

The Purposes of History Education in the Context of “Flourishing Life”, “Powerful Knowledge” and Political Reconciliation

Danilo Kovac

Sapienza University of Rome, Italy
University of Banja Luka, Bosnia and Herzegovina

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

History education
Post-conflict societies
Powerful knowledge
Flourishing life
Political reconciliation

ABSTRACT

Stretching beyond its theoretical field, the debates about the purposes of history education are of great importance to curriculum writers and classroom practitioners. The content selection from a broad field of history is connected to what educators deem an overarching purpose of education. With this in mind, this paper aims to examine the purposes of teaching history against the background of the two general theories of education, namely – the theories of a flourishing life and powerful knowledge. While the theory of a flourishing life encourages the development of personal autonomy, allowing individuals to make successful choices, the theory of powerful knowledge examines the importance of traditional academic knowledge for individual success. The paper will also use the context of post-conflict societies, to reflect on the question of possible purposes of history education.

1. Introduction

Many educationalists have contested the view of determining the purposes of history education, arguing that ‘‘a specific reason for studying history is simply a transparent attempt to introduce ideology or social engineering into curriculum’’ (Barton & Levstik, 2004, pp. 26). On the other hand, researchers such as John White, Paddy Walsh and many others, attempt to define the purposes of history education with precision (Lee et al., 1992). As a result, the main debate has arisen between the researchers who emphasised the subject’s intrinsic value – namely, that history is important in its own right - and those who favoured its extrinsic value – history is important for moral or civic agenda (White, 1994).

The debate resonated so strongly with the culture wars of the second half of the twentieth century that it became a crucial part of them, particularly within the American society (Fea, 2013). Furthermore, the consensus has not been researched even between those who have argued for precise definition of the purposes of history education. Instead, there are constant changes to the prevailing opinions replete with diverging voices. One of the most important changes was a step back from history as a means of transmission of particular civic and moral values, to history as the development of intellectual autonomy (White, 2004). The conflicting nature of these purposes is one of the many points that reflects the complexity of the question.

*Corresponding author E-mail address: danilo.kovac.17@alumni.ucl.ac.uk

Note: The article has been published in the WORLDCTE conference proceedings under the title "What Should be the Purposes of History Education".

Cite this article as:

Kovac, D. (2021). The Purposes of History Education in the Context of “Flourishing Life”, “Powerful Knowledge” and Political Reconciliation. *European Journal of Teaching and Education*, 3(1):11-19. <https://doi.org/10.33422/ejte.v3i1.648>

© The Author(s). 2021 Open Access. This article is distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and redistribution in any medium, provided that the original author(s) and source are credited.



The research conducted by Haydn and Harris (2010) revealed that many students were unaware of the reasons of why history is useful or important and specifically, what are the purposes of learning the subject. If students are unable to answer this question, they are less likely to personalise the past and see it relevant to their own life which directly corresponds to their intrinsic motivation and learning outcomes (Kitson et al., 2011; Harris 2005).

Having in mind the aforementioned findings of Haydn and Harris (2010), it is essential for curriculum writers, classroom practitioners as well as students, to have clarity on the overarching purposes of history education and its corresponding contents. Consequently, the question of the purposes of studying history is of crucial importance and should be revisited in various contents. With this in mind, my intention is to examine the question against the background of the two main contemporary theories of education. Similarly, I will use the context of my own professional involvement – a post-conflict society – to reflect on it.

2. Should a Flourishing Life Be a Purpose of History Education?

This section will touch upon the three aspects developed by White (1992, 1990) and Reiss and White (2014) in terms of the theory of a flourishing life. The authors' ideas related to education in general are mutually interconnected. The first concept is in relation to developing autonomous individuals and it is linked to their second idea, which bases the value of education on the spreading of democratic values. The last aspect discussed in this chapter assesses the benefits of studying particular periods of history.

White (1990) sees the benefits of education in terms of developing autonomous individuals within a liberal-democratic society. He explains that education may lead to a flourishing life, as each individual shall be enabled to make their own life choices. In his view, each person's flourishing is integral with the care for others' flourishing as well. Similarly, Reiss & White (2014, pp. 77) argue for the two distinct aims of education in relation to a flourishing life; namely, "to enable each learner to lead a life that is personally flourishing and to help others to do so too". In their further discourse they explain what today is considered as a personally flourishing life, referring to personal autonomy as its main feature. Education, in other words, should enable individuals to navigate autonomously through a wide range of choices in their lives. Appreciating all the values of the Western civilisation, I consider their argument flawed, given that a personal autonomy is not an ideal upon which many other cultures exist (Hofstede, 2001). Therefore, it cannot universally contribute to a personally flourishing life. The lack of awareness of other existing social contexts in terms of a 'flourishing life' is even more surprising given that the authors theorise what was considered a flourishing life in the past.

On the topic of the history education purposes, White's (1992) stances are consistent with his previous views of the purposes of education in general. He considers that it opens up a wide range of possibilities for a person in terms of employment, leisure, politics, and other areas. Further explaining his theory, White specifies history "as indispensable in making us aware of the key role of the value of personal autonomy" (White, 1992, pp. 16).

Given that the purpose of history education is also to "weigh alternatives and think of people different than ourselves" (Barton & Levstik 2004, pp. 37), and to develop "empathy towards the difference of others" (Kitson et al., 2011, pp. 127), I am of the belief that history studying ought to transcend the ideals of one part of the world; it should enable students to understand the reasons of those who do not share their own set of values, in terms described by White. Nonetheless, in my view, White failed to apply his notions by basing the benefits of education on a value that is not universally accepted. In doing so he failed to demonstrate the understanding for others, which is an essential purpose of his theory of history education.

Similarly, Reiss & White (2014) base the second aim of the concept of a flourishing life on spreading of moral values, to which they refer to in the context of a particular model of western democracy. They claim that "as a part of their moral education, schools should help students

to become informed and active citizens of a liberal democratic society” (pp. 79). They further state that education should encourage students “to take an interest in political affairs at local, national and global levels from the standpoint of a concern for the general good and to do this with due regard to framework values of liberal democracy” (pp. 79-80).

In a similar vein, Barton & Levstik (2004, pp. 35) see the purpose of history education in that “students will be best prepared for democratic citizenship if they receive a broadly humanistic education” However, I believe that seeing the world through the lens of one political system, and with its over presence in the curriculum, students miss one of the important opportunities for critical thinking as envisaging alternatives and developing tolerance are said to be important purposes of history education (Fea, 2013). Similarly, Lee (1992) contends that history education should change young peoples’ views by teaching them history and not by nurturing them as democratic citizens. He supports his argument by drawing on the existing disagreement about the very concept of democracy and the meaning on the term a “democratic citizen”.

Brant & Panjwani (2015) also argue against the dominance of only one (neo-liberal) understanding of economics in the school curriculum, emphasising benefits of studying and analysing other economic theories as well as being aware of the current challenges facing the neo-liberal economy.

Having in mind the above-mentioned, I am of the view that history education should primarily enable students to critically analyse any social issue and a set of values before accepting it. Only after doing so students should be learned how to behave in a system they live in. Instead of spreading democratic messages, glorifying the system, history education should enable students to critically analyse it in order to further improve it. This is how, in my opinion, history education, empowers students to, with deliberate thinking, lead an intellectual and flourishing life.

White (1992, pp. 18) also assesses which part of the history curriculum should be emphasised within the British education system. Emphasising the ideas that “self-knowledge and an awareness of social framework of the autonomous life and choices within it” are an important part of a flourishing life, White argues that the curriculum should be more weighted towards recent history. Not dismissing remote past as unimportant, White considers that the period of the last two thousand years, which starts with the emergence of the industrialised societies, is best suited for the goal of a flourishing life. In similar terms he proposed the aims of the subject in the light of promoting patriotism. He supports it with the argument that future citizens should have a sense of belonging to the larger polity in order the existing way of life is possible.

However, taking into consideration the strengths of White’s arguments it might be useful to consider what might be the practical disadvantages of his approach. If assessing cause and consequence is taken as one of the aims of history teaching, then the period of two thousand years provides enough room for a deep look into the topic. Change and continuity is to my five-month experience in Britain the second most common aim of British history teachers. This aim can be assessed only partially through the teaching of recent history. To better understand the post-industrial British history, I consider it essential to appreciate what its main advantages are compared to the pre-existing society. In order to understand what has actually changed, knowledge of more distant past is equally important. It cannot be denied, however, that White’s arguments are consistent. Studying recent history, I would say, perfectly corresponds with the White’s stance that history should prepare future democratic citizens. I am of the view, however, that if we want our students to at least to a certain extent transcend their current socio-political context and understand what it means to be a member of a mankind, studying remote history (in both, geographical and especially chronological terms) should be more appropriate. For this reason, I am more inclined to lean towards Lee’s (1992) interpretation of transformative aims of history education. He maintains that personal and social aims cannot have priority over transformative aims of history. Lee considers in which ways history education can transform how young people perceive the world and states that: “changing

people's world view through history is not the same sort of thing as changing their world view through patriotism" (pp. 24)

Consequently, I hold the view that a history curriculum based on the concept of personal autonomy, glorifying democratic values and leaning towards the recent history, cannot lead to a universally flourishing life. As a consequence, such curricula do not correspond with what I consider the overall purposes of history education.

3. Should Powerful Knowledge Be a Purpose of History Education?

In defining what powerful knowledge is, Young et al. (2014) gave three criteria according to which powerful knowledge is different from the knowledge students acquire in their everyday life, it is systematic and finally, it is specialised. They also explain that powerful knowledge enables learners to envisage alternatives. Similarly, in one of his works Young (2009, pp. 111) argues that the powerful knowledge, which should be delivered through schools, "provides a basis for making judgements and is usually, but not solely, associated with sciences". Young holds this knowledge in high regard, as it is the opportunity for students to move intellectually. In this chapter I will discuss several features of powerful knowledge and their applicability to the context of history education. The features concern the contribution of powerful knowledge to learners' intellectual advancement, superiority of academic knowledge over day-to-day knowledge; the power of academic knowledge to reduce social inequality; the relationship between powerful knowledge and politics, and finally pedagogic hierarchy.

Being a science teacher himself, Young sees his own subject as particularly valuable for delivering powerful knowledge. Without any intention to dismiss the importance of science education in this context, I firmly believe, however, that history education fulfils the criteria of powerful knowledge. The critical analysis of events and processes in the past are much different from students' everyday experiences, and this knowledge can be acquired through a systematic history education (Wineburg, 2001). Furthermore, history as a school subject, should engage students in weighing alternatives and reaching conclusions which would enable them to explain the current state of affairs in many domains, drawing on similar examples in the past (Barton & Levstik, 2004). Posing counterfactual historical questions is just one of the useful pedagogic tools to enable students to envisage alternatives (Chapman, 2003), which is defined as an important feature of powerful knowledge. Teaching about cause and consequence (Chapman & Woodcock, 2006, Woodcock, 2011; 2005), change and continuity (Blow, 2011; Counsell, 2011; Foster, 2008), provides a valuable basis for making judgements not only about the past, but also about the present. All these skills applied through specialised and systematic teaching can undoubtedly influence students' intellectual progress. As a history educator, I see one of the purposes of history education in helping students' intellectual progress, what corresponds to the criteria of powerful knowledge. What I do not agree with, however, is the social aspects of powerful knowledge.

Young (2009) gives two main arguments why academic knowledge, delivered through specialised subjects, does not necessarily enhance existing social inequality. One of his points is that powerful knowledge enables students to make generalisations and to transcend over social and historical origins. Young goes further arguing that a powerful knowledge is particularly useful for students from disadvantaged backgrounds, as it provides an opportunity, which they would not have in their day-to-day life. Thus, academic knowledge they acquire in schools is superior to their everyday knowledge. Young (2009) holds the view that academic knowledge can claim objectivity, it is based on scientific disciplines and coherent, while everyday knowledge is personal, uninformed and naive, and thus inferior to academic knowledge.

Catling & Martin (2011) expressed a different point, arguing that even though a child's experiences are different to that of an adult, they are no less valid to appreciate and investigate.

The authors explain that children develop sophisticated understanding of the world through risk-taking and errors making. Consequently, Catling & Martin (2011, pp. 325) emphasised the importance of children's everyday knowledge stating that "we see both (they think academic and everyday knowledge) as being part of any curriculum".

Young's (2009) idea of the superiority of academic knowledge over students' everyday conceptions is worth considering when it comes specifically to history education. It is particularly important because students may encounter different, or sometimes conflicting interpretations of history at their homes and in the classroom setting. Kitson et al. (2011) argue that if young people find classroom history lessons too distant from to their own class, race or gender, they are likely to dismiss it. They pointed out the fact that children learn history through family traditions, games and street art, explaining that dismissing this knowledge as a myth or too popular is dismissing the ways in which young people acquire knowledge. Similarly, Harris (2005) emphasised the importance of personalising the past or making links to the locality for capturing students' imagination for academic content of the subject.

I believe that history teaching is intrinsically linked with social, geographical and cultural identity and thus there are several starting points in history teaching. These differences given, I find it difficult to believe that history education can contribute to social equality, in the way which Young envisaged. Besides social issue, Young's argument about policy and education is worth considering.

Another point discussed by Young (2013) is the relationship between politics and 'powerful knowledge'. It seems that Young (2013, pp. 114) tried to distance himself from the connection between education and political issues stating that "reducing social inequalities is primarily a political task of establishing a more equal society, not an educational task". Young (2013, pp. 115) goes further, stating that "a knowledge based curriculum will highlight and not mask social inequalities in our society". Similarly, referring on his past work Young (2013, pp. 107) states: "My discipline and specifically my own early work-has spent too much time on the political question-who defines the knowledge base of the curriculum."

I deeply disagree with Young's argument that it is possible to discuss the purpose of schools without taking into account political context and the power of generalisations. I hold this opinion for two reasons:

Firstly, Young's theory of generalisation is to my mind contradictory in itself. In his work Young (2013) acknowledges that some of academic knowledge is flawed. But how to make universally valuable generalisation on a flawed knowledge? This to my view particularly important when it comes to history knowledge, which has another *sui generis* feature, as it is "always limited by our distance from the past" (Lee et al., 1992, pp. 22).

Secondly, Young (2013) seems to have neglected the issue of who defines the basis of knowledge upon which students make generalisation. Choosing a particular content, or a particular group of sources, instead of the other, can serve to justify any argument. In other words, using different data, students may make different generalisations. For the purpose of explanation, I will just take a simple example of a couple who have ended their relationship. They will probably agree on the favourite places they spent time together, about the clothes they commonly wore, about their favourite jokes, etc. They would not agree, however, on the reasons of their break-up. These people are two historical sources that maybe rightfully have a different interpretation of the past event. It is possible to make two completely different generalisation based on their accounts. This example seems to be at odds with Young's assumptions about the universal power of generalisation as a basis for powerful knowledge. Given that every society is based on hierarchy, I believe that the ruling class (group) may determine what knowledge should be used to make generalisations. It goes without saying that the degree of the interference of the ruling class in education depends on the level of democracy that exists within a society.

I believe that history education is particularly important for the social groups in power as it can be powerful in spreading political messages. Numerous examples of how history teaching was in service of particular ideas goes beyond this paper. I would just mention a few ongoing issues in Britain and in my own country, where history teaching is concerned. Many aspects of the British Empire are not universally answered (Visram, 2006). This is the reason for universal generalisation being particularly unreachable. The question of identities in politically unstable regions of the Balkans, is far from having a clear answer. Consequently, students in different parts of the region are offered different examples on which they make completely opposite generalisations and forge their identities.

Another principle on which Young et al. (2014) bases powerful knowledge is the distinct pedagogic hierarchy between teachers and students. I believe that this hierarchy is not universally applicable, especially when it comes to historical questions linked with young peoples' political views. For example, Lee & Shemilt (2009) mention that one of the purposes of history education is to help young people better understand the present and to navigate them away from a less desirable future. Having this purpose in mind, I wonder to what extent a right-wing oriented teacher can be hierarchically superior to a left-wing eighteen-year-old student, when making an analogy between a present and past political event. Their interpretation of causes of a political event may differ in accordance to their political views. Consequently, the distinct pedagogic hierarchy on which powerful knowledge is based may not be universally applicable.

The counter-arguments aforementioned to a powerful knowledge might be relevant only to history education. However, White (2012) notes that Young did not specify which academic subjects generate a powerful knowledge in his debate on the Framework for the National Curriculum. While supposing that maths and science give students access to a powerful knowledge, White asked whether it is the case with the subject such as history. In his response to this article, Young (2012) discussed many points raised by White, but did not provide a clear answer to the question related to history education.

The purposes of a powerful knowledge and history education mainly diverge in the aspects discussed above. Nonetheless, they overlap in terms of learners' intellectual advancement.

4. Could Political Reconciliation Be the Purpose of History Education?

Asked about the purposes of history education, many teachers gave a variety of responses (Chapman et al., 2018). Examining the extent to which history education can help political reconciliation is the topic of this chapter.

McCully (2010) argues that one of the ways in which history education can help in the process of reconciliation is through testimonies of those who lived at the time, irrespective of whether they were survivors, victims, perpetrators or bystanders. These stories, to her mind, can unlock emotional barriers and develop personal empathy.

Museums can be used for reconciliation purposes, sharing personal stories with students outside the classroom setting which can spread more meaningful messages and contribute to political reconciliation. I shall highlight several examples these. The Museum of Silent Heroes in Berlin collected biographies of ordinary German people who risked their lives to help endangered Jews. One of the many possible discussions which can break down generalisations, stereotypes, and helping develop some higher order thoughts, pertains to the motivation of ordinary German citizens helping-others, putting in danger their own life and the safety of their families. The second museum worth considering in this context is the Museum of Otto Dweit in Berlin. It is located in the setting of Dweit's former factory, which operated during the Second World War. Running a lucrative business of producing various types of brushes for the German army, Dweit deliberately employed Jews (especially ill sighted) to save their lives. The Museum of Grande Guerre in Peron (France) is another example of how museums can be

used for the purposes of reconciliation. The Museum follows the course of the First World War from the French, British and German perspectives, without bias and portrayal of victors and losers that may cause offense. Consequently, both French and German teachers visit it when teaching about the Great War. Needless to say, important messages are taught from the disasters of the world wars to future generations. However, my point is that these messages can be transmitted through history education in a way that they reinforce animosity from the past, or to contribute to reconciliation in a way stated above.

McCully (2010) recognises the circumstances arduous when dealing with the immediate aftermath of conflict, where grief, anger and personal trauma may hinder history education. Needless to say, educational challenges are further strained when the events are still disputed. As A. R. Chapman (2007, pp. 318) explained, it is very common in deeply divided societies where “there is a need for multiple level of healing and reconciliation”. McCully (2010) emphasised that history education in this context draws on heroic deeds, trying to justify the right of a system or a state to exist, reinforcing a particular, clear message through the history curriculum. The same author has a recipe for teachers to overcome this difficulty. McCully (2010) proposes the pedagogic approach based on historical enquiry. In that way, he argues, young people will examine historical evidence and reach judgements for themselves.

Working in this social context myself, I am of the view that McCully’s (2010) proposal cannot be universally applied. If political structures which produced conflicts are still in power, it goes without saying that they will keep a close eye on education. Consequently, in less democratic countries, these political structures may try to prevent teachers from exercising educational freedoms enabling students to reach judgements for themselves. Accordingly, I am of the view that political reconciliation may be owed to history education if events are not disputed, or political structures from the time of a conflict are changed. Otherwise, history education does not have the potential to contribute to political reconciliation.

5. Conclusion

Given that history education is inextricably linked to the learner’s cultural, social, geographical context, I consider it impossible discover the universal recipe which would help individuals lead a flourishing life. Instead of focusing its values on autonomy and individuality, history education should aim at moving humankind to the next stage of its socio-political development. Even though the power of history education cannot transcend over political context, it can assist both a learner’s intellectual and moral advancement. Learning about cultures chronologically distant and different to themselves, learner may better understand the very nature of being different. Consequently, they may better comprehend the multicultural world in which they live and be more tolerant towards people different from themselves. Taught on the examples from the past to recognise and navigate away from the causes of conflicts, history education should contribute to reducing each kind of individual and group conflict making the world better place to live.

References

- Barton, K., & Levstik, L. (2004). *Teaching History for the Common Good*. London, Routledge.
- Blow, F. (2011). ‘Everything flows and nothing stays’: how students make sense of the historical concepts of change, continuity and development. *Teaching History*, 145, 47-55.
- Brant, J., & Panjwani, F. (2015). School economics and the aims of education: Critique and Possibilities. *Journal of Critical Realism*, 14(3), 306-324.
- Catling, S., & Martin, F. (2011). Contesting powerful knowledge: the primary geography curriculum as an articulation between academic and children’s (ethno-) geographies. *Curriculum Journal*, 22(3), 317-335.

- Chapman, A. (2003). Camels, diamonds and counterfactuals: a model for teaching causal reasoning. *Teaching History*, 112, 46-53.
- Chapman, A. J., Burn, K., & Kitson, A. (2018). What is School History For? British Student-teachers' Perspectives//¿ Para Qué Sirve La Enseñanza De La Historia? Perspectivas De Docentes y Estudiantes Británicos. *Arbor: Revista de Ciencia, Pensamiento y Cultura*, 194(788).
- Chapman, A., & Woodcock, J. (2006). Mussolini's missing marbles: simulating history at GCSE. *History Teaching*, 124, pp.17-26.
- Chapman, A. R. (2010). Afterword. In E. A. Cole (Ed.), *Teaching The Violent Past, History Education and Reconciliation* (pp.317-329). Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Counsell, C. (2011). What do we want students to do with historical change and continuity?. In I. Davies (Eds.), *Debates in History Teaching* (pp. 109-123). London: Routledge.
- Fea, J. (2013). *Why Study History: Reflecting on the Importance of the Past*. Michigan, Baker Academic.
- Foster, R. (2008). Speed cameras, dead-ends, drivers and diversions: Year 9 use a 'road map' to problematise change and continuity. *Teaching History*, 131, 4-8.
- Harris, R. (2005). Does differentiation have to mean different? *Teaching History*, 118, 5-12.
- White, J. (2003). *Rethinking the school curriculum: Values, aims and purposes*. Routledge.
- Haydn, T. & Harris, R. (2010). Pupil perspectives on the purposes and benefits of studying history in high school: a view from the UK. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 42 (2), 241-261.
- Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's Consequences: Comparing Values, Behaviours, Institutions and Organizations Across Nations*. Second Edition, Thousand Oaks, CA Sage Publications.
- Kitson, A., Husbands, C., & Steward, S. (2011). *Teaching learning history 11-18 understanding the past*, Maidenhead, McGraw-Hill.
- Lee, P., & Shemilt, D. (2009). Is any explanation better than none? Over-determined narratives, senseless agencies and one-way streets in student's learning about cause and consequence in history. *Teaching History*, 137, 42-49.
- Lee, P. et al., (1992). *The Aims of School History: The National Curriculum and Beyond*, London, The Tufnell Press.
- McCully, A. (2010). What Role for History Teaching in the Transitional Justice Process in Deeply Divided Societies?. In I. Nakou & I. Barca, (Eds.), *Contemporary public debates over history education* (pp. 78-99). Charlotte, N.C.: Information Age Publishing.
- Reiss, M.J. & White, J. (2014). An aims-based curriculum illustrated by the teaching of science in schools, *The Curriculum Journal*, 25, 76-89.
- Visram, R. (2006). British history: whose history? Black perspective on British history. *Teaching History*, 94, 20-26.
- White, J (2012) Bibliographical note. Online. Available: <https://www.newvisionsforeducation.org.uk/about-the-group/home/2012/05/14/powerful-knowledge-too-weak-a-pr-op-for-the-traditional-curriculum/> (accessed 30 December 2018)
- White, J. (2004). *Rethinking the school curriculum: values, aims and purposes*, London, Routledge.
- White, J. (1994) The aims of School History. *Teaching History*, 74, 7-9.

- White, J. (1992). The Purpose of School History: Has the National Curriculum Got Right?. In Lee, P., White, J. P., Walsh, P., & Slater, J. (1992). *The aims of school history: The national curriculum and beyond* (pp. 9-19). London: Tufnell Press.
- White, J. (1990). *Education and the Good Life: Beyond the National Curriculum*. London: Kogan Page in association with the Institute of Education, University of London.
- Wineburg, S. (2001). Why study history?. Wineburg, Sam (2001): *Historical thinking and other unnatural Acts. Charting the future of teaching the past*. Temple University Press. Philadelphia, 3-27.
- Woodcock, J. (2005). Does the linguistic release the conceptual? Helping Year 10 to improve their causal reasoning. *Teaching History*, 119, 5-14.
- Woodcock, J. (2011). Causal explanation. In I. Davies (Ed.), *Debates in History Teaching* (124-136). London: Routledge.
- Young, M., Lambert, D., & Roberts, C. (2014). *Knowledge and the Future School: Curriculum and Social Justice*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Young, M. (2009). What are schools for?. In M. Young., & J. Muller, J. (2015) *Curriculum and the specialization of knowledge: Studies in the sociology of education*. Routledge.
- Young, M., & Muller, J. (2015). *Curriculum and the specialization of knowledge: Studies in the sociology of education*. Routledge.
- Young, M. (2013). Overcoming the crisis in curriculum theory: a knowledge-based approach. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 45(2), 101-118.
- Young, M. (2012) Bibliographical note. Online: <https://www.newvisionsforeducation.org.uk/about-the-group/home/2012/05/03/the-curriculum-%E2%80%98an-entitlement-to-powerful-knowledge%E2%80%99-a-response-to-john-white/> (accessed 30 December 2018)