enthusiastic teachers made archaeology part of their syllabus; but for most teachers the idea of including a subject that, to fully embrace, requires a fair amount of hands-on, outdoor activity, combined with a degree of understanding of the scientific processes involved (such as carbon dating) was not one that was contemplated with enthusiasm.
At the risk of sounding frivolous, I also think that, in the past, archaeologists had the reputation of being unwashed, hairy-faced, open-toed-sandal-wearing troglodytes, and archaeology just wasn’t ‘sexy’. Speed forwards a few decades via Indiana Jones and we find ourselves in a hipster era where beards and open-toed sandals are positively en vogue, and presenters such as Professor Alice Roberts - ‘a boffin without a beard’ according to The Independent (2014) - and the recently knighted Sir Tony Robinson of Time Team fame, give archaeology a more populist face. Coupled with this ‘sexed up’ version of archaeology, the framing of the subject as ‘prehistory’ places it in a more accessible and classroom-friendly light; and perhaps it is only now, after so many years of excavation and evidential accumulation, not to mention the vistas opened by science, technology and the internet, that there is a sufficiently engaging body of factual information that can form the basis of a prehistory topic on the curriculum, with current archaeology providing support.

It is worth noting Pam Meecham and Annie Davey’s findings (Meecham, P. and Davey, A. 2015) that ‘pupil focus groups revealed a high level of engagement with the language and practices of archaeology’, an enthusiasm that was commented on by some teachers. ‘One teacher reflected that they would like to deliver the entire prehistory programme of work via an archaeologist’s “perspective”’ (Ibid.). A current exhibition at the National Museum Cardiff taps into this trend: Treasures: Adventures in Archaeology compares ‘the stories of real life archaeologists with those of their fictional counterparts … [bringing] together thematic material from fiction and film in order to reveal how real life archaeological exploits have influenced popular culture.’ (Art Fund 2016). The blanket press coverage is testament to the exhibition’s success in engaging young and old alike.
Prehistory on the curriculum

In 2012 it was announced that the curriculum for England was to be overhauled, and it was at this point that it was finally decided, after years of lobbying, to propose the inclusion of prehistory on the English primary curriculum for Key Stages 1 and 2 - not as a subject in its own right, but, as the CBA had previously predicted, as part of the wider History curriculum (Appendix 1). When the new curriculum was published in September 2013 the emphasis was firmly on the chronological teaching of history with the aim that all pupils:

‘know and understand the history of these islands as a coherent, chronological narrative, from the earliest times to the present day: how people’s lives have shaped this nation and how Britain has influenced and been influenced by the wider world.’ (Department for Education 2013)

It further states that pupils should be taught about: ‘changes in Britain from the Stone Age to the Iron Age’ and gives as non-statutory examples:

- late Neolithic hunter-gatherers and early farmers, for example, Skara Brae
- Bronze Age religion, technology and travel, for example, Stonehenge
- Iron Age hill forts: tribal kingdoms, farming, art and culture (Ibid)

The provision of non-statutory examples on the curriculum is both helpful, as a guide for teaching the topic, and a hindrance, in so far as many teachers do not seem to look beyond them. Chatting with teachers taking their classes round the London Before London galleries at the Museum of London, and talking to museum educators, it would seem that most schools concentrate on Skara Brae in Orkney, Stonehenge (both of which are quoted as non-statutory examples) and cave painting. Stonehenge and Skara Brae have huge amounts of literature and online resources devoted to them, with ongoing excavations in Orkney at the Ness of Brodgar (orkneyjar.com) giving an added ‘live’ element to a study of Skara Brae. Cave painting, on
the other hand, is not mentioned on the curriculum. Although a wonderful ‘entree’ to classroom art projects, and well supported by various picture books (see Appendix 4), it is not found in Britain, apart from a few faint examples of Palaeolithic rock art at Cresswell Crags in Derbyshire. The best-known examples of Ice Age art come from France (for instance Chauvet Cave and Lascaux) and Spain (Altamira). Given that Britain was still part of the Continent at that time, perhaps this does not matter. The young age of most pupils learning about prehistory, as discussed above, means that it is important to have some kind of ‘in’ – an engaging way of introducing the children to the topic, and cave art is certainly that, as well as being preferable to dinosaurs and the Flintstones which are, anecdotally, also used. However, there remains the potential for chronological and geographical confusion, which teachers and museum educators should strive to avoid.

Lascaux Cave Paintings. (Image: pinterest)

It is also to be hoped that teachers look beyond the non-statutory examples and seek for local sites and monuments through which their pupils can learn about and engage with prehistory. Skara Brae is a truly amazing site but it is on the Orkney Islands and therefore unvisitable for most English school children. The importance of children physically connecting with their local historical and cultural landscape will be discussed later on, but the benefits of being able
physically to visit and explore what children are learning about in school should not be underestimated.

**Prehistory and learning theory**

Many joyful ‘HOORAYS’ from the likes of Francis Pryor greeted the news of the inclusion of prehistory on the primary curriculum, and indeed there are many positives to be taken from it. In his 2012 review of Cultural Education in England, Darren Henley (now Chief Executive of Arts Council England) speaks with enthusiasm of the skills ‘children acquire through good Cultural Education, [which] help to develop their personalities, abilities and imagination. They allow them to learn how to think both creatively and critically and to express themselves fully.’ (Henley, D. 2012, p.17). He goes on to emphasise the importance of critical thinking which ‘is especially important in heritage and history, where the subject could otherwise be reduced to the accumulation of facts, rather than also including the organisation of an understanding of historical context.’ (Ibid. p.15). Prehistory as a topic is well-placed to encourage both critical thinking and evidential analysis. The lack of an historical record means that other forms of evidence have to be taken into account – not just what was found, but the context in which it was found, how it ties in with other evidence already found, and so on. Consideration of this kind of evidence also allows for a degree of constructivism perhaps not so present in straight history.
Constructivism

The evidence-based nature of prehistory lends itself perfectly to Hein’s ‘constructivist learning situations’. Within a classroom, whether it be at school or in a museum or heritage centre, the necessity of drawing conclusions from evidence means that learners:

‘can use both their hands and minds, to interact with the world, to manipulate it, to reach conclusions, experiment, and increase their understanding; that is their ability to make generalizations about the phenomena with which they engage.’ (Hein, G. 1998, p.34)

![Diagram showing Hein’s Constructivist theory of Education.](picture: eduweb.com)

It is important not to take Hein’s divorcing of learners from objective truth too literally. When considering archaeological evidence, there isn’t always an objective truth: many people will interpret the same evidence in completely different ways, drawing perfectly reasonable but separate conclusions from the available information. Prehistory therefore positively invites children to ask the ‘why’, ‘how’, ‘when’ and ‘what for’ type of meaning making questions and to answer them for themselves using the evidence in front of them.
Object based learning

The Flesh Scraper

If I had sight enough
Might I not find a fingerprint
Left on this flint
By Neolithic man or Kelt?
So knapped to scrape a wild beast’s pelt,
The thumb below, fingers above,
See, my hand fits it like a glove.

Andrew Young 1969 (Corbishley, M. 2011, p.164)

‘An often-heard phrase among museum educators is that every object tells a story.’ (Shaffer, S. E. 2015, p.110). This age-old adage is certainly applicable when looking at prehistory. Once again, the fact that prehistory is so evidentially based provides ample opportunity for object based learning. The opportunity to handle objects, whether at school or at a museum, whether original or replica, allows a child’s natural kinaesthetic learning style full rein. ‘Object handling has a long-lasting effect and relationship with memory, more so than text-based learning often has.’ (Romanek, D. and Lynch, B. 2008, p.284). It can also be a great leveller: ‘there are some children who are less verbally gifted than others, but who may have a more advanced ability to engage with the object in a tactile way.’ (Ibid.). Current research also demonstrates ‘the therapeutic potential of a multi-sensory museum object encounter.’ (Chatterjee, H. and Noble, G. 2013, p.43). Whilst not exclusive to prehistory, the benefits for children in engaging with objects can include:

- individual creativity, discovery and learning
- increased self-expression
- connecting with the past
- communication with others
- a sense of place and identity
- the promotion of understanding, respect and tolerance
improvements in interest, understanding and written work
*(Ibid. p.42)*

Furthermore, a close scrutiny of prehistoric (and other) objects can open many other learning paths for children, as Shaffer demonstrates:

### Beyond the Obvious: Finding Hidden Meanings in Objects

- Objects tell **stories**.
- Objects have **meaning** that changes with the perspective of the interpreter.
- Objects have **physical attributes** (material, colour, shape, size, texture, dimension, design).
- Objects have **function** or purpose.
- Objects **connect** us to people, places and events.
- Objects have **emotional connections**.
- Objects have **value** (personal, sentimental, monetary, cultural, historical).
- Objects are **symbolic** and can serve as metaphors.
- Objects **enhance memories**.
- Objects are **concrete** representations that serve as entry points for abstract ideas.

*(Shaffer, S. E. 2015, p.113)*

All of these observations represent something that can be built upon in class, and help to reinforce the haptic learning obtained through the opportunity to handle objects.

### Cross-curricular learning

It is obvious from the examples quoted above that ‘Archaeology as a subject would appear to be perfect for teaching. It is multidisciplinary and questioning and goes to the heart of what it means to be human.’ *(Swain, H. p.267)*. This multidisciplinarity leads naturally to cross-curricular teaching and learning.

‘A cross-curricular approach to teaching is characterised by sensitivity towards, and a synthesis of, knowledge, skills and understandings from various subject areas. These inform an enriched pedagogy that promotes an approach to learning which embraces and explores this wider sensitivity through various methods.’ *(Savage, J. 2010)*.
Mike Corbishley discusses how this approach can be synthesised through the study of archaeology and prehistory and discusses several cross-curricular projects showing how the subjects can link together. These subjects include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>History</th>
<th>Science</th>
<th>Mathematics</th>
<th>Art</th>
<th>Design and Technology</th>
<th>Geography</th>
<th>Music</th>
<th>PSHCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>– including historic environment, change, chronology, interpretation</td>
<td>– including scientific enquiry, life processes and living things, materials and their properties, physical processes</td>
<td>– including counting, measuring, shapes and patterns, calculation</td>
<td>– including model-making</td>
<td>– including maps, aerial photographs, buildings, planning space, location, environment</td>
<td>– including citizenship</td>
<td>– including citizenship</td>
<td>– including citizenship</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An interesting example of how cross-curricular links can be made during a specific project can be found in one of a series of booklets prepared for teachers by the Schools Committee of the CBA. ‘Archaeology in the Primary School’ was published in 1982 and contains an account of the activities of Duxford Primary School’s Archaeology club during 1980. The club had been established following a school-wide archaeology project on ‘Islands’ in 1975. The following year the theme was ‘People of the distant past’ – ‘in particular looking for evidence as to how when and where the village of Duxford began and developed’ (Dale, F. 1980, p.10), a project that continued for several years. The fact that this project took place some considerable time ago in no way diminishes its relevance. Frances Dale felt strongly that:

‘Taking archaeology into primary schools should be concerned with enabling children to learn more about archaeology and its value to the community, and should provide opportunities for the children to understand and practice some of the skills that form a necessary part in developing that understanding.’ (Ibid, p.11)
The ability of archaeology and prehistory to connect children to their local area and its past is incredibly important in helping develop a sense of place. It can also help incomers to connect with an unfamiliar environment – ‘places are defined by the people that live in them, the shifting composition of their communities influences their meaning.’ (Davis, P. 2005, p.336). In today’s mobile and multicultural society, placemaking is an important part of connecting children to their immediate locality; as well as helping them to feel secure, it can help to develop a sense of civic pride, and delving into their own local past is a great way of doing this.

‘Every locality possesses physical attributes, each with associated (and often historical) meanings that are important to the local community. … It is important to recognise that ‘local distinctiveness’ … does not only apply to small rural settlements, it can equally be identified in an industrial town or the suburbs of a major city. Every place has special features that can be recognised, protected and celebrated.’ (Davis, P. 2005, p.366).

It is not always easy or affordable for schools to travel great distances to reinforce topic learning at a museum or heritage site, so if teachers can be helped and encouraged to find out about their local surroundings it could well form the basis of an exciting class project involving children more closely with their own communities and landscapes.

Back in 1980s Duxford finding evidence of its prehistory would have been quite a challenge as ‘the southern part of Cambridgeshire is mostly flat, arable farmland with few standing remains. Evidence of past human activity is there, though difficult to discover.’ (Dale, F. 1982, p.12). Frances Dale kept a chart outlining the activities and objectives of the Archaeology Club (see Appendix 2) and a glance at it shows the part the club played in developing a variety of skills, from observation to classification to evaluating evidence to manual dexterity. Nearly forty years later, such skills and knowledge assessments are considered an essential part of
evaluating learning outcomes within the museum and heritage sector and play an important role in developing their education programmes.

**Generic Learning Outcomes**

Generic Learning Outcomes (or GLOs) were developed in the early 2000s ‘in response to the need to define, capture and measure learning in museums, libraries and archives’. (Graham, J. 2013, p.4). They are based on constructivism and the premise that ‘learning is a natural and lifelong process, and that the most basic outcome of learning is personal meaning.’ (Hooper-Greenhill, E. 2007, p.45). Group, rather than individual learning, is focussed upon, with the GLOs providing a ‘toolkit’ with which museums and heritage sites can evaluate the educational efficacy of their programmes (see Fig.2)
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While not all museums use GLOs it does seem that GLO awareness is generally high, and their use has continued to ‘have a significant impact on developing thinking about learning, planning learning experiences and measuring the learning impact.’ (Graham, J. 2013, p.7).

This brief consideration of some learning theory shows that the inclusion of prehistory on the English primary curriculum should provide ample opportunity for teachers to develop interesting and engaging lessons. Using a prehistory topic as a starting point they can move in many different directions across the curriculum, with their pupils enjoying both object based, experiential learning together with the more traditional pedagogy associated with history. However, the introduction of a completely new topic onto any part of the curriculum is not straightforward.
Comprehending chronology

Extract from
The River’s Tale
(Prehistoric)

“… I’d have you know that these waters of mine
Were once a branch of the River Rhine,
When hundreds of miles to the East I went
And England was joined to the Continent.

“I remember the bat-winged lizard birds,
The Age of Ice and the mammoth herds,
And the giant tigers that stalked them down
Through Regent’s Park and Camden Town.”

Rudyard Kipling, 1911

‘100,000 years ... even an adult can’t really imagine what that’s like.’ (Meecham, P. and Davey, A. 2015). The fact that history is now, by and large, taught chronologically in schools means that children in Y3 are tackling prehistory and having to grapple with the chronological complexities of the vast expanses of time involved.

‘In terms of how children make sense of the past, their ability to sequence events, and gauge their distance from the present, is one of the ways in which they can develop a working structure or mental framework of the past, and establish at least one dimension of how events are related to each other.’ (Stow, W. and Haydn, T. 2000, p.85)

This is all very well, but ‘the conception of a universal time scheme is seen by many [researchers] as a late development’ (Ibid. p.88) and it is only, at around 9 or 10 years of age, that ‘children’s understanding of time extends to include historic time contexts.’ (Gelman, S. A. and Frazier, B. N. 2007, p.84). Therefore, if prehistory is being taught in Y5 or Y6, the children have far more likelihood of grasping the chronological implications than children in Y3. On the other hand, Michelle Welbourne, Education Officer at the Battersea Arts Centre in London, considers that young children are capable of understanding more than they are given credit for by the researchers. ‘Y3 children will grasp more than one might anticipate and think
quite deeply about what lives were like in prehistory.’ (Welbourne, M., interview, 17.08.16). Michelle finds that, on the whole, teachers do not expect her to reinforce chronology – they feel that it is something they can work on in class and they would rather her presentation concentrate on more people-focussed activities. (Ibid.). This is not always the case and many museum based Stone Age to Iron Age sessions will include some time spent discussing chronology.

Nick’s (Y7) timeline of the Stone Age. Image: Roslyn Green on edublogs

Many teachers and educators use timelines to reinforce chronology. These come in a variety of forms: from printed versions on paper, to pieces of rope or string, to dates on laminated cards that need to be put in order, to children holding hands and making a live timeline with each child representing a thousand years (Biddulph, K. interview 11.07.16). Some just deal with British prehistory while others cross-refer to contemporaneous cultures around the world.

The timelines available from Schools Prehistory and Archaeology (Appendix 3) show clearly the options and difficulties facing teachers when they are deciding how to approach chronology in British prehistory. Where in time is it best to start? How far back should they look? In this increasingly secular age how does one best explain BC/AD? Or BCE/CE, or BP, or KYA (for
‘Thousand Years Ago’? Within the limited time available for teaching a particular topic how much time should be spent trying to explain something many children find so hard to understand? The term ‘Stone Age’ encompasses such a vast expanse of time it is hard for adults to get to grips with it, let alone 7 and 8 year old children. The important thing is for the children to be able to distinguish between the three periods within the Stone Age which, as Kim Biddulph explained, can be done very simply by holding up three fingers and asking the children to name the Palaeolithic, Mesolithic and Neolithic:

‘The only thing that doesn’t get across is that the Palaeolithic is just so big, but I don’t think that really matters … I obviously try to make that big distinction between the hunting and gathering and the farming because that is the massive distinction.’ (Biddulph, K., interview, 11.07.16)

The understanding of these eras and the Three Age System of Stone Age, Bronze Age and Iron Age, the order in which they come and the changes that distinguish one from the other, is more important than children learning specific dates and fully understanding the amounts of time involved, and as Pam Meecham and Annie Davey observed, this does seem to be happening:

‘While conversations with teachers, classroom observations and focus groups with children did reveal a level of difficulty with numbers and dates, pupil drawings and written work done in the focus groups demonstrated a high level of confidence in sequencing and chronologies without using numbers.’ (Meecham, P. and Davey, A. 2016).
Teaching teachers and educating educators

One of the problems with having a curriculum at all, as far as prehistory is concerned, is that it has provided the grounds for a supply-and-demand based market within the museum and heritage sector. This in turn contributes to a self-perpetuating cycle whereby we learn what we are taught and then teach what we have learned. Over the years the history curriculum has shaped museum educational provision:

‘In a depressingly self-fulfilling cycle, the only “archaeology” most English school children study are the Romans and Egyptians. These then become the archaeological subjects of most interest to English adults so these feature prominently in popular culture, books, and museums. And this high profile and interest feeds back into their place in the school curriculum. … Most adults’ understanding of early history and prehistory is [tenuous], and, in most cases, this goes back to what they were taught or not taught at school.’ (Swain, H. 2007, p.266).

The upshot of this is that the current generation of primary school teachers and museum educators have been raised on a diet of Ancient Egyptians, Ancient Greeks and Romans, all of whom left behind an embarrassment of historical and archaeological riches, making them a most satisfyingly productive seam to mine in class. These are topics in which teachers have a reliable knowledge and resource base and therefore feel comfortable in communicating in their turn. They do not always have a reliable knowledge base in prehistory. Nor, indeed, do many museum educators.

Coming, by and large, from the same educational generation as our current crop of teachers, and having had to deliver to the previous curriculum, it should not be a surprise that museum educators often know little more than some teachers about British prehistory. Nevertheless, at a ‘Prehistory in Schools’ CPD session run by freelance museum educator, prehistorian, and creator of the Schools Prehistory and Archaeology website, Kim Biddulph, at the Pitt Rivers Museum earlier this year, it was noticeable that the majority of attendees were from the
museum and heritage sector rather than from local schools. Museum and heritage educators have had to bring themselves quickly up to speed in prehistory in order to avoid a ‘blind leading the blind’ scenario whereby teachers come to them for help which they are unable competently to supply. Discussing the workshop with Kim later she confirmed that museum staff make up a large percentage of attendees at her training days and admitted to ‘being very surprised by the lack of knowledge of prehistory in museums that have prehistoric collections amongst the education staff’, but acknowledged that ‘a lot of museum education staff are not going to have an archaeological background – a lot more have art history or something like that.’ (Biddulph, K. interview 11.07.16).

Kim Biddulph started her *Schools Prehistory and Archaeology* website and blog as a response to this general lack of prehistorical knowledge:

‘I was trying to write stuff to be available for teachers so that they would have some background knowledge about it, because from my experience the teachers I’d come across had no knowledge [of prehistory] at all – why would they? They had never been taught it at school and a lot of primary teachers aren’t history specialists.’ (Biddulph, K., Interview 11.07.16).

Anecdotally, various former colleagues in primary education have said that they would not feel comfortable teaching prehistory as it is something that they know little or nothing about. Clare Coleman, Education Officer at the Ashmolean Museum, also noted that ‘Anecdotally, a number of teachers have said that they don’t feel very confident with this time period.’ (Coleman, C., email 18.08.16), while Pam Meecham and Annie Davey, in their unpublished research report on children’s experiences of the prehistory topic, quote ‘Teacher B1: “I didn’t even know what prehistory meant as a term” … a view reiterated by several teachers.’ (Meecham, P. and Davey, A. 2015). In contrast, other teachers I spoke to reacted with enthusiasm to the idea of learning about and teaching prehistory, so perhaps it just boils down to whether a teacher
happens to be interested in the subject, and, if they are not, they are less likely to prioritise the time to learn about it.

It would seem, however, that there is strong case for the provision of CPD (Continuing Professional Development) sessions to enable teachers to learn this new topic and how best to present it to their pupils. Is this provision being met and if so by whom? In spite of the fact that many of their own educators do not have a background in archaeology and prehistory, have museums and heritage sites been able to provide what teachers need?
Continuing Professional Development

‘I was particularly impressed by the Museums and Galleries sector, with many national and local organisations from this area firmly planting education at the centre of their activities.’ (Henley, D, 2012)

When the new curriculum was announced in 2013 there was no available funding for CPD or for its centralised delivery. Former chair of the School Library Groups of the Educational Publishing Council, Rachel Cooke, was present at several briefings from the Department of Education concerning government thinking and implementation of the curriculum:

‘One thing that was very apparent from the start was that, unlike previous curriculum introductions and changes, there was to be no centralised funding for schools to implement the new curriculum. Schools would have to allocate money from their existing budgets for resources and training. It was perhaps inevitable therefore that heads identified new subjects on the curriculum as a priority but also, that as the curriculum came out very quickly, that few were really prepared in advance for the change.’ (Cooke, R. email 06.09.16).

While smaller museums and heritage sites are able to supply a lot of help regarding teaching prehistory, providing CPD is not part of it. However, some of the larger institutions and sites have been proactive in producing opportunities for teachers to learn about prehistory. It did not happen immediately however. As mentioned above, Kim Biddulph set up the Schools Prehistory and Archaeology website specifically to help teachers learn about a subject that she realised they were unlikely to have any background in. She also set it up because:

‘When the draft curriculum was first published, which I think was in 2012, … I was thinking ‘Fantastic! The CBA will do something, or English Heritage will do something, or some of the big museums will do something.’ I kept on looking around for something to be done … but no one really responded to the curriculum and I think people thought it would get thrown out and not make the final “cut”.’ (Biddulph, K. interview, 11.07.16).

When it became obvious that prehistory was going to make the final ‘cut’, however, the big guns rolled into action.
One of the most comprehensive projects was a joint venture between the Museum of London and the London Schools Excellence Fund (LSEF). ‘We ran a Prehistory in the Primary Classroom project, funded by the GLA, in 2014-15 to work with teachers to create CPD training and classroom resources too. Since then we have continued to deliver prehistory CPD for schools on demand.’ (Creed, K. email 2016). The aim of the project was ‘to increase primary teachers’ subject knowledge, confidence and understanding in prehistory, chronology and object handling in response to changes to the National Curriculum.’ (LSEF 2015, p.4). Teachers particularly valued the expertise provided by the museum staff as well as the opportunity to handle authentic objects. Furthermore:

‘The repetitious nature of looking at the subject content chronologically but in different ways was an approach that worked particularly well. Teachers listened to an expert curator explain the story of prehistory, then explored a range of activities that would enable pupils to engage with the story, handled object from each time period and toured the London before London gallery.’ (Ibid, p.61)

The project was based on a ‘cascade’ model whereby two lead teachers were given extra training with the aim of passing on their knowledge to other teachers. The problem with this approach was that ‘both core teachers had changed positions within two months of the project
and whilst they still contributed to supporting teachers’ learning their priorities were understandably elsewhere.’ (Meecham, P. and Davey, A.). Nevertheless the project seems to have been an overall success and ultimately included not only teachers but Initial Teacher Training (ITT) students, and staff and volunteers from smaller museums in Herts and Essex.

The Education and Outreach Officer for Epping Forest and Lowewood Museum Services reported that the training had been ‘invaluable in developing [her] own subject knowledge and confidence to develop and deliver programmes on this subject’ about which she ‘had no previous … knowledge or experience.’ (LSEF 2015, p.67). The training had enabled her to run her own CPD courses and to develop her own prehistory workshop to great effect. This expansion of the project means that its effects have been far wider reaching than had originally been envisaged, and hopefully will continue to be felt positively over the years to come - the cascade system working but not, perhaps, as it had originally been intended.
Stonehenge CPD

As a large and well-resourced World Heritage Site, Stonehenge has also been able to help teachers with their prehistory delivery. As part of SALOG (Stonehenge and Avebury Learning and Outreach Group), the Stonehenge education department works in conjunction with English Heritage, the National Trust, Wessex Archaeology, The Salisbury Museum and Wiltshire Museum to provide CPD for local schools that are located within a 60-mile radius of the World Heritage Site. (Snell, K. interview 23.08.16). As part of this Stonehenge hosts three CPD sessions a year. Attendance numbers vary but for the session coming up in September 2016 there are twelve teachers from five different schools booked in. (Ibid.). Historic England runs bi-annual CPD sessions from Stonehenge, of which extracts from one can be watched, via YouTube or Vimeo, on the website relating to their Heritage Schools programme. (Historic England website).

Initiatives that emphasise the local, such as Heritage Schools, show that is not just the larger museums and heritage sites who have moved to provide help for teachers as far as CPD is concerned. Given the lack of government funding in this area any such provision is particularly welcome. After an initial flood my guess is that these sessions will continue to run on a request basis for a number of years until the knowledge required to teach prehistory has filtered down
into the ITT colleges where the teachers who teach the teachers are also having to learn a whole new subject…

**Prehistory sessions and resources**

Having looked at some CPD provision, we return to the question of what teachers actually want and need to facilitate their delivery of prehistory in their classes. What sessions and resources are being offered by museums and heritage sites for their pupils? How do they tie in to the curriculum requirements and the non-statutory recommendations? Obviously there are thousands of museums and heritage sites around the country and it is not the aim of this paper to do an exhaustive survey of them all. However, a look at a few of them reveals a picture of museum and heritage educators doing their best to put together Changes in the Stone Age to the Iron Age sessions which manage to be informative and engaging, while reinforcing classroom learning. The earlier look at some learning theories showed how much prehistory has to offer as a topic educationally, providing opportunities for, among other things, cross-curricular learning, object handling, and constructivist-based meaning making.

It is interesting to see how museums and heritage sites have tailored their provision to fit their individual circumstances. The Battersea Arts Centre (Wandsworth Museum) in London, The Priest’s House Museum in Wimborne Minster, Dorset, and the Corinum Museum in Cirencester, are local institutions which are currently in the process of developing their Changes in Britain from the Stone Age to the Iron Age provision, all in direct response to its inclusion on the curriculum and to teacher demand. The provision currently includes a mix of in-house and outreach; as yet none of them provides online teaching resources.
The recently set-up partnership between the Battersea Arts Centre (BAC) and the Wandsworth Museum shows how well such relationships can work. Until recently Wandsworth’s historical and prehistorical past was represented by the Wandsworth Museum in Putney. The BAC was keen to connect its theatre, social enterprise, and heritage and culture work with Wandsworth’s local history, and proposed a partnership arrangement in which the museum relocated its services to the BAC.

Education Officer Michelle Welbourne’s original prehistory workshop at the Wandsworth Museum was based around a replica collection. The objects were put into different bags or boxes and the children had to work out what era they came from – Stone Age, Bronze Age or Iron Age – and the objects were then placed on a timeline. Prehistoric problem solving was considered and the children made models using appropriate materials to demonstrate their solutions. In contrast, all BAC workshops are artist-led, so Michelle’s original sessions are in the process of being adapted by artists and combined with new ideas to come up with something
informative, creative and exciting for the children. The whole education programme is still very much a work in progress with ideas continuing to be developed.

One option being explored is to create programmes suitable for all KS2 but which can be scaled up or down depending on the ages of the participating children. As a trial for this project, three schools (two Y3 groups and one Y6) and three artists have been trying out new ideas. The teachers involved are regular users of Wandsworth Museum/BAC with whom a good relationship has already been established. This means that their feedback can be relied upon to be honest and constructively critical where necessary.

In the Henley Culture Paper, Darren Henley warns of the ‘risk that the “creativity agenda” has come to mean a particular style of education, which does not place sufficient value on the development of a child’s understanding of cultural practice, or of fact-based knowledge about culture’ while at the same time ‘those who advocate a pure “knowledge agenda” fail to value the skills and experiences that engagement with cultural activities can bring to a child’s education.’ (Henley, D. 2012, p.18). It will therefore be fascinating to see what the final sessions are like and whether the BAC manages to find the necessary balance. Being artist-led, they will have a quite different slant from sessions that are more collection focussed, with the creative aspect making them both memorable and involving for the children. Learning through arts ties in with GLO assessment (including Skills, and Enjoyment, Creativity and Learning) as well as learning through touch, and constructivism.
The Priest’s House Museum, Wimborne Minster, Dorset

The Priest’s House Museum in Wimborne Minster, Dorset, is a far cry from busy Wandsworth, but it serves its local community in much the same way. Anne Tyson-Brown has just ceased working there, but agreed to talk to me (with their permission) as she had been responsible for setting up the Stone Age to Iron Age session which is delivered there. (Tyson-Brown, A. interview 23.07.16).

The Priest’s House Museum is a small museum devoted to the local history of East Dorset. It is a popular destination for local school children with its Victorian session being particularly well-attended. Anne observed that while newer teachers were keen to take on the challenge of the new curriculum, some of the older teachers were reluctant to lose the Victorian session they have enjoyed for so long, so it is now packaged under ‘local studies’ rather than ‘history’.

The Stone Age to Iron Age programme was developed as a direct response to the inclusion of prehistory on the primary curriculum. It piggybacked on the previously offered archaeology session which had been taken up mainly as an introduction to the Romans in Britain. There is a handling box which contains both original artefacts and some reproductions. The best of the
museum’s collection relates to the Iron Age which can still, if the children come at the end of the topic, lead in to the Romans in Britain which follows.

The museum also possesses an ‘excavation mat’. This was donated by Julian Richards (of *Meet the Ancestors* fame) who had designed it for a local project called ‘Under Your School’. The mat, which is about 6m square, is made up of layers. At the bottom is a white canvas layer with post holes painted onto it, this is followed by a layer of brown carpet, and a layer of astro turf. Appropriate ‘finds’ are placed within the different layers for the children to discover during the ‘excavation’. A session with this excavation mat is shared with a handling session and building wattle and daub models. A discussion about stratigraphy, what might be found, what might survive, what rots and what does not, also takes place. This is a great way of combining a hands-on activity with object based learning, as well as introducing the children to archaeological method (excavation) and theory (stratigraphy and dating).

Anne talked about the difficulty of engaging children, particularly when the finds do not especially represent the lives of children in prehistory. Both teachers and children can arrive with many misconceptions – the ‘Flintstone’ dilemma – people living in caves and consorting with dinosaurs. She also observed that the level of topic knowledge amongst teachers can occasionally be really shocking.

Although we did not have time to discuss it in depth, I took particular note of Anne’s comment about how hard it is to get a feel for what life was like for children in prehistory. ‘It is not at all surprising that children want to know about children. Scholars tend to be less interested.’ (Dommasnes, L. H., 2007, p.270). Children like to find out about other children, but perhaps more about how they lived rather than what happened to them when they died, and it tends to be burial evidence upon which our knowledge of children is based:
‘As we know from prehistoric cemeteries, and from recent research, child mortality was high. It is quite reasonable, however, to assume that the ones who survived did chores like everyone else, and have left much of the same kind of traces. Children worked. They have also suffered illnesses, been caught and sold into slavery, sacrificed to gods and married away to old friends of their grandfather’s.’ (Ibid. p.272).

This rather depressing assessment is probably true – it is all too easy for us to project our contemporary ideas and rose-tinted expectations of childhood onto our ancestors. A Stone Age to Iron Age session could be based specifically on what children’s lives might have been like: did they play games? Did they actually have what we would consider a ‘childhood’ today or were they treated as mini adults, contributing to the community from an early age, gradually picking up the skills required to survive and thrive in harsh circumstances? What could children realistically be expected to help with? For instance, when would they start hunting? Was there a pronounced division of labour between the sexes? It would certainly form an interesting base from which children could imagine, perhaps for a literacy topic, what a child’s life might have been like at different stages in prehistory. It would also be a way of introducing a narrative theme and looking at contemporary literature about prehistory. (Appendix 4).
Corinium Museum, Cirencester

This is quoted directly from an email from Emma Stuart, Learning Development Officer, in response to my request for feedback on Kim Biddulph’s Prehistory in Schools training day at the Pitt Rivers Museum. Corinium Museum is of interest because its prehistory provision currently only operates on an outreach basis, with in-house session development in the pipeline, and this email shows the thinking behind what is on offer now, and what they would like to offer in the future.

‘We have responded to prehistory being included on the curriculum in a number of ways. I guess first and foremost, we are lucky enough to have the sites and collections to facilitate our learning provision.

1. We sent a survey to teachers asking them what they would like to have access to i.e. re-enactors, learning sessions, information on local sites, loans boxes, etc. About 14 teachers responded but it helped inform our development.
2. The Prehistory training was fantastic for giving us an idea as to what we would include in a learning session. We used this to inform the introductory part of our loans box trials in local schools. We were lucky enough to receive Stage 1 HLF funding to help build 3 loans boxes covering Stone Age, Bronze Age and Iron Age.

Examining the loan box collection (Photo: Corinium Museum)
3. *We had the children dress up in costume (skins/fur, raw wool and patterned cloth - to show transition through the 3 periods - we know there is little evidence for clothing but it serves to illustrate change to children and they like dressing up especially at this age.*)
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A set of costume features in each loan box, with replica tools, adornment and pottery. *We had some lovely feedback from schools.*

4. *We also developed some art activities in schools to inspire learning about the period. What was interesting is that even though we were working with Year 3s, they seemed to understand the 'lithics' periods, which was really nice to see.*
5. Stage 2, if we are successful, will see session development. We will create a session, based on feedback from teachers and the loans box trials and this will sit in conjunction with newly developed prehistory galleries, which we hope will include a pit burial and a replica roundhouse section.

6. Our loans boxes have already been popular and borrowed by schools outside of the trial schools. The objects in the boxes are replicas. We used to include real items but found there was not much respect shown after having a smashed original Roman oil lamp returned by a secondary school. This made us rethink our loans system. They are quality replicas and serve to illustrate the periods.’
Heritage sites and open air museums

The advantage of most heritage sites and open air museums over their indoor counterparts is that children can enjoy outdoor activities, which can really help to bring prehistory to life. Here we will consider Stonehenge – a large, iconic, well-resourced World Heritage site in Wiltshire, and the Chiltern Open Air Museum in Buckinghamshire.

Stonehenge
(Interview with Katherine Snell, Education Officer for Stonehenge and Old Sarum, 23.08.16)

As Education Officer for Stonehenge and Old Sarum, Katherine Snell has the benefit of the amazing new education suite at Stonehenge. This was opened in December 2013, just after the announcement of the inclusion of prehistory on the curriculum – a serendipitous coincidence on the back of which a whole Stone Age to Iron Age programme has been built. Stonehenge is one of the few sites mentioned on the curriculum as a non-statutory area of study, so it is the focus of a lot of primary school attention.

The education department offers two sessions a day three days a week, and has thirty-five education volunteers who deliver. The six sessions a week (max. 30 children) are always full, so they have over 4000 children a year on Discovery Visits. Schools can also book to come on
a free self-guided tour of the site with resources available online. The visiting schools are almost exclusively Y3 and all seem to want to come in the autumn term (teaching chronologically means that the Stone Age comes first), an issue that was raised by other education officers at other sites and museums. Schools are now starting repeat visits, so the trip to Stonehenge is becoming a fixed part of their teaching programme. New schools continue to come as well.

Sessions are mainly volunteer-presented. The volunteers have an induction day followed by training for Discovery Visits which they gradually start to present (rather than being thrown in at the deep end), and refresher training in September. The volunteers are a varied bunch consisting mostly of retired teachers and some students. An education placement is offered for two months in September/October.

Three Discovery Visits are offered.

1. **Neolithic Life**
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This is the most popular visit. One hour is spent in the education space, where the subject is introduced, what will rot and what will not is discussed. Children are divided into groups and given four challenges of which they each do one and then feed back to the other groups
including: raising and moving stones; building Stonehenge; landscape; solstice alignment; dressing up in Neolithic/Bronze Age costumes.

Another hour is then spent in the reconstructed Neolithic houses, grinding corn and making bread, making rush ropes, and building wattle and daub fencing.

2. Stones and Bones

Run in partnership with the National Trust, this is an interactive guided tour of the stones using replica objects, a pop-up book, and 2D pictures. Outside, the time before, during and after Stonehenge is considered and the cursus barrows visited where one of the children is ‘buried’ with appropriate grave goods. Apparently this is THE most popular activity across all the sessions! On the way back the children chant using different instruments to keep time.
3. Myths and Legends

Ties in with the English curriculum and is supported by Lego Education who supply story starter kits. The children look at the Exhibition, the stones and then split into groups of three to think about their stories and use the Lego to storyboard them. The main legends considered are Merlin – bringing the stones from Ireland; Merlin and the Devil; and the Druids.

Handling Boxes – these are used during sessions to provide object handling and dressing up. The objects are all replicas. The clothes are leather for Stone Age/Neolithic, nettle and woven wool for Bronze Age. Outside are replica roundhouses which are well-equipped to give a feel of what life was like in the Neolithic/Bronze Age.
The Chiltern Open Air Museum  
(Interview with Kim Biddulph 11.07.16)
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The Chiltern Open Air Museum (COAM), founded with the intention of rescuing threatened buildings, covers a large acreage of mixed fields and woodland dotted with rescued and reconstructed buildings. The fortuitous mix of indoor and outdoor space makes it an ideal venue for learning about how our prehistoric ancestors lived and survived. Kim Biddulph has helped to develop the prehistory programming here which focuses on the Mesolithic and the Iron Age. The Mesolithic workshop concentrates on the skills essential to life and survival during this hunter-gatherer era which include fire making, covering a temporary shelter, hunting and pigment making. The workshop is presented by costumed interpreters and the entire 90 minutes take place outside making it a fully immersive experience for the children. The COAM has also developed a Mesolithic literacy workshop based on the brilliant *Wolf Brother* series of books by Michele Paver.

During my conversation with Kim we talked about how narrative and authenticity inform the programming at COAM. The interpreters do their best to be authentic, wearing appropriate costumes and avoiding any modern touches (such as watches). But is this level of authenticity really necessary? Katherine Snell told me that at Stonehenge, in order to avoid this authenticity...
question, staff never dress up (Snell, K. interview 23.08.16). Future evaluations at COAM will try to establish whether such a high level is of value to the teachers, or indeed to the children: ‘Do the children care if you’ve got an Iron Age person in glasses? Do we ask the person to wear contact lenses? I’m not sure you’re allowed to do that!’ (Biddulph, K. interview 11.07.16). The staff at the museum have done their best to learn authentic Mesolithic skills: Kim went on a bush craft course, learnt how to make fire with a bow, and a flint and steel; how to butcher animals and make shelters, ‘and since then it has definitely been a process of keep on learning … So we’ve ended up doing experimental archaeology here as staff just so that we get some skills that we can share with each other.’ (Ibid.).

The concept of authenticity will be discussed in more depth later, but it feeds into the theme of narrative which Kim feels is essential to all their workshops. ‘There has to be some reason why these kids are coming to do stuff and you can’t just say: “Come into the Iron Age house, I’m dressed up as an Iron Age person and here are some of the things we do.” That’s just boring.’ (Ibid.) All presentations are therefore framed in a story with interpreters going in and out of character in order to answer questions as they come up; the children are always willing to suspend disbelief and to immerse themselves completely in the story.

How to bring prehistory to life should be a constant challenge for all museum and heritage site educators today. Health and Safety restrictions preclude many relevant activities, such as flint knapping, and place severe restrictions on others, such as fire making. Outdoor facilities do certainly help and the reconstructed round houses at Stonehenge and at COAM enable children to get a feel of prehistoric life. There is increasing emphasis on this kind of outdoor learning, with a newly published report (Natural Connections Demonstration Project, 2012-2016) providing ‘strong evidence that learning outdoors has multiple benefits for school children. 92 per cent of teachers surveyed said that pupils were more engaged with learning when outdoors
and 85 per cent saw a positive impact on their behaviour.’ (Williams, A. 2016). These Outdoor Learning benefits will be considered again in Case Study 2 on the Rollright Stones.
CASE STUDY 1

THE PITT RIVERS MUSEUM
Stone Age to Iron Age

My MA placement was in the Education Department at the Pitt Rivers Museum (PRM) in Oxford. Hidden away at the back of the Oxford Museum of Natural History, the PRM is best known today for its world class ethnography collection, its thematic display of objects, its tiny hand-written labels and its darkly crammed wood-framed cases. It is less well-known for its archaeological collection although this made up a substantial part of General Pitt-Rivers original bequest.

General Augustus Pitt-Rivers lay the foundations of the Pitt Rivers Museum when he left his extensive archaeological and ethnographic collection to Oxford University in 1884.

‘In return for the donation of the collection, the University agreed to construct a new building to house the collection and future additions made to it. It also agreed to appoint a lecturer in
anthropology, and to maintain the General’s favoured mode of displaying the collection by type or function.’ (O’Hanlon, M. 2014, p.39).

Although the General intended the Pitt Rivers Museum to be one of archaeology and anthropology, it is for its anthropological collection that is now best known. With many ethnographic additions to the museum over the years, a large chunk of the archaeological collection has remained in storage, while many of those items that are in cases are displayed as examples of much later amulets, charms or sympathetic magic. Thus, for instance, a number of Neolithic stone axes are displayed variously as *pierres de tonnerre* (thunderbolts – placed in houses to avoid lightning which (of course!) never strikes the same place twice); fertility promoters; a cure for the sick, or a repeller of thieves.

Stone axes used as charms. (Photo: HK)
Some of this is about to change. The PRM is currently involved in a five year Heritage Lottery Funded project, VERVE - Visitors, Engagement, Renewal, Visibility, and Enrichment (otherwise known as Need, Make, Use) which is a museum-wide rejuvenation project aimed not just at displays, but at lighting, digitised interpretation, visitor engagement and improved accessibility. The stored collections are being reviewed and conserved with a view to putting more on display, and among these are the archaeological artefacts. A row of ten desktop cases on the upper gallery have been set aside for a new World Archaeology display which, it is to be hoped, will enhance the delivery of the Stone Age to Iron Age session currently provided.

While I was at the museum the process of selecting what was to go into the new cases was under way. This project followed on from earlier Pitt-Rivers related projects such as ‘Excavating Pitt-Rivers’, (PRM website); it included the commissioning of a report, by Kim Biddulph, on how best to make the new displays family and child friendly. Unfortunately, many of the selected items need to undergo conservation work before they can go on display which means that it is not possible to critique the final results here, but VERVE Curatorial Assistant, Madeleine Ding, confirms that Kim Biddulph’s ‘report’s suggestions are to be
included in the final displays, their interpretation and the public programming resulting from the display.’ (Ding, M. email 08.07.16).

Kim’s report was based on consultations with other ‘family friendly’ museums (including the Museum of London, the Petrie Museum, Manchester Museum and the National Museum of Wales), and with groups of children (from the Young Archaeologists Club), families visiting over half term, and a family focus group consisting of five adults, all of whom were either parents or grandparents of primary aged children, and two of whom were primary school teachers. The report focussed on how much people knew about archaeology and prehistory, what they thought about content, display ethos and interpretation, accessibility, and family and school programming. ‘The teachers were very complimentary about the school programme, both having brought many classes to the museum in the past and finding the style very engaging, and the promotion of critical thinking excellent.’ (Biddulph, K. 2016). They were particularly keen on the handling collections and ‘there was much discussion about the need for children to learn how information and facts are discovered, and the process of archaeology was deemed a very useful way to discuss this.’ (Ibid.)

Various recommendations were made as a result of Kim’s research concerning displays, narrative, accessibility and activities, and it waits to be seen how these are realised when the new cases and accompanying programming are unveiled in 2017. One point of interest is that the people involved in the consultation process were keen to see a continuation of the Pitt Rivers’ tradition of thematic display. When given the chance to arrange some ‘museum objects’ in a ‘display case’ only two people chose to arrange them by material with the majority arranging them either thematically (7), chronologically (6) or aesthetically (4) (Biddulph, K. 2016). In spite of this, when I had the opportunity to watch part of the selection process for the new World Archaeology cases, it became clear that the objects are to be displayed by material.
It could be argued that arranging objects by material and then subdividing them by function is in itself thematising them. For instance, within the ‘Non-Ferrous Metalwork’ case, there are sub-divisions of weapons, jewellery and spoons, and in the ‘Ferrous Metalwork’ case there are sub-divisions of weapons and keys.

The case that I found most intriguing was not arranged by material but by the fact that all the contents were replicas or fakes. For instance, in the picture below, the spear head is actually made from papier mache and weighs almost nothing, while the small ‘stone’ figurines are actually china ones that were put in a very soft water source and left to acquire a limestone ‘crust’. Some of the flint arrowheads are thought to be the work of the great Victorian forger, Flint Jack (1815-last seen 1874), who is alleged to have taught General Pitt-Rivers himself how to knap.
The ‘Fakes and Forgeries’ case (my name for it – it will probably be called ‘Reproductions and Casts’) raises once more the question of authenticity. In this particular circumstance most of the objects are old enough to fall into the category of ‘antiques’ if not ‘antiquities’. Some were created to deceive, but some were created as teaching tools, while others were made to sell as souvenirs. If ‘the authenticity of a thing is the essence of all that is transmissible from its beginning, ranging from its substantive duration to its testimony to the history which it has experienced’ (Benjamin, W. 1936) then these items too have an authenticity of their own – they are of long duration and have had arguably more exciting, if shorter, histories than many an original. If children have been sent round the museum to find particular objects in the cases (which they will not be handling after all) does it matter if they find a convincing replica which, visually at least, can engage them and teach them as much as an original object? Does it matter, furthermore, whether the objects they are given to handle during a session are originals or replicas?

Children’s reaction to recreated environments, such as may be found in a museum, suggest ‘that authenticity may reside in the viewer’s engagement with the object rather than being intrinsic to the object.’ (Gelman, S. A. and Frazier, B. N. 2007, p.83). Children also ‘seem to lack a historical understanding’ of “deep time” … periods that existed before a person’s
remembered past.’ (Ibid. p.84). While children certainly do get a frisson from handling authentic objects, observation would suggest that by and large it actually doesn’t cross their minds to care one way or the other whether they are handling an original or a replica. Young children live very much in the moment and they are perfectly happy to handle replicas in loans boxes or at a museum, just as they are happy to buy a tacky souvenir which ‘represents not the lived experience of its maker but the “secondhand” experience of its possessor/owner’ (Stewart, S. 1993, p.135). The handling of replicas takes the children beyond concerns of authenticity, enabling them to ‘reawaken’ the objects and, thereby, reawaken or create their own narrative and meaning around them. (Ibid. p.142). Thus, as long as the children are made aware that they are looking at/handling replicas or fakes, then these objects have their own appeal and can be used to good effect in the creation of constructive meaning making during sessions such as Stone Age to Iron Age at the PRM.

**Pitt Rivers Museum: Stone Age to Iron Age**

The PRM Stone Age to Iron Age session is exemplary in many ways (see Appendix 4 for session outline). Unfortunately all the bookings seem to be for the autumn term, so I was unable to observe this session while on placement over the summer. Developed as a direct result of the inclusion of prehistory on the primary curriculum, it packs in the most extraordinary amount of information and activity into a really quite short space of time. Unlike other sessions at the PRM it relies almost entirely on reproduction handling objects. It has
proved extremely popular – in July 2016 there were already sixteen sessions booked for the autumn term.

Developing the session has not been straightforward however. As discussed above, the availability of archaeological material in the cases that can be used to illustrate the Stone Age to Iron Age is currently severely limited. Although this will change when the new cases open, the fact that the objects represent World Archaeology means that many of the artefacts on display still will not reliably reflect the Changes in Stone Age to Iron Age in Britain specified by the curriculum. In conversation (14.07.16) Professor Dan Hicks, Curator of Archaeology at the PRM, emphasised the cross-cultural nature of the cases feeling it to be a good reflection of our society today. Once the cases are unveiled it may be that the Stone Age to Iron Age session can be tailored to take this is into account. People during the distant past traded, moved and migrated as much as people now (albeit on a smaller scale) and this could be used to introduce a really interesting cross-curricular element into the presentation. However, there is so much information already contained within the session that it is hard to see how this could be done without taking away from what is already in place, and many schools seem to be relying heavily on the workshop to provide basic information about changes in the Stone Age to Iron Age, not just for their pupils but for the teachers as well. (McVean, R. interview 13.07.16).

When interviewed, Becca McVean, the Primary Education Officer for the PRM, explained that young children trying to grapple with the concept of a distant past can get confused when more recent artefacts are used to illustrate what might have been, and that they are unable to distinguish between ancient (albeit in reproduction form) artefacts and those used by more contemporary societies who happen to be at a technologically similar level to our prehistoric ancestors. One or two more contemporary objects, such as a leopard’s claw bracelet and thorn fishing hooks, are used to illustrate certain aspects, but, by and large, the handling items and
the objects searched for in the cases are originals, or replicas, representing the eras under consideration. Ethnographic comparisons are touched upon at the end of the session but not explored in any depth, thereby minimizing any confusion. While I completely appreciate the need to avoid confusion, I do wonder if there isn’t a way of using the ethnographic collection to advantage – as a means of really bringing the subject to life. If the session is to tie in with the new World Archaeology displays in the future, then perhaps one way of doing this would be through the ethnographic collection, using it to illustrate both how the past might have been, and to open discussion about our multi-cultural present. That being said, all other PRM educational sessions are firmly based on the ethnographic collection, so there are plenty of other opportunities for schools to learn about them and enjoy them.

Another possibility would be to work in closer collaboration with the Ashmolean Museum which has an outstanding archaeological collection and award-winning online resources. The schools in Oxford and its environs really are spoilt for choice, with several world class museums to visit. The problem with the different museums is that they are all in competition with one another, delivering sessions on the same topics, rather than working together and delivering key sessions that play to their own strengths. One solution might be to develop a two, or, if the Museum of Oxford joined in, even three centre session which plays to the strengths of all museums (*Ibid.*). In an email (Coleman, C. 18.08.16) Clare Coleman, Education Officer at the Ashmolean Museum noted that bookings for their Stone Age to Iron Age workshop went down from over 1,000 children in 2014/15 to 330 in 2015/16 once the PRM had launched their Stone Age to Iron Age session (although she was unable to say for certain that this was the reason for the drop in numbers), so perhaps a collaborative approach would work well for museums as well as for schools.
At the PRM the presentation focusses on the replica object handling sessions where children have to work out which objects come from which era – Mesolithic, Neolithic, Bronze or Iron Ages. Although the children do not dress up they are able to handle different objects and fabrics, which help them to consider the technological changes that distinguish the different Ages and the order in which they occurred. The opportunity to search the cases for relevant artefacts is a wonderful experience. In theory, the unveiling of the new VERVE World Archaeology cases should seriously enhance the second part of the session. However, as mentioned above, they will not be in use until next year, and come with their own challenges. Meanwhile, the other objects in the museum (particularly the shrunken heads) provide irresistible distractions and all contribute to a memorable experience, and hopefully to the desire in the children (and teachers) to return another time for a closer look.

In addition to new online resources already in development at PRM there are downloadable teachers’ notes with suggestions for pre and post-visit activities. These encourage children to consider the evidential remains from which we can learn about prehistory, including visible monuments and archaeologically recovered artefacts. Becca considers the Stone Age to Iron Age session to be a work in progress, but one that can be easily adapted for use in the classroom, which will certainly be of use to teachers in the future.
Case Study 2

The Rollright Stones

The King’s Men Stone Circle. (Photo: c. Hamish Fenton)

‘In the region of Oxfordshire there are great stones disposed as if by the hand of man. But at what time, or by what people, or for what memorial or significance this was done is not known. However that place is called Rollendrich by the local people.’ The Wonders of Britain, 14th Century.

The Whispering Knights portal dolmen tomb (early Neolithic, c. 4,000 -3,500 BC), the King’s Men stone circle (late Neolithic, c. 2,500-2,000 BC), and the outlying King Stone (probably the marker for a Bronze Age burial site c. 1,800-1,5000 BC) are a group of Neolithic and Bronze Age monuments which together comprise the Rollright Stones. Situated on the county border between Warwickshire and Oxfordshire, near the town of Chipping Norton, they are the most easterly group of such monuments in England. The heritage site has been looked after by the Rollright Trust since 1997, during which time huge improvements have been made to the physical upkeep of and access to the site. However, it remains remote in situation and, apart
from two small laybys in which to park, it has no facilities. The stones sit on the crest of a long ridge with stunning views in both directions and an almost permanent needling wind which makes it chilly in summer and perishing in winter.

With the introduction of prehistory onto the primary curriculum the Rollright Trust started to receive requests from local schools to visit the site. As a result, the issue of educational access, which had been discussed but not formally acted upon, has had to be confronted as a matter of some urgency. In many ways the site does not lend itself to large parties of visitors. The lack of basic facilities combines with the fact that there is a minor but extremely fast road that cuts the King Stone off from the rest of the site making health and safety a major consideration. There is currently no learning section on the website, although there is plenty of information available on it that could be adapted for school use.

As the Rollright Trust has no official learning officer, sessions to date have been organised and run by the Trust Chairman, George Lambrick, with occasional help from others. While this works effectively, it would not be possible to run sessions on a daily basis such as at Stonehenge for instance. Over the past two years there have been about 14 school visits, ranging in number from 12 children to 90. These are free but need to be booked in. They can be self-led, but most choose to have sessions led by George, who is well placed to talk about the site having excavated at the Rollright Stones in the 1980s. (Lambrick, G. 1988).

Sessions are tailored according to the number of children in the group, and the number of adults available to supervise, so adaptability on the part of schools and Trust is key. When 90 children came, the teachers had worked out a strict rotation and the whole operation was incredibly slick. The children were divided into three groups each of which went to a separate monument. The groups were then subdivided again as necessary while carrying out the activities, which were supervised by George and two others.
‘Since then I have found that there are a lot of ways of splitting and rotating groups or keeping them all together for part of the visit and splitting them for other bits, also being able to incorporate things that they bring to do. For example, the artwork that Shipston did was one of the site activities – they brought their art teacher with them with watercolours and other materials (plus gazebos in case it rained).’ (Lambrick, G. email 06.09.16).

In contrast, when another school came recently, there were just 12 pupils with 4 school staff and 2 Rollright representatives, so they toured the site as one group, managing to fit in a huge amount in the available time. As a small group supported by a very keen teacher they were open to experimentation, which included the children performing a version of the Witch of Rollright legend amongst the stones, and dressing up in sackcloth to represent stones in a circle they made using a rope to lay it out accurately.

![Image](image.png)

Dressing up as stones! (Photo: Helen Arnold)

There are many attested benefits to such outdoor learning. A recent report on Learning in the Natural Environment (LINE) confirmed the positive impact it can have on pupils:
Outdoor learning compliments the advantages gained from object handling such as those, discussed earlier, observed by Chaterjee and Noble (Chaterjee, H. and Noble, G. 2013). It also connects well with the GLOs, mentioned previously, with Skills, Knowledge and Understanding, Attitudes and Values, Behaviour and Progression, and Enjoyment, Inspiration and Creativity all being positively affected by the sort of outdoor learning accessible at sites such as Rollright.

The good thing about the set up at Rollright is that it is totally flexible, or as George describes it: ‘practical but with benefits.’ The different activities inform them about the prehistory of the site, while also providing many cross-curricular learning opportunities. George’s observation echoes an earlier point on how prehistory lends itself to constructivism:

‘Because there is no written evidence for prehistory, much ‘evidence’ is based on observation and theorising so imagining what people did and how is a genuinely important part of the process which children can engage in. When discussing the function of the Stone Circle it is quite interesting to see how what the children have recently been doing [as on-site activities] comes out as ideas of what it was for… most of which are pretty plausible!’ (Lambrick, G. email 06.09.16).

The Rollright Stones Primary School Activity Plan (Appendix 6) details several activities which are split between the three monuments (although the location sometimes varies depending on group size). The main activity at the King’s Men stone circle is counting the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enjoyment of lessons (95%)</th>
<th>Connection to nature (94%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social skills (93%)</td>
<td>Engagement with learning (92%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and wellbeing (92%)</td>
<td>Behaviour (85%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attainment (57%)</td>
<td>(Natural Connections Demonstrations Project, 2012-2016: Final Report. p.77)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
stones. It is supposed to be impossible to count the same number twice, a fact that has been proved by both children and adults (although when the children are told that anyone who gets the same number three times is granted a wish it has a noticeable effect on the outcome!). This is a great way to learn about counting and statistics, as well as getting lots of exercise running round the circle three times. ‘It’s not “can you count”, it’s “what counts” – there is no definitive answer.’ (Lambrick, G., conversation).

The other main activities are laying out a timeline and stone moving. The timeline is 60m long and is divided up into metre-long sections marked with black tape, each of which represents 100 years, with a piece of red tape marking every 500 years. Because it is so long the children get a very visual impression of how distant from now 6000 years ago is (which is when the Whispering Knights portal dolmen tomb was built). There are significant dates printed on laminated sheets which the children have to peg on to the correct section of the timeline. Most of these are to do with the monuments, but some represent other moments in British and World history. Teachers and children are invited to bring along their own significant dates (such as when their school was founded, dates relating to other subjects they have been studying, or family anniversaries) which help the children tie in other aspects of their lives with the Rollrights. Children can find this activity quite tricky, particularly when trying to count backwards once into BC dates, but they all get to have a go and really seem to enjoy the challenge.
Moving the stones is definitely the most popular activity at Rollright. A small stone (of the same type of oolitic limestone as the other Rollrights) is moved on a wooden sledge and rollers which have to be shifted from the rear to the front as the stone moves along. The stone and sledge are steered with wooden levers. Apart from being a bit of a health and safety nightmare, this exercise is excellent for encouraging teamwork. The stones are small but extremely heavy. The children are invited to try to move the stone on the sledge on their own, which is impossible. However, when they put the rollers underneath and work as a team, the stone moves along surprisingly swiftly. The pleasure the children get from this experience is palpable, and their recognition of the value of teamwork is obvious.
Lifting the sledge with levers so that the rollers can be slotted in underneath.
(Photo: Rollright Trust)

The King Stone session allows the introduction of the many and various legends that are attached to the Rollright Stones. *The Witch of Rollright*, mentioned earlier, is the best known of them, but there are many others, all of which could form the basis for literacy, drama or art projects, either on site or back at school. The legends are all referenced on the Rollright Trust website so can be easily accessed for either pre or post-visit classroom work.

Still from *The Witch of Rollright* animation. (Image: HK)

A comparison between an educational trip to the Rollright Stones and a higher-profile site such as Stonehenge shows that flexibility can bring its own rewards. Children can learn about
Changes from the Stone Age to the Iron Age at both sites. The well-constructed learning programme at Stonehenge, combined with the amazing facilities, including the museum and the new reproduction round houses, together with a really impressive replica object handling selection make it educationally well worthy of its World Heritage Site status. Nevertheless, at Rollright small is beautiful in many ways. The lower number of school visits means that each session can be tailored to suit the different schools’ circumstances and requirements. The smaller number of daily visitors means that the children generally have the run of the site and need not feel overwhelmed by the sheer number of other people. Thus if the school would like to do an art or drama project, as long as they supply the necessary equipment, it is not a problem – indeed it is encouraged. The children are able to engage with their local environment and (weather permitting to a certain extent) reap the many benefits that such outside learning can bring. The children’s enjoyment is reflected in the many entertaining thank you letters and copies of post-visit projects that the Trust is sent (Appendix 7).

There is always room for improvement, and work on a learning section of the Rollright website is essential. When staff are planning school trips it is so much easier if there is an online breakdown of what is available, together with suggestions for pre and post-visit activities, as at the Pitt Rivers Museum. It would also be useful to have a handling collection that could be brought along to site, representing the domestic items and tools that might have been used by the builders of the various Rollright monuments.

I suspect it would be unworkable, but it would be interesting to have an open trench on site where the children could try their hand at archaeological excavation, or other forms of experimental archaeology such as the stone moving. It would also be a good site at which to offer a more specific cross-curricular study day, concentrating on the local environment as much as on prehistory. In the long term, it would be helpful to introduce volunteer deliverers
so that the burden of taking sessions does not always fall on one person, and the site becomes generally more educationally accessible.

The King Stone by Sam Phillips. (Image: Rollright Trust)
CONCLUSIONS

This paper has explored some of the different ‘ways into the past’ that museums and heritage sites are developing for both for children and teachers to learn about Changes from the Stone Age to the Iron Age as a direct result of the inclusion of prehistory on the primary curriculum. It has tried to show how the programmes are being shaped by locality, size, and collection focus, as well as by teacher request. It has looked at archaeologists’ past efforts to get prehistory included in formal education, and examined some of the reasons why prehistory as a subject has so much learning potential, allowing teachers scope to expand projects across the curriculum, and to tap into many different aspects of learning. It has considered matters such as authenticity and the lives of children in prehistory. Increasingly, as sites of ‘social education’, museums and heritage sites are able to help in this multimodal process, ‘proposing to their visitors conceptions of a social and cultural kind: a curriculum of social education.’ (Kress, G. 2010, p.176). The paper has suggested that smaller sites and museums are able to tailor sessions to fit a school’s specific needs. It has looked more closely at the Pitt Rivers Museum in Oxford, and at the Rollright Stones in Oxfordshire, exploring their provision for learning about prehistory and proposing one or two possible directions for the future.

As well as ‘ways into the past’ some ‘ways into the future’ need to be considered for prehistory on the curriculum. How far should museums and heritage sites go to help to make Changes from the Stone Age to the Iron Age memorable, so that children do not forget it as soon as they move on to the next topic? It is even their responsibility? ‘Cultural organisations should not be expected to replace formal Cultural Education in schools. Arts educators should exist to augment and broaden the work of classroom teachers, rather than as a replacement.’ (Henley, D 2012, p.40). Certainly, encouraging a cross-curricular multimodal approach is one way of ensuring that prehistory is understood and remembered. As time goes by and teachers become
less reliant on museums and heritage educators to help them to learn about prehistory, the more
the educators will be able to develop their sessions into something that goes beyond
imparting/reinforcing the necessary Stone Age to Iron Age information.

The curriculum itself could be altered to explore ‘the possibility of a spiralling curriculum,
allowing the revisiting of the same topics with different emphasis as pupils develop their
schooling, and in longitudinal study with certain topic areas.’ (Heritage Alliance, 2013). This
would ensure that pupils moving into secondary school have a thorough grounding in historical
and prehistorical evidence based learning, which would stand them in very good stead when
considering other periods in history.

Another way forward would be to make the whole process of the archaeological recovery of
evidence more accessible. This would rely heavily on the willingness of archaeologists to
engage with local primary schools and to keep them involved and up to date with any
discoveries. A recent excavation at Must Farm near Whittlesey in Cambridgeshire has received
a great deal of media coverage with a whole television programme and many newspaper
columns devoted to this ‘British Pompeii’. Must Farm is a late Bronze Age site (c. 1000 BC)
consisting of several stilted roundhouses which collapsed into the river when fire swept through
them. The project’s ‘exploration of deeply buried deposits is transforming our understanding
of prehistoric life and revealing a level of preservation previously only dreamt about.’ (Must
Farm website). This is no idle boast. The discoveries made here will completely change the
way Bronze Age Britain is understood – from its domestic life to its international trade.

What is really exciting about this site and its potential impact on prehistory learning has been
the way in which the project has used social media to explain and publicise its finds. The Must
Farm education officer was unavailable for comment, but Site Diary 41: An Update on our
Outreach gives a clear picture of their learning intentions and results. As well as showing
round over 2000 visitors, ‘we were also keen to get as many children [as possible] to see the excavation and ran a number of successful school days, where we have helped show hundreds of young people some fantastic Bronze Age artefacts and archaeology.’ (Must Farm site diary 07.08.16). They released a sustained flow of information on Twitter and Facebook, and wrote detailed site diaries explaining the finds on a weekly basis. Most importantly, they intend to continue with this coverage, albeit at a lower level, during post excavation work, which may well last for some years.

This use of digital media has huge classroom potential. It is not possible to say whether any special connections were made with local schools which they intend to pursue, but this is a fantastic opportunity to involve children with the process of archaeology from start to finish. Obviously Must Farm is an exceptional site, but there is no reason why other excavations should not follow the same process, digitally and physically engaging with the schools in their locality. While I am not so deluded as to think archaeological excavations would have quite the same impact, I have in mind something akin to astronaut Tim Peake’s communications to schools around the country while he was up in space, which were hugely informative, influential, and most importantly avidly followed by thousands of children. On a much smaller scale, this idea of dissemination of information and engagement with children would make a
real difference to the way in which they think about prehistory, and how they will be able to integrate it with their learning as they grow. It might also be that such excavations could work productively in partnership with museums and heritage sites, using their facilities for talks and presentations, and building on the Changes from the Stone Age to the Iron Age provision already in place.
APPENDIX 1

Extracts from the Department of Education History programmes of study pertaining to Prehistory

History programmes of study: Key stages 1 and 2

National curriculum in England

Purpose of study

A high-quality history education will help pupils gain a coherent knowledge and understanding of Britain’s past and that of the wider world. It should inspire pupils’ curiosity to know more about the past. Teaching should equip pupils to ask perceptive questions, think critically, weigh evidence, sift arguments, and develop perspective and judgement. History helps pupils to understand the complexity of people’s lives, the process of change, the diversity of societies and relationships between different groups, as well as their own identity and the challenges of their time.

Aims

The national curriculum for history aims to ensure that all pupils:

- know and understand the history of these islands as a coherent, chronological narrative, from the earliest times to the present day: how people’s lives have shaped this nation and how Britain has influenced and been influenced by the wider world
- know and understand significant aspects of the history of the wider world: the nature of ancient civilisations; the expansion and dissolution of empires; characteristic features of past non-European societies; achievements and follies of mankind
- gain and deploy a historically grounded understanding of abstract terms such as ‘empire’ ‘civilisation’, ‘parliament’ and ‘peasantry’
- understand historical concepts such as continuity and change, cause and consequence, similarity, difference and significance, and use them to make connections, draw contrasts, analyse trends, frame historically valid questions
• and create their own structured accounts, including written narratives and analyses
• understand the methods of historical enquiry, including how evidence is used rigorously to make historical claims, and discern how and why contrasting arguments and interpretations of the past have been constructed
• gain historical perspective by placing their growing knowledge into different contexts, understanding the connections between local, regional, national and international history; between cultural, economic, military, political, religious and social history; and between short- and long-term timescales.

Attainment targets

By the end of each key stage, pupils are expected to know, apply and understand the matters, skills and processes specified in the relevant programme of study.

... 

Key stage 2

Pupils should continue to develop a chronologically secure knowledge and understanding of British, local and world history, establishing clear narratives within and across the periods they study. They should note connections, contrasts and trends over time and develop the appropriate use of historical terms. They should regularly address and sometimes devise historically valid questions about change, cause, similarity and difference, and significance. They should construct informed responses that involve thoughtful selection and organisation of relevant historical information. They should understand how our knowledge of the past is constructed from a range of sources.

In planning to ensure the progression described above through teaching the British, local and world history outlined below, teachers should combine overview and depth studies to help pupils understand both the long arc of development and the complexity of specific aspects of the content.

Pupils should be taught about:

• changes in Britain from the Stone Age to the Iron Age

Examples (non-statutory): these could include

• late Neolithic hunter-gatherers and early farmers, for example, Skara Brae
• Bronze Age religion, technology and travel, for example, Stonehenge
• Iron Age hill forts: tribal kingdoms, farming, art and culture

Department of Education 2013
APPENDIX 2

Duxford Primary School Archaeology Club 1980

Outline and development of one year’s Club’s activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>OBJECTIVES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observation</td>
<td>Accurate observation and recording</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mystery objects: what are they? (Look for clues)</td>
<td>Interpreting clues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memory testing (after various objects have been observed)</td>
<td>Evaluating evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classification: sorting random objects – e.g. manmade/natural building materials/metal, glass/pottery/bone/shell/stone etc.</td>
<td>Making considered judgements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dating: how can objects be dated? (fabric/form/fashion/function)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiments to show effect on metals of water/earth/acids etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do objects become buried?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local studies: surveys of houses (windows, roofs, chimneys etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building materials used locally.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How can buildings be dated?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information (concerning materials and technology)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classification of human technological advances: eg stone, copper, bronze, iron, steel, plastic</td>
<td>As above + use of measuring skills, drawing of plans, elevations etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visits to museums helpful</td>
<td>To increase knowledge of historical background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timechart can be made to scale to show the relatively rapid advancements made by humans once technological skills developed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiments: using flint flakes for carving wood and chalk or scraping animal skins: animal fat lamps, spinning wool, weaving</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children use reference books as and where necessary’ Local ‘experts’ to help if possible eg thatcher, potter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looking for evidence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remains – standing/buried</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Observation activities on local standing**  
remains of past human activity, eg churches 
Slides, eg Roman walls, mosaics, roads etc  
Buried remains (no digging!)  
How do objects become buried?  
How do they reappear eg ploughing  
Experiments to find out how different materials react to water/acids/earth etc over a period of time  
Visit a site to show ‘levels’ of past  
Field walking (with owners’ permission) …  
Use local maps, plans, study roads, position of mills, manor houses, woods, tumuli, churches, fields  
Study street names, try to find origins, past buildings etc in locality  
Look at aerial photos of the area | **Specific topics can be studied, eg:** **Homes, Observation**  
Building materials  
List modern building materials  
Visit site to see new development  
Visit older house – compare fabrics, techniques, foundations  
Sort building materials (composition, obtainability, durability)  
Building design  
Window shapes, door shapes, roof shapes, chimneys, walls, extensions  
Village or street survey: trying to date buildings. Local plan is necessary. Simplified recording systems is also necessary  
Experiments: to find out how postholes are made. Also hutbuilding (large or model size)  
Fieldwalking (see previous section)  
Museum visit to archaeological and anthropological sections. Grass huts, log cabins, igloos etc all show human adaptability and use of the environment  
Visit to see ‘foundations of the past’  
Slides – prehistoric, Roman, medieval and later (buildings/excavations)  
Model making: to scale if possible  
Questions to be asked eg **Will rain dissolve the walls? Where did the animals sleep?**  
**Where was the cooking done?**  
Answered practically as far as possible |  
**Accurate observation and recording**  
**Interpreting clues**  
**Evaluation evidence**  
**Making considered judgements**  
**Develops manual as well as thinking skills**  
Council for British Archaeology (1982, p.14)
APPENDIX 3

Four timelines from *Schools Prehistory and Archaeology* website

1. From the earliest signs of human activity in Britain (around 800,000 years ago) showing clearly for just how long the Palaeolithic lasted in comparison with subsequent eras.
2. From the Upper Palaeolithic (around 50,000 years ago)
3. From the end of the last Ice Age (around 12,000 years ago)
4. From the introduction of farming to Britain (around 6,000 years ago)
I wouldn’t go so far as to say that there is an abundance of contemporary literature to help teachers explain the Stone Age to Iron Age, but there are some wonderful books around and it is worth mentioning just a few here.

*Stone Age Bone Age!* by Mick Manning and Brita Granstrom is a fantastic introduction to our ancient ancestors. It emphasises over and over again just how resourceful and inventive Mesolithic man had to be in order to survive and progress: ‘Stone Age! Bone Age! What a clever age!’ (Manning, M. and Granstrom, B. 1999). Publisher added notes make suggestions for classroom or home-based activities and show how the story can tie into various parts of the curriculum.
In a similar vein, Satoshi Kitamura’s *Stone Age Boy* tells the story of a boy who goes back in time to the Mesolithic and learns how people survived and how tough life was: ‘I had a go, but it was very difficult.’ (Kitamura, S. 2007). The book’s end pieces show drawings of Mesolithic animals and a useful timeline is also included.

For older children the *Wolf Brother* series by Michel Paver is really excellent – the stories are exciting and gripping, and the lifestyle described is as authentic as it is possible to be when describing a long-past era. The Chiltern Open Air Museum runs a workshop based on these books which is hugely popular, particularly with Y5/6 children. (Biddulph, K. interview).
To examine the shift from a hunter-gatherer society to farming
To explore changing technology through the late Stone, Bronze and Iron Ages (tools and food production)
To find out what the everyday challenges of life were for people from this period

Preparation
Stickers on Upper Gallery cases for the trail
Tables set up

Objects on four tables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mesolithic</th>
<th>Neolithic</th>
<th>Bronze Age</th>
<th>Iron Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flint blades</td>
<td>Flint leaf arrowheads</td>
<td>Flint barbed &amp; tanged arrowheads</td>
<td>Iron knife</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>microliths</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flint pick</td>
<td>Flint axehead</td>
<td>Bronze axehead</td>
<td>Iron axehead</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reindeer skin</td>
<td>Sheepskin</td>
<td>Woollen cloth</td>
<td>Woollen checked cloth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bear claw pendant</td>
<td>Jet/shale beads</td>
<td>Amber beads</td>
<td>Glass beads</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leather bag</td>
<td>Pot</td>
<td>Ceramic beaker</td>
<td>Ceramic bowl</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire bow</td>
<td>Flint and pyrite</td>
<td>Ember pouch</td>
<td>Flint and steel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazelnuts</td>
<td>Wheat</td>
<td>Beans</td>
<td>Fat hen seeds (like black quinoa)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Timing | Activity | Resources |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15 mins</td>
<td>Introduction. Welcome pupils to the Museum and introduce the OUMNH as a place of natural objects and the PRM as a place of man-made objects. Ask questions to gauge the level of knowledge. Ask 3 adults to hold up the timeline at the front of the group and look at it together. Show pupils where we are now (mobile phone icon). Indicate where the Year 0 is on the timeline. Explain that we call the period before the Romans arrived prehistory – before there were written records. This means that if we</td>
<td>Time line</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
want to find out about what it was like during this time we have to look at the objects and archaeological sites.

This timeline starts with the Mesolithic – the Middle Stone Age. We call the period before the Mesolithic, the Palaeolithic – the Old Stone Age. This is when people lived in caves and cave paintings have been found (Lascaux – 17,000 BC). The Mesolithic period is similar to the Palaeolithic – it started after the end of the Ice Age, around 12,000 years ago, and people lived in caves. How do you think people got food? (See timeline picture of hunter). Can you see the green line? That is when Britain got cut off from the Continent and was made into an island after sea levels rose from the melting ice.

Then in about 4000 BC the Neolithic started – the New Stone Age. What do you think they were eating? (Note timeline picture of a crop). If you are farming the lad, what else might you keep in fields? The idea of farming was brought from the Continent, along with sheep and wheat, which were originally domesticated in the Near East (Jordan/Syria area). If you have sheep, what materials do you have available to you? (Wool – you can make clothes out of wool).

Next we get the Bronze Age and the discovery of metal. The first metal to be discovered was copper – imagine the people heating up the ore and discovering you could produce this lovely bright coloured material. It must have seemed like magic. At first we think it was workshopped but then people discover you could make things out of it. They discovered if you added tin to the copper you could make the stronger metal of bronze (copper mines in Ireland and Wales, tin mines in Devon and Cornwall)). Bronze is a lovely glowing orange colour (Need this clue if pupils haven’t covered the Metal Ages at all).

Next there was the discovery of iron which was even stronger than bronze (also sharper edge than bronze and stays sharper for longer). It could make better tools and farm equipment, so more land could be farmed producing more food which could support more people – hence you get population growth. (Iron ore was more common than copper or tin so it was easier to find – but the metal itself was harder to extract and needed hotter temperatures. Whilst bronze could be cast into shapes, they initially only knew how to beat iron into shape.)

Was everything made of bronze and iron? No – but they were the materials used predominantly for tools and the
Three Age System of Stone, Bronze and Iron essentially tells us how technology changed.

| 35 mins | Introduce the four tables set up with objects from one of the time periods on the timeline, i.e. one is Mesolithic, one is Neolithic, one is Bronze Age and one is Iron Age. Explain that they have to work out which time period each set of objects belongs to. Explain that when a group gets a table they need to match the labels to the objects. They then need to look at the materials on the table and consider what time period they belong to. They must place their voting card in the brown envelope without having a sneaky peek to see how everyone has voted. When the bell is rung they need to put their labels back in a pile, pick up their wallet of remaining voting cards and move onto the next table (demo direction of movement). Talk about how to handle objects - for example, the pots can be touched but need to stay on their stands. Ask teacher to divide group into 4 equal groups. Try to allocate an adult per group and ask them to move round with the group. Give each group about 4 minutes at a table – you could go round demonstrating how to use the fire bow.

Gather group back in front of you. Do a dramatic drum roll to reveal how people have voted – go through tables in chronological order. Explain what key object denotes the period, i.e. reindeer skin for Mesolithic, sheepskin (farming) for Neolithic, bronze axehead for Bronze Age and iron axehead for Iron Age.

Explain that they are going to be part of prehistoric timeline. Each group will be bringing up the objects from the table they were last stationed at. Explain yo will pass them an object and then they will need to stand in front of the timeline. Call the first group over to the Mesolithic table and and each puil an object. Position them in front of the Mesolithic section.

**Mesolithic**

Use of animal skins – early Mesolithic, quite cold, still have reindeer.

Microliths – used to make a composite tool. Put 5-6 blades along a shaft of wood to make a tool, e.g. a saw. For an arrow might have 1 microlith pointing forwards and 2 pointing back. (Microliths appear in Britain after landbridge to Europe is flooded – an insular tradition.) Attach with tree resin mixed with ash and beeswax to stick in.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flint pick</td>
<td>– maybe for digging eg putting wooden posts up or digging pits to put rubbish in in a ritual way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bear claw</td>
<td>– in this time period a lot of jewellery is pierced animal teeth/claws.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire-bow</td>
<td>– no evidence bow was used here – anthropological deduction from Native American tribes and Indonesia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooking pot</td>
<td>– how do you think this might work? If put flames under the bag it would burn… They put water in the bag and placed hot stones wrapped in something to heat up the water, and kept on replacing the stones with more hot stones. In this way you can cook food and digest it more easily than if it is raw – this enables you to gain more energy from it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazelnuts</td>
<td>– hunter/gatherer society (at Mesolithic sites evidence found of charred hazelnuts and red deer bones).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neolithic</td>
<td>Sheepskin – can make clothes out of wool. (Keep domesticated animals but not systematised farming yet).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flint leaf arrowhead</td>
<td>(not a technological advance, just fashion).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flint axehead</td>
<td>– ground and polished using sandstone or sand and water (did use stone apart from flint e.g. granite form Cornwall). What do you use an axe for? – chopping down trees. Stone axes were tied on with sinew or rawhide which shrinks as it dries and keeps the axehead on tightly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jet</td>
<td>– fossilised wood – washed up on beaches of eastern England. Fancy necklaces have been found in Neolithic burial mounds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flint and pyrite</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round bottomed pots</td>
<td>Pottery was introduced in the Neolithic. How was pottery made? – shaping clay and baking in fire. What is pottery good for? – storing things, cooking in. It’s not good to carry around – heavy and breakable. What does that tell you about the Neolithic people? – they settled down and didn’t move around like the hunters in the Mesolithic. They didn’t eat off table! Had pots nestling on the ground. (Pottery invented in the Near East again – linked to farming. First pottery fired in bonfires so fragile.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheat</td>
<td>Wheat – wheat and barley were introduced as two main crops.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Bronze Age**
Woollen cloth – evidence of spinning wool into yarn. Barbed and tanged arrowheads.
Bronze axehead. The bronze is poured into a mould and made into a hollow axe which then goes over a handle. There’s no need to tie it on as it fits tighter and tighter onto the handle each time you use it.
Amber necklace – fossilised tree resin, hence why get insects stuck in it. In the Bronze Age people liked things which were yellow/orange and shiny. Possible link with sun worship. People started to make things from gold. (In Neolithic it would be ancestor worship – have communal tombs, take bones from tomb into house).
 Ember pouch – could be used in any of these time periods. Shows how precious fire is.
Beaker - Continental fashion for drinking beer, used in feasts. Flat bottom indicates use of tables.
Beans – bean and pea revolution so get lots more calories.

**Iron Age**
Checked woollen cloth – checked cloth famous across Roman Empire.
Iron knife.
Iron adze. The iron axehead is hafted through a wooden handle and then tied on.
Glass beads – late Iron Age people made glass beads. (Used in Greece and Egypt before finally getting to Britain. Roman influence felt in late Iron Age – Gallic wars during 50s BC. Lots of chiefs’ sons trying to be Roman as it is fashionable.
Flint and steel.
Large pot.
Fat hen seeds – more variety introduced as farming develops.

---

20 mins Introduce the trail by talking about sources of evidence.
*Show the group the bronze axehead. If this was buried in the ground ad dug up 3,000 years later, which parts would be most likely to survive? – the metal. This means that many of the objects which we have from these periods are incomplete. When you look at the weapons and tools upstairs, the handles are often missing as they were made from materials such as wood which rot easily.
There are three conditions under which something might survive:
*If it was kept very dry
*If it was kept very cold (e.g. in ice)*

---

Gallery Hunt – one for each pair. Yellow stars Arrows and numbers on cases on the Upper Gallery Pencils
If it was in a waterlogged area

We want you to track down these weapons, tools and traps from the Stone, Bronze and Iron Ages which you can find on the top floor. Look for the yellow stars stuck on the cases. This means there is an object on your sheet you need to find. Tick it off or draw it. There are 9 stars to find – so 9 objects. Make sure you walk and stay in your pairs. When you hear the bell then you need to come back to the entrance door of the Upper Gallery. (How do we know about the other stuff? Not very much has been preserved through b being waterlogged, surprisingly, in Britain. So there is another source of evidence. Archaeologists sometimes look at more recent societies in different parts of the world that have the same level of technology as people in prehistory – it’s called ethnography. When westerners first came across people who lived in North America, for instance, they were a Stone Age society. So the bow drill has not been found on any British archaeological site, but it is known from North America and it is thought people in British prehistory might have used it.)

5 mins

Feedback on how they got on with Gallery Hunt sheet. Hold up the thorn fish hooks.
What do you think this object is? What is it made from? (Bramble thorn, nettle cord, wood)
Could have come from any period in prehistory but it is unlikely to have survived unless in a waterlogged area. The interesting things is that people were using fishing lines like this in England only 100 years ago – we have one like this on display from 1900.
People in prehistory were just like us, with the same needs. They needed to have places to live, food to eat, things to wear, but they also wanted to look good and be important. What else would they have needed? E.g. to entertain themselves, to get rid of disease, to get around (mention some of the objects that relate to these themes e.g. knucklebones, trepanned skulls, boats). Invite children to look around again to find some of these or to look up the evidence for these in prehistory back at school.
APPENDIX 6

ROLLRIGHT TRUST
PRIMARY SCHOOL ACTIVITY PLAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>location and topic</th>
<th>Prepare/ Explain/ Show</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Discuss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Kings Men: Introduction**  
*10-15 mins*  
**Topic:** Provide an overview of the whole site highlighting key issues | Three monuments –  
Different ages across Neolithic and Bronze Age  
Span 2000 years (3500-1500 BC)  
Different functions  
Remains around the Stones  
Mostly not visible above ground  
Span most periods – Mesolithic, Neolithic, Bronze Age, Iron Age, Roman, Saxon, Medieval, Modern  
How people’s understanding changes  
Medieval ‘Wonder of Britain’  
Legends and Names of Stones  
First Antiquaries and Danes  
Stukeley and idea of Druids  
Idea of Stone Bronze & Iron Ages  
Modern archaeology  
Science – eg radiocarbon dating, geophysics | Children walk round the stone circle in pairs or small groups to examine  
Character of the stones (shapes and surfaces)  
Plants growing on the stones  
Anything hidden in holes & cracks  
Any evidence of shaping/carving?  
Size of the stones  
Shape of the ring  
Spacing of the stones  
Any especially prominent stones?  
Was there a special entrance? | Ask children to comment on what they’ve observed and ask questions (using adjacent points as prompts if necessary) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>location and topic</th>
<th>Prepare/ Explain/ Show</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Discuss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Kings Men: Counting**  
*15-20 mins*  
*Topic: Counting the Stones in the circle is NOT easy even for grown ups (we don’t know how many there are!)*  
Children find this tricky and will come up with widely differing numbers… | The legend says that if you count them and get the same number on three tries have any wish you like….  
One legend says a baker put buns on the stones so he could collect them up and count them – but every time he did some had gone missing  
Another story says a large stone was taken to make a bridge – it took 24 horses to drag it down the hill and two men were killed on the way; when they got the stone over the stream it flipped back – twice! – then the crops failed and they decided the stone was cursed and they should take it back – it only took one horse to drag it back up the hill….!  
There are real issues about how many stones there are; even more how many there might once have been… | Children walk round the stone circle in pairs counting them – and report number to teacher.  
When all done teacher gives top and bottom numbers and where most fall – whether any numbers were reported by more than 5 pairs | Why are the answers different?  
Not that the children can’t count but it is actually very difficult: some are hidden; some are only just poking out of the grass; some are much smaller than others. So it is difficult to know exactly which stones should be counted!! small stones should be counted  
The Rollright Trust who own the site don’t know either!! |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>location and topic</th>
<th>Prepare/ Explain/ Show</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Discuss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kings Men:</strong> Purpose</td>
<td>The Stone Circle is thought to have been was where people gathered for a variety of community activities several thousand years ago Design Part of cluster of monuments Concentration of artefacts in fields next to the Stones Roman pottery from excavation Modern finds But there are other ideas – burying dead people, coralling animals, even that it was once roofed to make a big building… Think about how this might compare with what people do today Do you think we could look for things that might have been left behind that would show what it was used for?</td>
<td>Children discuss amongst themselves what the circle might have been used for in groups of c. 5 for 2-3 mins</td>
<td>How many people would fit inside the circle for gatherings? What sort of activity have you been to where people gather? – eg Personal celebrations Religious services Sport Art exhibitions Learning What places do people use today? Churches, synagogues, mosques etc Football grounds Cinemas &amp; theatres Museums and art galleries Village halls, town halls… Schools! What might have been important then? How do you think people might use the Stone Circle now?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kings Men:</strong> Purpose</td>
<td>What was the Stone Circle for? - Children may have different ideas like coralling animals etc. Why do people do things communally?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>location and topic</strong></td>
<td><strong>Prepare/ Explain/ Show</strong></td>
<td><strong>Activity</strong></td>
<td><strong>Discuss</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kings Men: Design</strong></td>
<td>The stone circle is both incomplete and with fallen stones as recorded in the 1670s put back in the wrong place in a restoration of c. 1880. We believe the Stone circle is a design from N England and once was a continuous wall of almost touching stones with a narrow entrance opposite the tallest stone.</td>
<td>Ask children and teachers to walk into the circle through the entrance and stand side-by-side in all the gaps. More in widest gaps only one in narrowest. Teachers either side of tallest stone. Children in other gaps but NOT entrance.</td>
<td>What difference does it make to how the space was enclosed? Does the gradation of sizes work to focus attention on the tallest stone? Would it have meant it was much clearer where people came in and where ceremonies took place?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*10-15 mins*

*Topic:*

What was the original form of the ring? Does it have particular design features that tell us who built it or how it was used?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>location and topic</th>
<th>Prepare/ Explain/ Show</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Discuss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Kings Men: Timeline**  
20 mins  
Topic: It is a REAL challenge for children to understand deep time back to the Stone Age (as it is for adults)....  
Our timeline is intended to help people grasp through physical experience how long ago the Stones were built relative to other events | *Pre-visit:* Ask children to discover when their grandparents were born (and *their* parents)? - This provides a more personal context for thinking about past time  
Explain how timeline works:  
Rope across the circle represents its age  
Labels attached with clothes pegs at millennia and half millennia (marked by red and black tape on the rope)  
Labels and pictures of the Stones, other local history, national and world history can be added  
By walking through it a better sense of chronological timescales is obtained | Add labels to time line in correct places (with help) relative to millennia and half-millennia  
One child and one adult each stand at the point where their great grandparent was born  
Children pace out ‘granspans’ – how many back to:  
Beginning of Great War (1914)  
Queen Elizabeth I  
Norman Conquest 1066  
Rollright Saxon cemetery  
Rollright Roman settlement  
Rollright Iron Age settlement  
Rollright King Stone  
Rollright King’s Men  
Rollright Whispering Knights  
Rollright Mesolithic… | What do children think about how long ago things happened  
How long was the Stone Age compared with time since then?  
What was the relative time span of the Old Middle and New Stone Ages (palaeo-meso-neo-lithic)  
When were the first “civilisations” – with cities central rule etc – like Mesopotamia, Egypt, Indus, South and Central Americas relative to British Neolithic and Bronze Age  
How does the span of time covered by the Stones compare with time since the Romans?  
How many ‘granspans’ back to different events? |
| **Walking out to the Whispering Knights**  
c. 10mins  
Topic: Need for break from formal learning!!! | Explain where group is going and to walk in an orderly manner… | Walking together and chatting | Informal conversations between children and with teachers |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location and topic</th>
<th>Prepare/ Explain/ Show</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Discuss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Whispering Knights</strong>&lt;br&gt;c. 5-10mins&lt;br&gt;<strong>Topic:</strong> What was the Whispering Knights for? How did people bury the dead in ancient times?</td>
<td>The Whispering Knights is the earliest of the monuments at c. 3500 BC. It is a ‘portal’ tomb with its symbolic doorway facing downhill. No-one has excavated inside the chamber, but it is thought that it would was used to dispose of the dead after their remains had been reduced to skeletons – or were rearranged when they had decomposed… Excavated chambers of this period have bones of several people clustered (eg skulls put together in one part of the tomb).</td>
<td>Examine the chamber – is it complete or are some stones missing? Consider whether the ‘portal’ doorway have opened? Think about what it would have looked like with the cap stone on top.</td>
<td>How would you have got in to bury anyone? Do we usually bury people individually or mixed with others? Why might people’s bones be mixed up rather than buried individually? Eg was social identity and connection with ancestors more important than individual identity? Was it designed to impress people and look important? If so how? Why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Whispering Knights</strong>&lt;br&gt;c. 5-10mins&lt;br&gt;<strong>Topic:</strong> What was ancient engineering like?</td>
<td>Where did the stones come from? How were they transported? How were they erected? No wheels and no metal… BUT Levers Sledges or Rollers Ropes made of wild plants or gut Levers made of wood Antlers to use as digging picks Cattle scapula as little shovels Baskets for moving earth</td>
<td>Examine the stones and think about how big they are Consider how the size of the Whispering Knights stones compares with the King’s Men Think about trying to move the stones when they were lying on the ground.</td>
<td>How many people do you think it took to move the biggest stone Do you think it was quite an achievement to erect the stones and put one on top? Was that deliberate to say this is an important place worth the effort? If you were building the Whispering Knights today what sort of equipment would you use?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>location and topic</td>
<td>Prepare/ Explain/ Show</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Discuss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking to the King Stone back via the Stone Circle c. 15mins</td>
<td>Stop at gateway at top of field before getting to Stone Circle How was the countryside different from what it is like today? What was the same? Most field boundaries 19th century – 2-3 paces along timeline Copses by Stone circle 1930s – 1 pace along timeline How do we know? Soils preserved under monuments Snails who like it shady or open Charcoal and charred cereal Pollen from valley peat deposits Bones of wild animals Historical maps and documents</td>
<td>Ask Children to suggest ideas about whether the following were the same or different: Shape if the land (hills &amp; valleys) Fields &amp; woods (overall landcover) Hedges Copses by Stone circle Crops growing in the field</td>
<td>What was the same? - topography What was different? – everything else may have been forest with clearings? Crops – wheat and barley were grown but not same varieties; oilseed rape not grown What would it have been like before forest was cleared? Could you see the Whispering Knights from the King’s Men?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location and Topic</td>
<td>Prepare/ Explain/ Show</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Discuss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close to King’s Men</td>
<td>Two small stones are available to move with either rollers or sledges (both methods are viable and can be tested)</td>
<td>Children with help of teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>location and topic</strong></td>
<td><strong>Prepare/ Explain/ Show</strong></td>
<td><strong>Activity</strong></td>
<td><strong>Discuss</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>King Stone</strong> 5-10 mins</td>
<td>The King Stone is a single standing stone monolith (all the other stones are recently taken off the fields or quarry and left for people to sit on). There were Bronze Age barrows nearby with human cremations – some marked by wooden posts. There have been lots of theories about why it was erected. Astronomical outlier of Kings Men (but not aligned on sun or moon). Part of an otherwise lost avenue of stones leading to the Kings Men. Guide post for people to find the Kings Men. Part of a ‘porthole’ entrance to a burial chamber in a long barrow. A permanent memorial to mark a Bronze Age cemetery.</td>
<td>Examine the King Stone and surrounding area and consider which idea seems best.</td>
<td>Which idea seems best? Why might some ideas not be very good? Astronomy doesn’t line up with anything significant. There is no other indication of an avenue. The Kings Stone’s position isn’t very prominent to act as a guide post. The hollow that was thought to be half a ‘porthole’ entrance to a chamber is the result of souvenir hunters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>King Stone</strong> 5-10 mins</td>
<td>The King Stone is thought to mark a Bronze Age cemetery in which bodies were cremated (including children). One was marked by a wooden post. Another cremation was in a little cavern made in the rock at the bottom of a hole in which a large post like a railway sleeper was set upright. The cremated remains of a child were buried in a small upturned urn at the base of the post. They were radiocarbon dated to c.1800 BC.</td>
<td>Think about what happens to people when they die – Consider how these burials compare with the way we think the Whispering Knights tomb was used.</td>
<td>How did burial customs change? How do we dispose of the dead now? Burial Cremation How do we commemorate dead people? Gravestones Personal memorials and plaques War memorials etc Places named after people (eg football stadia, village halls, theatres).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>location and topic</td>
<td>Prepare/ Explain/ Show</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Discuss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>King Stone</strong></td>
<td>The shape of the King Stone as compared with antiquarian drawings shows that between 1805 and the end of the 19th century a large hollow was made in its side as a result of people knocking bits off. The only protection was the myths and legends about the dreadful things that would happen if you messed about with the Stones. Taking bits of standing stones was common and was one of the reasons why a laws to protect ancient sites were passed in 1882. The Rollright Stones were included in the Schedule of the new Act and were put into state care in the following years. Railings and notices were erected to stop people damaging them – and for some time the Kings Stone had an upper tier of railings… (The railings themselves are so historic that they are now protected as well!).</td>
<td>Examine stone in comparison with illustration Examine and note the form of railings (‘unclimbable’) and holes for upper tier</td>
<td>Why should we protect ancient sites? Do you think people still damage the stones? What do you think of the railings – are they useful or just an historical curiosity?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>King Stone OR Coach going home</strong></td>
<td>Remind children what they did</td>
<td>Children think about what they saw</td>
<td>Which aspects most struck them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>c.5 mins</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Topic:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are key things learnt?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dear Mr Lambrick

Thank you so much for teaching us about the history of the Rollright Stones. I enjoyed it SO much that I will remember it for my whole life!

My favourite part was (most definatly) the stone moving because I learnt how people my age could move such heavy stones realy easily.

When we got back to school we ate our lunch and then made clay modles of what we would look like if we were ternel to stone so we could make our own stone circle ...

Over the week we have been making leaflets about the Rollright Stones because we would recommend a day out there to everyone. I have enclosed a copy of my leaflet for you to read.

Yours sincerely

Jake M.
There are many other stories about the mass, massive and ancient, including that it is bad luck to remove one of the mysterious and ancient stones.

The myth of the stones is that a king wanted to rule all England, so he summoned 7 witches and gave each of them a stone that was said to be lying on the other 2 stones.

If you can see long, Compson will become king of all England. So he became king, and the general rose up and arrested him.

The King Stone was the monument of one of the three Earthly Kings. It is a great burial cairn, containing human remains, including 6 children's remains. Because of the damage, 2 layers of metal gates were built to protect it from people chiseling away at it. Why not climb the hill, finish, and discover the amazing, adenable views over the tiny town of the long Common?
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