プロジェクト報告

Role of History in School Education and Recent Developments in the National Curriculum in England

Dr Elena Zaitseva（Liverpool John Moores University）

Abstract

The paper explores current debates around role of History as a discipline that is taught in English schools and its place in the National Curriculum. Drawing on historical developments of the debates and focusing specifically on the recently proposed History curriculum as part of the wider curriculum reforms driven by the current UK Government, the paper will reflect on the role of the subject in educating young citizens and on factors that could hinder implementation of the reforms.

Introduction

What is the role of humanities in the modern school and what part do they play in educating the young generation? How disciplines such as History and Geography should be taught? What is more important and what is less important for school children to know, to understand and when they should learn it in order to gain an understanding of historical processes and role of their country in a wider world history? What teaching methodologies and approaches should be used to nurture 'thinking' learners, who are able to critically appraise social, cultural and political developments that are happening in our time?

These are never-ending debates that take place in many countries and complexity surrounding these issues is growing as national and global landmarks are changing

faster than ever. History and Geography are very dynamic disciplines by their nature.

If to describe the situation with teaching History in England in few words[1], the subject has 'a limited place in the curriculum' (OFSTED, 2007, p.4). With a major focus on literacy and numeracy in primary school, History, alongside other disciplines such as modern foreign languages, geography, art and design, physical education, remains a 'non-core foundation subject'. It means that attainment targets are not as strictly defined as for the core subjects and the subject is marginalised both in terms of what was covered and the time available for teaching it (OFSTED, 2005). In secondary school only just over 30% of pupils study the subject in Key Stage 4[2] (after they turned 14 years), and even fewer after they turned 16. It implies that a substantial number of young people 'never consider important historical issues when they are mature enough to do so' (OFSTED, 2007, p.5). Although, especially in primary school, pupils enjoy History lessons, enthusiastically take part in local historical trips, role plays, mini research projects and other activities, consequent reports produced during last 7 years by the Office for Standards in Education, Children's Services and Skills (OFSTED)[3] emphasised that this enjoyment is not always transferred in a cohesive understanding of the historical processes and developing 'historical thinking'.

This paper reflects on the recent developments in History teaching in England, their 'historical' background and political and pedagogical debates around this topic. It will briefly touch the history of these historical debates, which are going back to 1967, but the main focus of this paper will be on the current situation and on possible 'underwater stones' that might hinder effect of the proposed reforms. Methodologically the paper stands as a review drawing on a range of sources, including examination of the literature, analysis of official policy documents from the

1) This paper mainly reflects on situation in England as Welsh, Scottish and Northern Irish systems have variations in the curriculum structure and content of individual subjects.

2) 'Key stages' of the National Curriculum break down as follows: Key Stage 1 – 5 to 7 years old, Key Stage 2 – 7 to 11 years old, Key Stage 3 – 11 to 14 years old and Key Stage 4 – 14 to 16 years old.

3) The Office reports directly to Parliament and is an independent and impartial inspection structure. They inspect and regulate services which care for children and young people, and those providing education and skills for learners of all ages.

Department of Education, reports published by the OFSTED, discussions in media and press and other 'grey literature'[4] on the topic.

English 'History Wars'

Polemics around teaching humanities in school and History in particular started in England in mid 60th. Before that 'majority of school pupils learnt their history at school by copying copious notes dictated by a teacher and then regurgitating them in examinations' (OFSTED, 2007, p.26). As Robert Guyver (2013) rightly observed, these were debates about 'qualitative' and 'quantitative' approaches to teaching History where educational views were intertwined with ideological and political preferences. Quantitative approach is focused on ability to 'measure' historical knowledge - emphasising defining, measuring and raising standards for testing. It often puts emphasis on chronological and sequential approach to historical narrative. Qualitative approach is about providing education for development and empowerment of a learner, via internalisation of knowledge and skills. This 'involves elaboration and flow' (Guyver, 2013, p.59), and has Bruner's ideas of 'spiral' curriculum as its essence. Jerome Bruner is an influential American educational thinker (still alive) who advocated learning through enquiry. He believes that children of any age could learn the 'fundamental principles' of a subject and the connections between ideas within subjects. Bruner also developed ideas of intuitive learning of a subject, where teachers would provide a guidance and demonstrate intuitive reasoning to pupils. In his seminal work 'The Process of Education', Bruner introduced a 'spiral curriculum' – one that should revisit these basic ideas, repeatedly building upon them until the pupil understands them fully (Bruner, 1977). His ideas influenced practice of many progressive educationalists of the time who, following Bruner, advocated 'knowing as a process not a product' (Bruner, 1966). Difference between qualitative and quantitative approaches in History teaching was deeply rooted in political and ideological preferences as will be explored later.

4) 'Document types produced on all levels of government, academics, business and industry in print and electronic formats that are protected by intellectual property rights, of sufficient quality to be collected and preserved by library holdings or institutional repositories, but not controlled by commercial publishers' (Definition approved at the 12th International Conference on Grey Literature, Prague, December 2010)

Having started in mid 60th, the debates resulted in a School Curriculum Project in early 70th. The main emphasis of the project was to move from curriculum driven by 'substantive knowledge' (content being in the core of the curriculum) to curriculum driven by concepts and skills where content illustrates these principles' (Guyver, 2013, p.61). Bruner' s notion of 'spiral' curriculum was widely adopted in mid 70th. Teachers were responsible for selecting evidence, narratives and stories to support the ideas and concepts presented. Very influential work of Peter Rogers published in 1978 - a pamphlet *The New History: Theory into Practice* (Rogers, 1978), also emphasised this approach. Rogers encouraged a critical use of sources, and in particular, the questioning of testimony and the author's position to know, as opposite to trust a given information or appeal to authority as a means of finding out about the past. Margaret Thatcher called Rogers' work 'radically left-wing, undermining traditional, sequential and essentially patriotic school history' (as cited in Guyver, 2013, p. 61).

At the same time work of opposition who were arguing that teaching methods should be more rigorous and 'deliver the basics' (Bennett, 1976) was also widely published around this time.

In the end of 70th – beginning of 80th the debates continued, and an influential work of John West who tried to merge both approaches had a major influence on developments in teaching of history. Building on ideas of Vygotsky and Bruner, West challenged ideas of Piaget 'whose views were limiting what children could do and understand at certain age and stages' (Guyver, 2013, p. 62). His work would encourage a free flow across (in and out) various chronological periods in order to understand the chronology (West, 1980).

While various approaches to teaching history were discussed and implemented in schools with a relatively broad flexibility (depending on teacher's preferences and knowledge of the topic), major School Inspection in 1978 uncovered that quality of teaching history across the country wasn't satisfactory (DES, 1978). Repeated topics, unsuitable reference books and fragmented knowledge were reported by inspectors. The inspectors' report emphasised a need to a more rigorous framework for teaching

History: 'A framework is required to provide some ordering of the content being taught. This may be a single path through a chronological sequence or a more complex series of historical topics which, while not necessarily taught in chronological order, should give a perspective in terms of the ordering of events or by means of comparison with the present day' (ibid, p.73).

Throughout the 80th Government position was a 'marriage' between developing historical skills and mastering concepts, and learning historical content. They recommended that chronological periods taught should be long enough to illustrate dimension of change, and mentioned a balance of local, national and international history to be taught. More than one model was suggested in their recommendations of how school history programme could be organised (DES, 1985).

It was only in 1991 when first national curriculum for history in England was introduced. The History Working Group that was working on the curriculum between 1989 and 1991 made it a very open process, involving frequent consultations with public. Conservatives didn't like the proposed curriculum, and as Margaret Thatcher mentioned in her autobiography, she preferred patriotic model of history, supported by dates (Thatcher, 1993, p. 593). Frictions between Conservative government and History Working Groups at that time where around what's being tested knowledge or understanding and relationship between attainment target and programme of study.

During John Major's Government the curriculum content was reduced, becoming even more focused on British history (although still relatively balanced) (Guyver, 2013). Under the New Labour government (1997-2010) the main emphasis was put on literacy and numeracy and other foundation subjects, including history, were given less attention in schools. They published new National Curriculum in 1999 where little changed from the previous one.

By the end of Labours in power the situation with teaching history, as described in the report of OFSTED (2007), was the following:

- In Primary School pupils know about selected periods and themes, but they are often weak at linking information together to form an overall narrative or story. They are also often weak in important history skills.
- Primary School teachers are not always clear about the standards expected; as a consequence, pupils' progress is faltering.
- There is not enough curriculum liaison between Key Stage 2 (Primary) and Key Stage 3 (Secondary). Secondary schools find it difficult to know where to begin their teaching because of variations in the quality of provision in primary schools.
- Pupils' achievement in secondary schools and colleges is good and, in terms of examination performance, standards compare well with other subjects. Pupils understand important concepts and are adept at history skills. However, less than half of pupils study the subject at Key Stage 4 (14-16) and even less post-16 (OFSTED, 2007, p.5).

The following actions were recommended:

- revise the curriculum to deal with the concern that young people study a few unconnected topics and so gain only a limited understanding of chronology and often cannot answer the 'big questions' of history
- in revisions, pay attention to coherence and progression across all phases
- ensure the history curriculum reflects the principles of Every Child Matters[5] providing young people with the historical knowledge and skills to understand the world in which they live and prepare them for adulthood (ibid, p.6).

Last four years, 2010-2014, with the Coalition Government in power, saw a revival of debates around the National Curriculum. History, not surprisingly, was in the epicentre of these discussions. Conservative Michael Gove, who took over the

5) Every Child Matters is a UK government initiative for England and Wales that was launched in 2003. It consists of a number of development programmes in relation to children and children's services multi-agency partnerships to work together in-order to enhance well-being and development of children and young people from birth to age 19. For more information see Education and Skills Committee, 2004.

Education Department in 2010, was a driver behind the major changes.

'Standards are falling': trigger of the curriculum reforms

Debates around new National Curriculum that took place in 2010-2014 were underpinned by intention of raising standards of school leavers. The main argument behind the reform was that UK pupils' standards are below those in other countries (DfE, 2013). At the same time UK employers, universities and colleges were often dissatisfied with school leavers' literacy, numeracy and general knowledge. Although the proportion of young people achieving good grades has gone up in recent years, it wasn't' reflected in their level of preparedness for the next stage of their study or for work after school.

Figures published by the respected Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)[6] indicated that in the independently-administered tests designed to assesses how pupils use their knowledge and skills in real life, UK remains a long way behind countries like Singapore, Korea and Japan when it comes to basic standards in education. Among the 65 countries which took part in the study, the UK was ranked 26th for mathematics, 23rd for reading and 21st for science (OECD, 2012).

Despite the UK spending more than other countries' average on education, there has been no change in the international test attainment. Actually it was the first time that Britain failed to make the top 20 in any subject.

The Head Teachers (School Directors) and representatives of educational authorities argued that UK school system is not designed to work well within that kind of framework and as attainment tests in this country are different from other countries, 'comparing us to South Korea or Finland doesn't make sense'. The more important task from their point of view was to deal with more critical problems such as achievement map that we still have between rich and poor children' (Education

6) Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), its published reports are available at http://www.oecd.org/education/

Report, 2013).

The OECD insisted the figures "could not possibly" be used to judge the Coalition, which came to power in 2010, suggesting the poor performance was a reflection of Labour's 13 years in Downing Street.

This gave new Coalition Government good grounds to move ahead with the reforms. One of their aims was to make GCSEs and A levels[7] more rigorous – to prepare students properly for life after school. Acquire a core of essential knowledge in English, mathematics and sciences was their first priority, but teaching history also was a major topic of their attention. Two major steps that new Government made in relation to teaching History and bringing the subject back into the educational landscape were introducing English Baccalaureate in 2009-10 and changing History curriculum in 2013-14.

English Baccalaureate Initiative

In order to increase pupils' uptake of math, science and core humanity disciplines (History and Geography) after 14 y.o. Michael Gove introduced English Baccalaureate.

The English Baccalaureate is made up of English, mathematics, history or geography, the sciences and a language. It was informed by a list of subjects published by The Russell Group[8], to which prestigious universities such as Oxford

7) GSCE - General Certificate of Secondary Education: a public examination in specified subjects for 16-year-old schoolchildren. A –levels - General Certificate of Education Advanced Level: a qualification in a specific subject typically taken by school students aged 16–18, at a level above GCSE. Although the Education and Skills Act 2008 introduces a requirement for all young people to participate in education or training until their 18th birthday through full-time education or training; work-based learning; or part-time education or training, compulsory teaching of history stops at 14 y.o. (with the end of Key Stage 3 or lower secondary education). After Year 9 students select their GCSE subjects. Students following the academic route typically take GCSEs at year 11, followed by A Levels at Year 13 and majority will be choosing subjects they develop interest to.
History could be one of them in year 11.

8) The Russell Group is an association of 24 British public research universities.

and Cambridge belong to. They included 'facilitating subjects' in a publication entitled *Informed Choices* (2013). According to the publication these consist of mathematics and further mathematics, English literature, physics, biology, chemistry, geography, history and languages (classical and modern). These are subjects that high profile universities encouraged pupils to take in their GCSE and A levels. To achieve the English Baccalaureate pupils should get a C or better (A, B and C are good marks) in the core subjects of English, maths, history or geography, the sciences, and a language.

Previously, in addition to mathematics and English, pupils could take any subjects for GCSEs, including less academic ones – e.g. arts, physical education; product design; food technology, textiles or other. The Government argument was that this system encourages schools and pupils to focus on subjects that are easier to pass while English Baccalaureate should encourage more schools to offer a broad academic education to all pupils, particularly the most disadvantaged, to age 16 in line with our international competitors.

Government official positions is that The English Baccalaureate (EBaccs) is a performance measure, not a qualification (DfE, 2014b). Schools where a high percentage of students achieved EBaccs with good marks are considered as well performing - it relates to the way schools are assessed for league tables.

Introducing English Baccalaureate seemed played its role. Government statistics in 2012 demonstrates that there was a revival in the number of pupils studying modern languages and History and Geography in English secondary schools (Teaching personnel, 2012). The statistics showed that 72,000 more pupils took the EBacc than in 2012, but also a noticeable gap in figures was observed between different parts of the country (Sedghi, 2013). In total, 202,000 pupils entered the EBacc (35% of the total), up from 130,000 (23%) in 2012.

The statistics also revealed that in 2012 year a total of 3,400 additional teachers taught the subjects to their pupils, comparing with 2011. This equates to a 23,000-hour increase in the total teaching time spent devoted to the three areas. Geography

saw the biggest rise, with teachers now spending 13 per cent more time teaching the courses than in the previous year. The proportion of pupils entering history or geography was 60%, an increase of 10% on year before. According to the DfE, this was the highest proportion of pupils entering geography since 2003 (ibid). The shift may also suggest that Michael Gove's decision to introduce the English Baccalaureate is paying dividends.

New National Curriculum and changes related to history

A series of consultations took place between 2011 and 2013 about new national curriculum on 11 September 2013, and that will be taught from September 2014. 'The new curriculum for all subjects contains the essential knowledge that all children should learn, but will not dictate how teachers should teach' (DfE, 2014). Arguments behind introducing changes in the national curriculum (in particular Key Stage 4 – 11-14 were convincing. Government had the following two aims:

- to increase the involvement of universities in the design and development of more rigorous A levels
- to encourage more 16- to 18-year-olds to take up mathematics and science subjects.

A revised programme of study for history was also submitted. It increased the coverage of world history, while requiring all children to be taught the essential narrative of this country's past. Teachers, according to the proposal, were given a greater level of flexibility over how to structure lessons.

The main emphasis of the new curriculum was put on chronology. 'Teaching the subject chronologically, rather than as a series of disjointed topics, will mean pupils understand how key events and people link to and follow one another, and where they sit in the context of Britain's rich story' argued Department of Education (DfE, 2014a).

Debates were mainly around how to organise and rationalise narrative of the English history curriculum for 7-14 y.o. – to combine both British an international contexts. Although all parties were expressing an urgent need to extending

compulsory history teaching to the age of 16 and Michael Gove expressed his interest to do that, they didn't manage to implement that.

What was new about History Curriculum:

- Greater focus on the history of Britain (from 25% to 40% of content) and students will be expected to show an understanding of chronology. But students should also show an understanding of the history of the wider world.
- Students will no longer be able to follow GCSE courses that are narrowly focused on one period of history or have a narrow focus on one historical theme.
- A greater weighting on the selection, recall and application of historical knowledge and understanding.
- In particular students should study a substantial and coherent element of British history and/or the history of England, Scotland, Wales or Ireland (minimum 40%). This must include at least one in-depth study chosen from the Medieval (500-1500), Early Modern (1450-1750) or Modern (1700-present day) periods.
- A substantial and coherent element of the study of the history of the wider world (minimum 25%), from the same periods as above (ibid).

The first cohort of 600,000 GCSE candidates will study under the new regime from 2015, with the first examinations in the core subjects of English, science, history, maths and geography coming in 2017.

The changes, particularly the move to teach history chronologically, have brought criticism from other historians.

Who are the opposition?

The new history curriculum has been supported by some of the country's most eminent historians, including Professor Niall Ferguson, Professor David Starkey, Antony Beevor and Dr Amanda Foreman. They wrote a letter to the Times newspaper, which welcomed Michael Gove's plans to have topics taught in chronological order, saying it had "long been needed (Sellgren, 2013). Main argument that 'it should be made possible for every pupil to take in the full narrative of our history throughout every century. No-one would expect a pupil to be denied the chance to obtain a full knowledge of the rich tapestry of the history of their own

country, in both its internal and external dimensions' (ibid).

Although the review for reasserting the importance and centrality of history to 'any broad and balanced curriculum was welcomed by the Historical Association, they were disappointed that history curriculum would stop at 14 y.o, not 16 y.o. as was discussed previously.

The Historical Association also they expressed concern that new curriculum will be problematic to teach in primary school, where most teachers are not history specialists, and *'are being expected to teach complex areas of history such as religion, war, identity and nation building without any training or resources and possibly little historical knowledge of their own*' (ibid). This particular problem will only be exacerbated in small rural schools where classes are made up from more than one year group making sequential teaching difficult.

Amongst the opposition are educational theorists and practitioners, as well as faith-based groups. Prof Chris Husbands, director of the Institute of Education at the University of London noticed that danger of chronological teaching is in "*ending up with a seven-year-old understanding of the Saxons, a 10-year-old understanding of the Middle Ages and a 14-year-old understanding of the industrial revolution. But history is more complex than that. What we want young people to have is a usable map of the past*" (ibid).

One of the active groups who took part in the polemics was 'Curriculum for Cohesion', representing teachers, academics and employers. They called new curriculum "unteachable in the overwhelming quantity and detail that it will require teachers to teach" which would lead to either topics remain uncovered or teacher will be 'skimming the surface, leaving pupils with little remembered useful knowledge of Britain and very little affection for the subject of history' (Burns, 2013).

The authors, who include Muslim academics, also said that the plans ignore modern historical scholarship which focuses on interconnectedness of civilisations and nations. They say the curriculum needs to include the Muslim contribution to world history

in order "to counter the types of historical narrative that are available on the internet" (ibid).

Three academics epresenting Politeia think-tank has backed up the government's plans for the history curriculum. Prof David Abulafia of Cambridge University has dismissed suggestions that the draft curriculum is "jingoistic" because it focuses heavily on British history as "absurd". Prof Abulafia said children living in this country were surrounded by reminders of Britain's history and were being educated in the nation's school system: "It is right and proper that they should first of all have a fundamental grounding in the history of this country", he said (ibid).

Although School Heads shared the aspiration for high standards, but warned of the practical problems of implementation. 'One year to implement such ambitious proposals effectively alongside the vast number of concurrent reforms is a tall order' (Coughlan, 2013).

They also questioned the level of political involvement in the process. Brian Lightman, leader of a head teachers' union, was critical about the new version of the curriculum being written mainly by politicians with a limited professional input of teachers and school leaders. Opposition (Labours) were critical to the proposed curriculum, saying that the Education Secretary was more interested in sound-bites than evidence about how to narrow the educational achievement gap between rich and poor. 'We need to get young people ready for a challenging and competitive world of work, not just dwell on the past' (ibid).

Concluding notes

Education in England is about to witness a major change: implementation of the new curriculum starts in Autumn 2014. Importance of a well rounded History education can't be underestimated: it is imperative for everyone to understand the past in order to understand the present – some positive steps have been made in this direction, also much needs to be done. 'Alongside other core subjects of the curriculum, history has a special role in developing in each and every individual a

sense of their own identity as part of a historic community with worldwide links, interwoven with the ability to analyse and research the past that remains essential for a full understanding of modern society' [9] (Times, Letter 2013). Although History uptake after 14 years old is slowly improving, the Government hasn't fulfilled its promise to extend compulsory History till 16.

History curriculum looks more inclusive. New curriculum is set to explore more fully the story of the United Kingdom in its diversity and its relationships with Europe and the rest of the world. But still there are some large gaps in this new curriculum.

Delivery of the new curriculum might be an issue as teachers lack expertise, changes were introduced too fast and teachers are not trained properly. Also disruption of constant changes might impact on effectiveness of delivery.

The debates around teaching of History and other subjects belonging to humanities (e.g. geography, religious education and citizenship) are still ongoing. Alternative view expressed includes idea of a cross-subject/cross- disciplinary curriculum where 'notion of individual subjects and teachers' pedagogy, could be constructed' (Harris et al, 2012).

What is important is to preserve the purpose and integrity of the subject. The following quote resonates well with our point of view on what has to be the ultimate purpose of the History education:

'… *The essential caveat in addressing issues is that history must not lose its integrity and become distorted for different purposes. History's main contribution to the UK's democracy has always been its plurality and unpredictability - different historians coming at events and people from different perspectives, using evidence critically and with integrity, and presenting different views. Above all else, history needs to provide young people with the ability to make up their own minds* (OFSTED, 2005).

9) See The Times, Wednesday 27 February 2013 for the full text of the historians' letter

References

Bennett, N. (1976) *Teaching Styles and Pupil Progress*. Boston, MA: Harvard University Press

Bruner, J. S. (1960: revised edition 1977) *The Process of Education*. London: Harvard University Press. Bruner, J. S. (1966) *Toward a Theory of Instruction*. London: Harvard University Press. Burns, J. (2013) Draft history curriculum 'list-like and too narrow', BBC news, 11 April 2013, viewed 13 July 2014, http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/education-22072703

Coughlan, S. Curriculum changes 'to catch up with world's best', BBC news.,8 July 2013, viewed 13 July 2014, http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/education-23222068

Department of Education and Science (DES) (1978), *Primary education in England – A survey by HM Inspectors of Schools*. London: HMSO
http://www.educationengland.org.uk/documents/hmi-primary/

Department of Education and Science (DES) (1985), *History in the primary and secondary Years – an HMI View*. London: HMSO.

Department of Education (2013), *Reform of the National Curriculum in England*.

Department of Education (2014), *Reforming qualifications and the curriculum to better prepare pupils for life after school* (https://www.gov.uk/government/policies/reforming-qualifications-and-the-curriculum-to-better-prepare-pupils-for-life-after-school/supporting-pages/gcse-reform)

Department of Education (2014a), History GCSE subject content and assessment objectives https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/206146/GCSE_History__final.pdf

Department of Education (2014b), English Baccalaureate: information for schools, https://www.gov.uk/english-baccalaureate-information-for-schools

Education Report: UK Lagging Behind the Best, Sky News, 03 December 2013, http://news.sky.com/story/1176956/education-report-uk-lagging-behind-the-best

Education system in the UK
https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/219167/v01-2012ukes.pdf

Great Britain, House of Commons Education and Skills Committee, Every Child Matters, Ninth Report of Session 2004–05
http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200405/cmselect/cmeduski/40/40.pdf

Guyver, R. (2013) Landmarks with Questions - England's school history wars 1967-2010 and 2010-2013, *International Journal of historical learning, teaching and research*, v.11 (2), 59-87

Harris, R., Harrison, S. and R. McFahn (2012). *Cross-Curricular Teaching and Learning in the Secondary School Humanities: History, Geography, Religious Studies and Citizenship*, Routledge.

History in the curriculum (2010), Eurydice Network, available online: http://www.nfer.ac.uk/eurydice/information-by-topic/schools-curriculum-and-assessment/history-in-the-curriculum.cfm

Humanities and language teaching rises in secondary schools, *Teaching Personnel*, Published 27.04.2012
http://www.teachingpersonnel.com/news/2012/4/27/humanities-and-language-teaching-rises-in-secondary-schools/

Informed Choices: A Russell Group Guide to making decisions about post 16th education 2013-2014, available online: http://www.russellgroup.ac.uk/informed-choices/

Office for Standards in Education (OFSTED) (2005) The Annual Report of Her Majesty's Chief inspector of Schools 2004/05, available online: http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/sites/default/files/documents/annual-reports/t/The%20Annual%20Report%20of%20Her%20Majestys%20Chief%20Inspector%20of%20Schools%202005-06%20%28PDF%20format%29.pdf

Office for Standards in Education (Ofsted) (2007), History in the balance: History in English schools 2003–07.
http://www.heacademy.ac.uk/assets/hca/documents/reports/history/History_in_the_balance.pdf

Rogers, P.J. (1978) *The New History: theory into Practice*, Issue No. 44 London, The Historical Association.

Sedghi, A. (2013) GCSE, EBacc and A level results: what do the latest figures tell us? Guardian, Datablog, 17 October, 2013,
http://www.theguardian.com/news/datablog/2013/oct/17/gcse-ebacc-alevel-results-figures

Sellgren,K. Historians split over Gove's curriculum plans
http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/education-21600298

Thatcher, M. (1993) *The Downing Street Years*. London: HarperCollins Publishers

West, J. (1980) *History 7–13* (*Guidelines, structures and resources with 50 classroom examples*). Dudley: Dudley Teachers' Centre, Dudley Metropolitan LEA.