

Teaching History: innovation and continuity since Rafael Altamira

La enseñanza de la Historia: innovación y continuidad desde Rafael Altamira

Olga DUARTE PIÑA, PhD. Lecturer. Universidad de Sevilla (oduarte@us.es).

Abstract:

The teaching of History (methodology, projects, materials), has undergone many changes from Rafael Altamira's research over the end of the nineteenth century and first third of the twentieth century through to research by innovation groups comprising teachers in the last third of the twentieth century.

This paper shows the changes and continuities in history teaching models, as well as coincidences and differences. Its aim is to present a history of innovation concerning the teaching of the discipline because, although innovation has been discontinuous and has been more or less present depending on the circumstances and the actors who have promoted it, its return always maintains the intensity of the original expression. Consequently, we believe that this overview of innovation, analysing noteworthy proposals, is needed to record attempted changes and improvements and ensure they are available as a reference point when attempting to understand current initiatives.

Keywords: History of contemporary education, History teaching, educational innovation, teaching materials, educational development.

Resumen:

La enseñanza de la Historia en sus metodologías, proyectos y materiales de enseñanza ha ido variando desde Rafael Altamira, en el tránsito finisecular y primer tercio del siglo XX, a los grupos de innovación formados por profesores durante el último tercio del mismo.

En este trabajo se muestran los cambios y las continuidades en propuestas de enseñanza de la Historia, las coincidencias y las diferencias. La finalidad es exponer una historia de la innovación sobre la enseñanza de la disciplina porque, aunque la innovación ha sido discontinua y se ha manifestado con mayor o menor intensidad dependiendo de las circunstancias y los agentes que la han promovido, siempre su retorno mantiene la misma intensidad de lo originario. Así pues, consideramos necesario hacer este recorrido por la innovación, analizando propuestas desatadas, para dejar constancia de los intentos

Revision accepted: 2017-09-20.

Cite this article as: Duarte Piña, O. (2018). La Enseñanza de la Historia: innovación y continuidad desde Rafael Altamira | *Teaching history: innovation and continuity since Rafael Altamira*. *Revista Española de Pedagogía*, 76 (269), 141-155. doi: 10.22550/REP76-1-2018-07

de cambio y mejora y tenerlos como referente a la hora de entender y comprender las actuales iniciativas.

Descriptor: Historia de la educación contemporánea, enseñanza de la Historia, innovación educativa, material didáctico, desarrollo de la educación.

1. Introduction

When analysing the processes of innovation, it is important to take into account the areas where innovative activities are possible. In the broader framework of this research¹ we have studied the political-educational and cultural settings, legislation, currents in historical thinking, agents, and *agencies that produce discourses*². Consequently, this article considers and classifies as changes or continuities the characteristics of innovation in teaching methods and projects, how socially valuable and educationally useful historical knowledge is regarded as being, the teaching materials published, and, essentially, the repercussions for the teaching system. The sources for this research are works by a series of authors from the first third of the twentieth century that form the basis of innovative history teaching and have been chosen according to how they are implemented and their level of diffusion. Other sources include questionnaires and interviews with teachers who took part in innovation groups during the last third of the 20th century, publications in the academic field, and the classroom materials published.

It could be argued that a favourable political and cultural context is needed to make educational innovation possible, but that if this context does not occur, innova-

tion still happens because it is immanent to teaching and does not necessarily need to be connected to a process of educational reform. Nonetheless, if the two elements –innovation and reform– are both present, it becomes possible to amplify the former and give it the necessary features. However, innovations depend on the people who promote them –the teachers– and the dissemination of their teaching proposals, as they are the ones who support and develop innovations in the face of the continuities of the education system, even though the system changes with the society it is part of and which it teaches. Innovation develops through processes of revision, reflection and creation, but it finds limits to its spread in the traditional structure of the school. Nonetheless, some proposals do become incorporated into the education system, and so the system is not always the same after the impact of the innovation.

Taking into account the plans for innovative actions mentioned above, various moments in the process of innovation in history teaching can be identified: an initial period dating back to 1895 with the publication of the work *La enseñanza de la Historia* (Teaching History) by Rafael Altamira and continuing until 1935; a second period of *underground continuity* (1935-1975); a period in which innovation returns through groups of teachers (1975-

1995) who published and disseminated their materials for teaching at baccalaureate level; and a final period that started in 1996 and continues up to the present day in which the discourses and projects of the teachers who intervened in the previous period follow other paths. This will be analysed in this work that provides an overview of an extensive period which focuses on the most significant moments, what could be referred to as the *drivers of innovation*, in particular in the teaching of history in secondary education.

2. Initial proposals and initiatives for change in teaching history

History had to be created as a subject for the baccalaureate, and its presence in the curriculum dates back to the 1836 to 1838 period. Nonetheless, for the teaching of history to be conceived as a social science and as an innovative educational project for the first time, we must move forward nearly sixty years to the period between 1891 and 1923. In this period, Rafael Altamira did part of his work, publishing *La enseñanza de la Historia*, the second extended and improved version of which appeared in 1895, *Valor social del conocimiento histórico* (The social value of historical knowledge, 1922), and *Ideario pedagógico* (Pedagogical thinking, 1923). With these essays, the teaching of history was for the first time viewed as a transformative social action, a practical activity, and a useful activity for training individuals and peoples.

If Rafael Altamira is to be considered as the instigator of a process of renovation of history as a science and field of teaching, then it is important to consider his in-

tellectual precursors and list some of the moments and authors that form the origins of innovation as a project for creation in education and in training the individual, given that Altamira's work brought together ideas about science and pedagogy that had been developing for some time.

Marías (2005, p. 339) states that throughout the eighteenth century in Spain «there is no creative philosophy» and this would not appear until the late-nineteenth century with Unamuno and Ortega y Gasset. Midway through the century, a change in the ideas and character of Spanish liberals can be seen, and outside the political field, this change affected education, art, literature, and religion. Millán Chivite (1975) called the human type that arose from this dynamic «the new man of the Generation of 1868». This generation was complex in its composition and substantive in its range of political-cultural trends. From the generation of the *new man*, a generation that made the revolution, we wish to emphasise the «academic democrats»³, followers or admirers of Julián Sanz del Río who were also influenced by Krausism.

Pedagogy and reformism from then on became the premises for action of the Krausists. At the start of the 1860s, some of Sanz del Río's followers (Francisco de Paula Canalejas, Emilio Castelar, Miguel Morayta) adopted them as guidelines for political action. Although the «young democracy» from then on attracted a sector of the Krausists, these, as Canalejas himself notes, were not agitators but teachers. [...] The Krausists did not make the revolution, as Gil Cremades observes, but the revolution of 68 remembered them,

entrusting to them the key duties of its educational policy (Ruiz Torres, 2001, p. 65).

After the revolution had failed, those who trusted in perfecting humankind through education did not abandon their project, and with the reestablishment of the monarchy in 1874, which involved a return to positivism and the rejection of the educational project that had developed during the six years of the revolutionary period, they founded the Institución Libre de Enseñanza (Free Educational Institution, ILE) in 1876.

Thinkers, teachers, and artists, including Rafael Altamira, joined the ILE⁴. This elite was enthused by the need to renovate the education system, develop the sciences and the arts, and encourage research. «The teaching of history was, therefore, essential for the ILE's goal of raising a new generation of young Spaniards who would form the basis of a modern, democratic nation» (Boyd, 2001, p. 873).

At the same time, new institutions and structural reforms appeared that put education at the vanguard of the political moves to regenerate the country. To illustrate this process (see Mainer, 2009, pp. 51-52), the key moments in a period of the creation of institutions will be mentioned, starting in 1900 with the foundation of the Ministry of Public Instruction and Fine Arts. A year later, a course in general pedagogy was established at the Museo Pedagógico Nacional (National Pedagogical Museum). This course was the precursor of the chair in pedagogy founded at the Central University in 1904. The Junta para la Ampliación de Estudios e Investigaciones Científicas (Board for the Expansion of Scientific Study and Re-

search) was created in 1907, two years after the Escuela de Estudios Superiores del Magisterio (School of Advanced Studies in Teaching), and in 1910, the Centro de Estudios Históricos (Centre for Historical Studies) was founded.

Among this group of new institutions, it is important to distinguish those characterised as *discourse producing agencies*, «all of them spaces where the first signs of a renewed professionalization would start to appear» (Mainer, 2009, p. 61): the National Pedagogic Museum, the chair in Higher Pedagogy, the Board for the Expansion of Scientific Study and Research⁵, the School of Advanced Studies in Teaching and the Centre for Historical Studies, encouraging the dissemination of the new educational theories and practices.

It is important to note the impetus and scientific and pedagogical knowledge expressed in these spaces, with the participation of historians, university or school professors, professors at the Escuela Normal teacher training school, inspectors, and primary school teachers, who were regarded as the creators of a renovated discourse and practices. And it is also important to acknowledge them as the authors of works in which new methodologies for teaching history were originally conceived, considering their professional status, their involvement in the *discourse producing agencies* and the level of dissemination of their work. The university professor Rafael Altamira, the school professors Rafael Ballester y Castell and Antonio Jaén Morente and the teachers from the Escuela Normal Teófilo Sanjuán Bartolomé, Daniel González-Linacero, and Gloria Giner de los Ríos García stand out

in this dawn of innovative history. A choice that identifies them as the leading figures in the didactic transformation of history, figures whose ideas would, much later, reappear as the findings of other innovative teachers from the mid-1970s onwards.

The group of «founding fathers» (Mainer, 2009) of the didactics of history comprised Rafael Altamira with his work, *La enseñanza de la Historia*⁶ and the school professor Rafael Ballester with *Clio. Iniciación al estudio de la Historia (parte primera y segunda)* (Clio. Initiation in the study of history [first and second part]), the first edition of which was published in 1913 and the seventh and final one in 1945⁷. Altamira's book is an essay on the situation of history teaching in Europe's leading universities with ideas and guidelines about how to teach it, while Ballester's work is a textbook for teaching on the baccalaureate that eschewed verbose, lengthy, or unclear stories and was designed as a guide for the period of learning to which it was directed, with sufficient content to guide any later studies students might wish to pursue and on which they would be instructed in historical science, its auxiliary disciplines, and the historian's craft.

After these founding fathers, others continued their work. Teófilo Sanjuán's *Cómo se enseña la historia* (How history is taught) was published in 1923 and republished five times up to 1933 in the «Serie Metodológica» collection (Methodological series) of the journal *Revista de Pedagogía* and was intended for trainee teachers⁸. In the concepts of his methodology, history teaching appears as an organic overview that educates the intel-

lect and shapes citizens; it incorporates the use of literature as an auxiliary discipline to history and advises using real objects to clarify and illustrate teaching. But what is notable with this author is the organisation of content based on elements that synthesise human development, what he calls *lines of association* that become conceptual milestones of a civilisation and connections to new knowledge, their gradation remaining in the judgement of the teacher, who must trace the course of each civilisation. Illustrating the coincidences in innovation, it is worth noting that without being aware of this methodological proposal, the Cronos group's curriculum project of the early 1990s organised the content of history into *basic tasks or functions of social life*, also called *facets*, and *basic social notions*. These organisational nuclei have a «dual analytical and pedagogical value» (Grupo Cronos, 1995, p. 18) and make it possible to specify educational knowledge.

The works by the professor at the Palencia Escuela Normal Daniel González-Linacero, *Mi primer libro de Historia* (My first history book, 1933, second edition 1935) and *Mi segundo libro de Historia* (My second history book, 1934)⁹ are books for primary school teaching that are dedicated to a version of history that starts from the child's immediate setting, told simply so that it is understandable, addressing students from a position that is close to their own life.

The textbooks by Antonio Jaén Morente, *Lecturas históricas (Iniciación)* (Historical readings: Introduction) and Gloria Giner de los Ríos, *Cien lecturas históricas* (One hundred historical readings) were published

in 1935. Jaén's book presents summarised stories from history, covering what is important in knowledge with the intention of making students feel history and «educating spirits, not people who sit exams» (Jaén Morente, 1935, p. 5). Rafael Ballester, in his textbook *Clío*, also draws on a simplified version of history that is not overburdened with names, dates, and secondary episodes. González Linacero says the same thing but in other words to provide a useful history that is free from «showiness and sensationalism» (González Linacero, 1999, p. 33). His book is an original collection of fragments from literary texts as sources for studying history: *auxiliary Literature for History* as Altamira proposed¹⁰.

Broadly speaking, this stage is characterised by the importance it attributes to learning in primary and secondary teaching with the aim of ensuring that the student develops a general knowledge of the discipline, something Altamira describe as a period of *general culture*. This period contains a series of changes that define the new teaching proposals. On the one hand, new conceptualizations: the concept of civilisation and of internalist history that included all of the orders of life compared with politics as the organising principle of the content, the social subject in contrast with the historical character or hero, and history in its organic sense with the reciprocal influence of all of its parts in contrast with a particular and exclusionary history. Furthermore, there are its teaching aims in the intrinsic regenerative relationship between the past and the present and, related to this, its capacity to educate people. Finally, there is the importance of learning the histor-

ical method for the intellectual development of students, contrasting with the exclusive exercise of the memory.

The period of these publications ran from 1895 until 1935, the final year of the selected innovative publications, because the main changes in the discourses and teaching of history of this first period occurred in this time. This is also because these educational proposals can be compared with those that were implemented elsewhere in Europe under equal intellectual and pedagogical conditions.

During the Second Republic, there were convergences between what Escolano (2002) calls the «political-institutional culture» and the «pedagogical culture», but the changes and improvements in the scope of school practices did not become generalised because the business of change and innovation responded to the *principle of multiplicity*¹¹ but was not a mass phenomenon. There were changes in the areas and practices in which they spread and in which innovative teachers engaged: the National Pedagogical Museum, the chair in Higher Pedagogy, the Board for the Expansion of Scientific Study and Research, the School of Advanced Studies in Teaching, and the Centre for Historical Studies, and the publications were still there as examples of a methodological discourse on the teaching of History with a new pedagogical thinking.

When concluding this section, we do not infer that innovation is doomed to failure but, instead, to a constant process of *restarting*¹² that will be seen in the following sections.

3. Underground continuity

Although, there have been attempts to prove that after the Civil War, all of the pedagogical and didactic knowledge that had previously been built and upheld disappeared, authors such as Laín Entralgo and Seco Serrano (1998, p. 17) argue that there was «an underground continuity, affected but not destroyed: much that appeared to have been eradicated continued to exist, albeit in another form, with a different position in life, accordingly acquiring a new configuration». While it is true that many of the intellectuals and teachers who facilitated the change in teaching approaches and in their practices from the last quarter of the nineteenth century had been expelled from their chairs or purged from their teaching roles, not all of them left the country; a minority remained who, despite being restricted in their functions, maintained this prized knowledge to give it life carefully¹³.

After 1939, history textbooks again contained the traditional models of the political tale of heroes and their deeds, presented to exercise the students' memories. «Francoism did everything it could to control, monitor, and put under state command the dissemination and practice of innovations in the school» (Mainer, 2008, p. 7) and it created institutions to this end such as the Centro de Documentación Didáctica para la Enseñanza Media (Didactic Documentation Centre for Secondary Education, 1954) and in 1958 the Centro de Documentación Didáctica para la Enseñanza Primaria (Didactic Documentation Centre for Primary Education). The pathway for going beyond the ideological discourses and educational prac-

tices imposed by the regime was narrow. The journal *Vida Escolar* (1958)¹⁴ became a medium for expressing and exchanging ideas in which previous theories about didactic innovation would start to appear: references to active methodologies, to the use of audiovisual media and reflections about the teacher's role. In 1965, the Servicio de Investigación y Experimentación Pedagógica (Pedagogic Research and Experimentation Service) confirmed the gradual opening of the education system.

However, it was primarily in universities that, in the 1950s, a historiographic renovation was promoted that would be clearly reflected in the teaching of history. Jaume Vicens Vives in his efforts to bring Spanish historiography up to date and transform it, and in his dedication to teaching and to publishing didactic works, considered the teaching of history based on academic rigour and social commitment¹⁵. In this period, it was mainly university professors who recovered the lost steps of historiography and of the teaching of history. Consequently, and supporting the hypothesis of continuity in proposals for renovation and innovation in history teaching, a line can be traced from masters to followers, starting with Rafael Altamira and Rafael Ballester, taking in José Deleito and Pere Bosch-Gimpera, reaching Jaume Vicens, continuing with Joan Reglà, Miquel Tarradell, Emili Giralt, continuing up to Josep Fontana¹⁶ and connecting with those who, despite still being university students would, as school teachers, go on to create *Grupo Germania 75*, *Grupo Historia 13-16*, and *Grupo Cronos*. This line preserves the paradigms that focus on perpetuating the historical science and the innovative teaching of it.

In the universities of the 1960s –Valencia, Barcelona, Salamanca and Madrid– students of Philosophy and Literature discovered the new historiographic currents, principally of French influence, from the *Annales* School to historical materialism, currents that would make it possible to change the teaching of history in the Polyvalent Unified Baccalaureate and argue for a new didactics, suggesting methodological innovation and choice of content in light of these schools of historical thought.

4. The new innovative adventure or the return of a tradition

In the mid-1970s, coinciding with the educational reforms of the General Education Act of 1970, groups of teachers started to appear based on previous individual experiences that would be the basis of new educational changes. Some of these teachers travelled to England and France to discover how history was taught in those countries and reflected new didactic concepts in their classroom projects and materials, in contrast with the stultifying educational milieu of the classrooms of the late Francoist period. Once again, foreign journeys acted as a spur for teacher training and the incorporation of educational models and innovative experiences, recalling what Altamira and other contemporary teachers had done through the Board for the Expansion of Studies.

In 1975, the year of the publication of the baccalaureate syllabus and the first edition of the *Pruebas Iniciales* (First tests) by Germanía 75, the journal *Cuadernos de Pedagogía* was founded.

Issue 7-8 of July and August contains an article by Gonzalo Zaragoza –who went on to become part of the Historia 13-16 group– called *Algunas ideas sobre la nueva historia* (Some ideas about the new history), and in the November issue the historian Josep Fontana wrote *Para una renovación de la enseñanza de historia* (For a renovation in the teaching of history). In his text, Josep Fontana, who had been a student and follower of Vicens Vives, and provided intellectual support to Grupo Germanía 75, proposes revising the content and traditional schemes of history teaching for all levels of instruction so that students can reflect critically on the society in which they live.

The events described above did not come about by chance, but instead were symptoms of changes in pedagogic discourses and practices. It could be said that a stimulus for didactic innovation *restarts*¹⁷, illuminated by an educational, social, and cultural transition and thanks to the General Education Act in the setting of new history syllabuses in the baccalaureate and in professional training. These syllabuses would lead to new teaching propositions. The 1970 act also created *Institutos de Ciencias de la Educación* (Educational Science Institutes), important bodies for covering and disseminating new approaches and ideas for educational change. Furthermore, from the end of the 1960s, the Pedagogical Renovation Movements (MRP) and Summer Schools were active, bringing back the model of the ones held during the Second Republic.

If *discourse producing agencies* were identified at the start of this article, the Educational Science Institutes, the

Centros de Profesores (Teachers Centres), the Colegios de Licenciados y Doctores (Associations of Graduates and Doctors), and the Summer Schools now became the spaces for communicating and disseminating innovative projects and materials.

Between the mid-1970s and early 1980s, Adara Editorial and the Germanía 75, Historia 13-16, Grupo de Humanística, and Cronos groups started a new period of innovation. The teaching of History, as the study of civilisations and for humanistic education, was implemented in classrooms which became workshops where students handled the selected sources in work files or workbooks and where the academic method of understanding history was recreated. What had already been proposed in the first quarter of the century returned in the minds of the teachers in this period of change, without them being aware that this had already happened.

Adara Editorial emerged following a teaching experience at the Santa María del Mar Jesuit college in La Coruña between 1969 and 1974. Once the company had been established, in 1977, its editors prepared and published *Una nueva estrategia para la enseñanza de las Ciencias Sociales* (A new strategy for teaching social sciences) and *Taller de documentos* (Document workshop). The project proposed studying the past through historical sources and through a process of guided research by students. This was at the same time as Germanía 75 which introduced a radical renewal of content based on the tenets of historical materialism, methodological renewal, and the educational value given to knowledge of

history that sought social change. At the end of this decade, the members of Grupo Historia 13-16 prioritised learning the historian's methods over learning content as the basis of historical understanding, transferring the Schools History Project that was used in English schools. From the early 1980s, Grupo Humanística proposed studying history by starting with the present and moving backwards to the past, and Grupo Cronos chose to offer teachers a selection of historical texts based on the most relevant historiographic problems in the discipline that supported a renewed teaching programme with the aim of contributing to students' critical sense and intellectual development, encouraging a history teaching model where students, starting with sources and historiographic documents, would reconstruct the historical process in its general lines and acquire working habits and intellectual working techniques.

The groups' didactic projects and publications were widely disseminated throughout Spain, leading to a qualitative and amplified turn in history teaching practice in secondary education. The experiences and materials not only comprised plans for methodological change, but were also proposals for historiographic and ideological change and for contesting the existing educational and political system.

The materials that the groups Germanía 75 and Historia 13-16 published and Adara Editorial's folders of documents were of use to new teachers who were introduced to innovation through the example of these groups and their teaching proposals. Owing to their

degree of dissemination, other innovative experiences continued and appeared, as some teachers from Aula Sete, Ínsula Barataria, and Gea-Clío who were interviewed have said¹⁸, and these teachers' approaches for innovation and change successively influenced other groups of teachers.

In 1990 and before the implementation of the General Organisation of the Educational System Act (LOGSE), on 31 January (Official State Gazette of 1 March), the Ministry of Education and Science announced a contest to prepare curriculum materials for the Reform. In the resolution of 23 October of that year, Grupo Cronos (Salamanca), Ínsula Barataria (Zaragoza), Aula Sete (Santiago de Compostela), and Bitácora (Barcelona) were selected. At this juncture, Pagadi (Navarra), Espacio y Sociedad (Navarra), Investigación y Renovación Escolar (Seville), Plataforma Asturiana de Educación Crítica (Asturias), Kairós and Gea-Clío (Valencia), and circles of teachers who encouraged each other to innovate in their classes also appeared.

The curriculum projects proposed by these innovation groups were theoretical proposals based on research, experimentation, and teacher training that were accompanied by books for teachers and workbooks for students, thus setting them apart from the materials published by Germanía 75, Adara, and Historia 13-16 that were conceived as methodological proposals for directly transforming practice in classrooms.

There were three key issues in the drive for innovation in this period: the expansion

of historical knowledge as it became linked to other social sciences, the educational value of the critical perspective of analysing reality, and connecting and studying the problems of the world one inhabits while seeking their historical significance. However, new political, educational, and cultural parameters were simultaneously being developed: the restoration of democracy, the process of establishing the autonomous regions and the development of a period starting in the mid-1960s that R. Cuesta (1998) called the *technocratic mass education mode*.

The socio-political circumstances that could permit a comparison with the innovative movement at the start of the twentieth century were no longer the same. We were not facing a centralised state but instead progressive decentralisation initiated with Spain's process of establishing the autonomous regions and transferring competences. Also, if the teaching programmes intended to create people capable of understanding and identifying with a homeland to regenerate it and the transformations were proposed from above, in the new democracy the innovative movement had taken the initiative but this leading role would soon start to be interrupted by the political management of the reform, eventually entrusted to experts who were unfamiliar with the reality of the classroom and not to teachers¹⁹. The curriculum projects that had won the competition called by the Ministry were not taken into account and the process of curricular experimentation in schools that viewed «the reform as something that would be generalised after being tested» (Rozada, 2003, p. 37) was ig-

nored, side-lining all of the proposals for innovation that could have transformed an education system that they knew in its theory and its practice.

When the groups chosen by Ministerial Order found out about the change in direction in educational policy, they promoted the *I Seminario sobre Desarrollo Curricular en el Área de CC.SS., Geografía e Historia. Educación Secundaria* (First seminar on curriculum development in the field of social sciences, geography, and history. Secondary education) which was held in 1991 at the Institute of Educational Sciences of the University of Salamanca and coordinated by Grupo Cronos. Many of the groups mentioned attended these meetings, which continued until 1995 with ideas and debates on the design and testing of their curriculum proposals for teaching social sciences; the results were published in the proceedings of the meetings. In 1995, Cronos, Asklepios, Ínsula Barataria, Investigación y Renovación Escolar (Educational Research and Innovation) (IRES), Aula Sete, Gea-Clío, and Pagadi created the Federación de Grupos de Innovation *Icaria* (*Icaria* Federation of Innovation Groups) (*Fedicaria*), bringing together the innovation movement and taking the baton of didactic research in the field of the social sciences and in the field of teacher training. This federation, far from being weakened, worked from the principles of critical thinking, based on a *critique of didactics* and a *critical didactics*, an intrahistory of teaching, with new sources, primarily from French and German sociology and philosophy, despite the course that the teaching of history would take after 1997's «Debate on

the Humanities», the educational reforms of 2002 that were not eventually implemented, and the 2006 reforms as a result of which an encyclopaedic, factual, and Eurocentric teaching of history based on memorising facts has returned.

Through the annual meetings and the journal *Con-ciencia Social*, an innovative educational theory was forged based on new currents of thought with historiography no longer setting the pattern of didactics.

In summary, the period from the 1970s to the 1990s was the period of maximum dissemination of the proposals for innovation, change, transition, establishing the new political system, unleashing social transformations, and supporting new educational values. However, the initial determination to implement change and establish a new educational system, arising from the need for innovation, had petered out by the end of the 1990s as it did not have the necessary support of the political elites who did not direct their innovative spirit towards improving education.

After the late 1990s the innovation groups again gave way to people working individually or took on a new form in the federations of groups mentioned above, but it can also be seen in the film and history association *Sine Nomine*, in the *Fundación 10 de marzo* in which Ramón López Facal from the defunct Aula Sete participated, and in the books dedicated to history teaching published by Raimundo Cuesta of Grupo Cronos. Now the only remaining witnesses to all of the second innovative period are Investigación y Renovación Escolar and Gea-Clío.

Two ideas can summarise this section: there was a period of legislative change in 1970 with educational reforms that allowed innovation while not officially encouraging it because the political context was not favourable, and there was a period of reform conducive to innovation that started in 1983 and culminated in 1990, but this became institutionalised and was controlled by political authorities and experts in education without teaching experience. After this date, «with the reform movements discredited and the experimentation groups nullified, the system had no ideology and lacked a practical rationale» (Gimeno Sacristán, 2007, p. 27).

5. Conclusion

Innovative activity runs through the history of education; innovation does not perish as it is situated outside the chronological-historical timescale of the reforms and always affirms its novelty. What does happen is that the innovative proposals cease to be relevant as they are developed in a particular context, and yet the postulates of innovation always return with an original meaning, in a return that never brings back the same thing.

We maintain that there is an innovative future immanent to the teaching process, and a contraposition of times: *Aiôn* and *Chronos*, innovation as an *event* or the reform that fixes things and people, that «takes on a form and determines a subject» (Deleuze and Guattari, 2010, p. 265).

Innovation introduces a *multiplicity* in its different forms of renovation, and it changes, not only because of the contexts and agents, but also in its didactic

proposals and editorial projects. It is a continuous process of implementing the necessary features that does not create a structure or hierarchy. The nature of these multiplicities changes as they connect with others, and they can be interrupted but always recommence as has been described throughout this work.

Throughout this overview of innovation we find overlaps in desires to improve and change a style of history teaching that focuses on political facts and exercising students' memories, but the proposals in which the past was studied with the aim of regenerating people's connection with their homeland differ from the history-teaching projects that attempted to explain the present and its social problems, even though both included a will to contribute to transforming reality and training citizens. Therefore, the educational and social value of the discipline was always of interest, placing the student at the heart of the teaching and learning process. In this overview, there were also institutions that allowed for and spread the discourses but the first institutions disappeared with the dictatorship and the new institutions became meritocratic agencies in which discourse and practices lost value. Nonetheless, disseminating the proposals by editing and publishing materials was vital for preparing this historical overview of the process of change and educational innovation since they remain as witnesses to the extensive period analysed.

Innovation now has two faces: an institutionalised one that has its own parameters for recording innovation and another that develops at the margin and with a true desire for change in how history is taught.

Notes

- ¹ This article is a synthesis of the research carried out in my doctoral thesis, *La enseñanza de la Historia en la educación secundaria: innovación, cambio y continuidad* (History teaching in secondary education: innovation, change, and continuity), supervised by Dr. Javier Merchán Iglesias and awarded by the Faculty of Educational Sciences of the University of Seville on 6 November 2015.
- ² In Mainer (2009), we find this definition to classify those institutions that accommodated and disseminated the discourses on didactics and educational innovation.
- ³ According to Millán Chivite (1979, p. 39) this expression was coined by Marcelino Menéndez and Pelayo in his *Historia de los heterodoxos españoles* (History of Spanish outsiders). «They are called democrats, because they accept democratic principles or support the consequences of their postulates, even if they are active in other political movements. And ‘academic’ because they perform teaching roles in the University of Madrid; some of them also in provincial universities or in secondary schools».
- ⁴ «With a European and internationalist outlook, the institutionalists rejected the ‘quietist and indulgent’ patriotism of those who were happy to rest on the laurels of a former global empire. True patriotism requires criticism as well as reverence for the past, and respect for innovation along with conservation» (Boyd, 2001, p. 873).
- ⁵ The teachers and residents of the Pedagogical Museum and of the Board for the Expansion of Studies could travel to «what we might call ‘shrines of European pedagogy’: either teacher training centres –the *École Normal Supérieur* of Saint Cloud in Paris, the Rousseau Institute in Geneva, and the *École Normal* in Brussels– or institutions and teaching activities regarded as model by the New School – and of course, the complex of centres dedicated to the beliefs of Dr. Decroly, the work of inspectors like Cousinet and Dottrens, the schools connected to the cooperative movement led by Freinet or the schools of northern Italy» (Mainer and Mateos, 2007, p. 205).
- ⁶ «The prologue of 1895 informs us that the first edition from 1891 was written based on the lectures given on the subject that concerns us at Madrid’s Museum of Primary Teaching –later known as the National Pedagogical Museum– between 1890 and 1891; the success of this first version [...], along with the pursuit of research into historiological questions from a dual professional and pedagogical perspective inspired its author to prepare a considerably reformed and extended second edition» (Mainer, 2009, 130-131). According to Aróstegui (2002, p. 377), the first edition of *La enseñanza de la Historia* was not put on sale but was circulated among his colleagues.
- ⁷ Publication and subsequent edition details from Mainer (2009, p. 787).
- ⁸ Mainer affirms (2009, p. 146) that the work «was cited over and over again until well into the 60s and became a real foundational text in the genre of history teaching».
- ⁹ Although these were intended for primary education, I have included them thanks to their peerless didactic approach and because *History* (my third book) intended for the baccalaureate students was already in press, «[...] but as they sealed the house and took everything, we do not know what became of it, like his library». These are the words of María Paz González Perotas, the daughter of Daniel González, that Josep Fontana transcribes from the letter she sent to him while he was preparing the introduction to the book *Enseñar Historia con una Guerra Civil de por medio* (Teaching history with a civil war in the way, 1999, p. 12).
- ¹⁰ All of these Works are catalogued by Mainer (2009, pp. 759-761 y pp. 787-791) in annexe 4 in «Declarative texts of the didactics of social science. First order» and in the category of «Texts-textbooks for the school» (2009, pp. 787-791) and have been selected based on this categorisation and on the number of editions.
- ¹¹ The principle of multiplicity defined by Deleuze and Guattari (2010, pp. 13-14) in relation to the characteristics of the rhizome could be applied here if innovation is regarded as being like a rhizome. Multiplicity generates dimensions and connection, it is not subjected to unity or to a structural model, nor to the logic of reproduction but instead it creates, experiments, multiplies without ever being the same again.
- ¹² Following Deleuze and Guattari (2010, p. 15) I introduce the notion of restarting to explain how innovation can be broken and interrupted «but it always restarts depending on one or another of its lines, and depending on others».

- ¹³ «Liberal culture subsisted, sometimes with the faint intensity of a mere murmur, others discretely hidden or disguised, but it was never inactive, much less extinguished» (Mainer, 2009, p. 478).
- ¹⁴ Although this journal is mentioned thanks to its reach, there were other earlier ones: *Consigna* (1940), **revista española de pedagogía** (1943), *Estudios Pedagógicos* (1949) or *Bordón* (1949) (cfr. Mainer, 2008, p. 6).
- ¹⁵ This question is illustrated by a publication from 1960 from the Teide publishing house, a short work entitled *Metodología para la enseñanza de la Historia* (Methodology for teaching history) by Montserrat Llorens and dedicated to the man who had been her teacher and mentor.
- ¹⁶ This is a line from teachers to followers, from followers who will become teachers, and so on, in succession, until an enlightening nucleus was created who were together at the Literary University of Valencia where followers of Vicens Vives would have students who would go on to become school teachers and form the Germania 75 group, the paradigm of the new innovative period and a reference point for high school teachers in the final years of Francoism and the first years of democracy. In this series of teachers, Pierre Vilar must be regarded as continuing the work of Vicens Vives and as Josep Fontana's mentor.
- ¹⁷ «The General Education Act of 1970, despite being inspired by the Christian spirit of its period, had one great virtue: a very flexible framework that gave teachers a great deal of autonomy» (Delval, 2007, p. 77).
- ¹⁸ Interviewed as part of the research for the doctoral thesis mentioned at the start of this work.
- ¹⁹ «... the authorities felt that more functional instruments were needed to organise and be able to present something to society that could be recognised as an educational reform. [César Coll's work] offered the authorities of the time on a plate the possibility of breaking the deadlock. These authorities had, by then, already accumulated sufficient mistrust towards the progressive sectors of the academic and alternative pedagogies. Coll's work was in itself an example of order and rigour [...]. Something concrete was needed and the model offered three perfectly articulated levels of this, [...] that step by step made it possible to organise a *curriculum*» (Rozada, 2003, p. 38).

References

- Altamira, R. (1997, reissue of 1895). *La enseñanza de la Historia. Preliminary study by R. Asín Vergara*. Madrid: Akal.
- Aróstegui, J. (2002). La teoría de la Historia en Francia y su influencia en la historiografía española. In B. Pellistrandi, *La historiografía francesa del siglo XX y su acogida en España* (pp. 365-402). Madrid: Collection de la Casa de Velázquez.
- Ballester and Castell, R. (1933). *Clío. Iniciación al estudio de la Historia*. Tarragona: Editorial Rafael Ballester y Castell.
- Boyd, C. (2001). El pasado escindido: la enseñanza de la Historia en las escuelas españolas, 1875-1900. *Hispania*, LXI/3 (209), 859-878. Retrieved from <http://hispania.revistas.csic.es/index.php/hispania/article/view/280/281> (Consulted on July 27, 2012).
- Castán, G., Cuesta R. and Fernández, M. (1995). *Proyecto Cronos. Ciencias Sociales, Historia y Geografía. Segundo Ciclo de Educación Secundaria Obligatoria. Guía para el profesorado*. Madrid: Ediciones de la Torre.
- Cuesta, R. (1998). *Clío en las aulas. La enseñanza de la Historia en España entre reformas, ilusiones y rutinas*. Madrid: Akal.
- Deleuze, G. and Guattari, F. (2010). *Mil mesetas. Capitalismo y esquizofrenia*. Valencia: Pre-textos.
- Delval, J. and Valera, J. (2007). Para aprender es necesario actuar. *Las reformas educativas a debate (1982-2006)* (pp. 75-94). Madrid: Ediciones Morata.
- Escolano, A. (2002). *La educación en la España contemporánea. Políticas educativas, escolarización y culturas pedagógicas*. Madrid: Biblioteca Nueva.
- Fontana, J. (1975). Para una renovación de la enseñanza de la Historia. *Cuadernos de Pedagogía*, 11, 1-5, Edición Digital 33 Años Contigo. Barcelona: Wolters Kluwer.

- Fontana, J. (1999). *Enseñar Historia con una Guerra Civil de por medio*. Barcelona: Crítica.
- Gimeno, J. and Valera, J. (2007). Una visión desde dentro y desde fuera. In *Las reformas educativas a debate (1982-2006)* (pp. 19-44). Madrid: Morata.
- Grupo Cronos (1995). *Proyecto Cronos. Ciencias Sociales, Historia y Geografía. Segundo Ciclo de Educación Secundaria Obligatoria. Guía para el profesorado*. Madrid: Ediciones de la Torre/Ministerio de Educación y Ciencia; Proyecto Didáctico Quirón.
- Jaén, A. (1935). *Lecturas históricas (Iniciación)*. Madrid: Imprenta de Salvador Quemades.
- Lain, P. and Seco, C. (Eds.) (1998). *España en 1898. Las claves del Desastre*. Barcelona: Galaxia Gutemberg / Círculo de Lectores.
- Mainer, J. (2009). *La forja de un campo profesional. Pedagogía y didáctica de las Ciencias Sociales en España (1900-1970)*. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas.
- Mainer, J. (2008). *La renovación pedagógica en España: Crónica de una pertinaz desmemoria (1945-1990)*. Retrieved from <http://www.nebraskaria.es/wp-content/uploads/2016/09/RENOVACION-PEDAGOGICA-2008.pdf> (Consulted on May 27, 2017).
- Mainer, J. and Mateos, J. (2007). Los inciertos frutos de una ilusionada siembra. La JAE y la Didáctica de las Ciencias Sociales. *Revista de Educación*, extra number 2007, 191-214. Retrieved from <http://www.juntadeandalucia.es/educacion/vscripts/wginer/w/rec/3090.pdf> (Consulted on June 6, 2012).
- Marias, J. (2005). *España inteligible. Razón histórica de las Españas*. Madrid: Alianza.
- Millán-Chivite, J. L. (1975). *El hombre nuevo de la generación de 1868. Resúmenes de tesis doctorales y tesinas de licenciatura*. Sevilla: Servicio de Publicaciones de la Universidad.
- Millán-Chivite, J. L. (1979). *Revolucionarios, reformistas y reaccionarios (Aproximación a un estudio de la generación de 1868)*. Sevilla: Servicio de Publicaciones de la Universidad.
- Rozada, J. M^a (Coord.) (2003). *Las reformas escolares de la democracia*. Oviedo: Federación Icaria, Plataforma Asturiana de Educación Crítica y KRK Ediciones.
- Ruiz, P. (2001). Política y ciencia de la Historia en la universidad de Valencia entre 1868 y 1939. *Biblioteca Virtual IFC, Institución Fernando el Católico* (pp. 55-95). Zaragoza: Institución Fernando el Católico. Retrieved from <http://ifc.dpz.es/recursos/publicaciones/22/93/04ruiz.pdf> (Consulted on June 4, 2012).
- Zaragoza, G. (1975). Algunas ideas sobre la nueva historia. *Cuadernos de Pedagogía*, 7-8, Digital Edition 33 Años Contigo. Barcelona: Wolters Kluwer.

Author's biography

Olga Duarte Piña is Lecturer of Didactics of Cultural Heritage and trainer in the Training Program for University Teachers of Instituto de Ciencias de la Educación at Universidad de Sevilla. She participates in the research project «Teacher training for university teachers. Progress and obstacles of the participants in a program based on improvement cycles of their practice».