

## **'I'm good at art, but stupid': time to check and challenge the state of the National Curriculum**

### **Summary of main points:**

- The national curriculum for art and design concentrates student learning on the 'appreciation of great artists and designers'.
- Appreciation is an outdated art historical concept that embeds educational disadvantage by devaluing young people's poor and working-class communities.
- Appreciation trivialises the discipline, relying on unhelpful stereotypes of creative identity that have negative consequences for learning, mental health, and employability.
- The language of appreciation misrepresents the making process, contributing to the deskilling of young people and disconnecting the national curriculum from learning at universities and the needs of industry.
- Reforming the national curriculum for art and design to concentrate on practical intelligence, making, and investigating would be more inclusive and improve student engagement.
- Practical intelligence, making, and investigating can protect creative occupations from the threat of AI and enhance the scope for inter-disciplinary working.
- Concentrating on practical intelligence, making, and investigating could support the learning needs and self-worth of pupils who choose not to go to university as well as those who do.

### **Introduction**

What kind of educational experience enables a young person, aged twelve, to arrive at the conclusion that they are 'good at art, but stupid'? In the summer of 2022, I journeyed to Barnsley to assist the evaluation of an arts and health project called *Draw Hope*, a wellbeing initiative devised by the Borough's Museums and Heritage Trust for vulnerable young people referred by the NHS Social Prescription Service. I'd been involved in the pilot and had dropped in on a Saturday morning session, where the youngest person in the room introduced themselves using this phrase. How, at aged twelve, could they be so sure that having a gift for art was not a marker of intelligence? What kind of education system do we have if it allows young people to write themselves (and art) off by Year 7? This policy note asks Westminster to listen to this young person and to heed the very human cost of this country's present education system.

In 2023 the House of Lords Committee for Education for 11 to 16 year olds published *Requires improvement: urgent change for 11-16 education*. The report criticised the ‘narrow’ curriculum of the English education system’s EBaccalaureate (Ebacc), its denigration of creative subjects and inability to meet the needs of employers or fulfil its promise of social mobility.<sup>1</sup> In 2024 the Government published its response, which refuted the House of Lords’ evidence and rejected its recommendations.<sup>2</sup> This paper is a reply to the Government’s response. My evidence iterates the need for reform by asking Parliament to reflect on the myths about art, creativity and social mobility that underpin current education policy in England.

The arguments I put forward are informed by my work as a Professor of Art and Art History, and roles as a representative of the Council for Higher Education in Art & Design (CHEAD) and National Art Education Archive (NAEA).<sup>3</sup> For twenty years I have taught at York St John University (YSJU), an institution committed to social justice and widening participation. This career choice has been determined by my ethical stance as an educator; I was the first in my family to go to university and I am a native of Barnsley, one of the poorest Boroughs in the country where fewer than 10% of school leavers go on to higher education. The students who come from poor and working-class communities like mine choose universities based on geography, cost and whether they can see themselves fitting in. I remain committed to supporting the learning of these young people.

**The national curriculum, appreciation, and social mobility**

In England, the statutory national curriculum for art and design from Key Stage 1 to 3 (KS1-KS3, ages four to fourteen) concentrates student learning on the 'appreciation of great artists and designers'.<sup>4</sup> Each Key Stage is prefaced by a Purpose of Study statement, which affirms that 'art, craft and design embody some of the highest forms of human creativity'.<sup>5</sup> Given this noble standing, the Purpose of Study concludes, pupils 'should [...] know about how art and design both reflect and shape our history, and contribute to the culture, creativity and wealth of our nation'.<sup>6</sup> This thinking is consistent with what British art historian Sir Herbert Read (1893 — 1968) named the 'common assumption' that to develop an appreciation for culture is a transformative experience that permits ordinary people to learn the 'language' of art and 'lift' themselves 'on to the cultural level'.<sup>7</sup> It is this idea that supports the Department of Education's belief that a knowledge-based curriculum for art and design in England is the best way to turbo charge social mobility.<sup>8</sup>

In 2023 the journal *Sociology* published an analysis of fifty-years of creative occupation employment data from the Office of National Statistics.<sup>9</sup> Brook and his co-authors found that the opportunity for creative work is and always has been 'profoundly unequal in class terms'.<sup>10</sup> In 1941 Read made it clear that the concept of appreciation as a civilising and cultivating social leveller is 'fundamentally wrong, and fundamentally undemocratic'.<sup>11</sup> Eighty years later Diane Reay, Professor of Education at Oxford echoed Read's argument, blasting Ofsted's 'authoritarian and elitist' emphasis on the acquisition of cultural capital as an act of middle-class acculturation.<sup>12</sup> 'I'm good at art, but stupid' succinctly articulates the injustice that Read and Reay identify.

Appreciation teaches pupils that culture happens elsewhere, on a global stage, not at the level of the local. The unwritten assumption of the curriculum for art and design is that the lives lived in poor and working-class communities are not great or noble, but provincial and parochial. If artists are to acquire cultural legitimacy they must, as sociologist Pierre Bourdieu expressed it, abandon their 'provincial backgrounds'.<sup>13</sup> If a pupil fails to engage with or value the knowledge deemed relevant by the curriculum it is perceived to be their fault; their lack of aspiration, intelligence and/or wilful ignorance, not the fault of an education system that only sees them and their families in terms of deficit. In short 'I'm good at art, but stupid' articulates what Reay calls the sense of 'individual lack' that grows in young people as they internalise the English education's systematic discrimination against class.<sup>14</sup>

## **Section 2 Biography, ideas, intentions: the impact of appreciation on learning**

Appreciation not only inscribes hierarchies of class in learning, but its language moulds art and design to the requirements of a knowledge-based curriculum whilst reinforcing their reputation as practical, non-academic subjects. To briefly summarise that language; the first aim of KS1 is to enable pupils 'to produce creative work, exploring their ideas and recording their experiences'.<sup>15</sup> From this beginning the curriculum instructs students to develop a use of 'colour, pattern, texture, line, shape, form and space,' enabling them to become 'proficient' in the techniques of 'art, craft and design' and to 'evaluate and analyse' their work using the 'language of art'.<sup>16</sup> At KS2 pupils must 'improve their mastery' of techniques and come to 'know about great artists, craft makers and designers'. KS3 asks students to become 'proficient in their handling of materials' and organise their knowledge of the history of art, craft, design and architecture via 'periods, styles and major movements from

ancient times up to the present day.<sup>17</sup> Finally, KS4 places particular emphasis on pupils' 'personal intentions', citing them no less than seventeen times over seven pages of GCSE documentation.<sup>18</sup> 'Intentions should be realised' it states, 'through purposeful engagement with visual language, visual concepts, media, materials and the application of appropriate techniques and working methods'.<sup>19</sup>

The vocabulary of 'ideas', 'mastery', 'meanings', 'movements', 'personal intention' and 'style' all conform to an understanding of creativity which is biographical in origin. As art historian Catherine Soussloff pointed out, biography has been the 'dominant' cultural and art historical 'source for the construction of the image of the artist' since the beginning of the 1500s.<sup>20</sup> Central to this biographical understanding is the heroic mythology of the artist. Set apart from everyday people, this great artist can triumph over almost any adversity and any material due to their single-minded commitment to the realization of ideas.

The figure of the great artist may have been conceived in the Renaissance, but it has found a ready home in almost every century since. In particular the great artist tallied with the meritocratic ideals of the eighteenth-century Enlightenment, informing the creation of the Louvre Museum and National Gallery, London. In 1793 the opening of the Louvre had been intended to sustain revolution, the purpose of the opening of the National Gallery, as part of the remodelling of Charing Cross and Westminster, had been to forestall it.<sup>21</sup> Both museums sought to divorce the status of art from the aristocracy and the monarch and transfer its power to the people. The display of art in these new institutions was organised into movements and national schools, devised to celebrate the achievements of great men who were able to earn their place in history. This performed an important ideological function,

aiming to inspire national pride and invest the general populace in the shared cultural wealth of the State as citizens, rather than demand their deference as subjects of the monarch.<sup>22</sup> In the twentieth century, movements and national schools gave structure to the bewildering phenomenon of Modern art. Within the white walls of new institutions such as the Museum of Modern Art, New York, colour, line, shape, and surface became isolated formal problems, distanced from the world to which they responded, making way for the concepts of artistic gesture and style as expressions of creative personality. In the twenty-first century these romanticised myths found a new and fertile home on the internet, a resource on which most pupils rely.

The language of learning employed for art and design in England is indebted to this history. Its reverence for centuries of great artists and designers is intended to inspire young people, presenting role models of individual agency and imagination that can align pupil's world view to the entrepreneurship essential for our Creative and Cultural Industries. 'Requires improvement' presents compelling evidence to the contrary, however, arguing that opportunities to develop the 'skills of collaboration, creativity and problem solving', prerequisites for success in the creative industries, have been 'squeezed' out of English education by the Ebacc.<sup>23</sup> I would suggest that the introduction of appreciation to the curriculum in the late 80s and early 90s was the first decisive step in the deskilling and denigration of the discipline. An art historical approach to the discipline offered an 'appraisable core of knowledge', promising 'curriculum coherence and manageability'.<sup>24</sup> This rationalization of assessment and teacher education rejected the recommendations of the 1991 curriculum working group, chaired by archaeologist and Conservative peer Sir Colin

Renfrew, that asked for teaching to concentrate on 'making, investigating, and understanding'.<sup>25</sup>

Academics have spent the last fifty years disentangling the discipline from appreciation: a theoretical framework that is wholly inadequate to the task of articulating how art and design get made and matter for the world we live in. Universities expect undergraduates to engage critically with their work to take its relationship to culture and society seriously. Appreciation teaches students to heap praise on their subject, hindering the development of critical thinking, an essential skill for life and learning. In the biography led knowledge-based performance context appreciation creates dependent learners who expect to be told how to develop a thing they call 'my art'. This misapprehension has a profoundly damaging effect on their capacity to learn and wellbeing.

University tuition is not perceived by students as a catalyst to their development and confidence as professionals in a field. Rather it is a direct threat to a creative identity and sense of self-worth constructed via dangerous popular stereotypes that privilege artistic isolation and depressive temperaments, neither of which are good for mental health or employability.<sup>26</sup> Over the course of my career I have witnessed the annual influx of undergraduates turn into cohorts with progressively fewer and fewer creative skills who have lost the capacity for thought, originality, and innovation because they fear making mistakes. Success as an undergraduate now depends on how much resource creative courses can dedicate in three years to undoing the damage done by twelve years of the national curriculum.

### Section 3 Knowledge and skills; Or making, investigating, and understanding?

'I'm good at art, but stupid' neatly expresses the curriculum's fundamental blind spot; the belief that the practice of art and design is skilled and technical, but not academic. This perception is evident in the Government's rejection of the House of Lords' call to reduce the content of the national curriculum to make more time for creative skills:

The latest evidence about how the brain works is clear that knowledge and skills are not in conflict, but rather that students have to build knowledge to give them the material through which to develop skills: skills cannot be developed in the abstract, but only by applying relevant knowledge, so that is where an effective curriculum has to start.<sup>27</sup>

To presume that skills only develop in response to relevant knowledge is to misunderstand the formative role played by the handling of materials and tools. Materials and tools are not 'abstract' but indebted to their physical properties, and the histories of their development and use. The curriculum's reference to materials and techniques implies, anthropologist Professor Tim Ingold would argue, that creative works first happens 'in the head'.<sup>28</sup> Just as the arguments made in this policy note were crafted through the writing process, materials and skills are a means of what Ingold calls 'thinking through making'.<sup>29</sup>

University teaching gives central importance to making, as evidenced by the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education's subject benchmark statement:

Art and design skills, particularly those in 'making', contribute to cognitive development and engage learners. Through engagement with materials, processes and ideas, 'making' develops creativity, inventiveness, problem solving and practical intelligence.<sup>30</sup>

Making is also integral to the assessment of the 'originality, significance and rigour' of art and design outputs in the Research Excellence Framework (REF).<sup>31</sup> The REF, coordinated by the Government's non-departmental body, UK Research and Innovation (UKRI), assesses art and design's contribution to the economy, culture, knowledge and society on a national and



international level, rewarding excellence via the allocation of public funding. Creative submissions to REF are supported by statements that explain the synthesis of materials, skills and ideas in their research process.<sup>32</sup> There is, therefore, a fundamental disconnect in the English education system between the importance assigned to making in teaching and research in universities and the national curriculum.

## **Conclusion**

How is a twelve-year-old to know that in the grown-up world of the creative industries and universities you can't be good at art *and* stupid? To be good at art and design is to create new ways to make sense of the world and live better lives within it. In the twenty-first century we can leave the rehashing of relevant knowledge to the algorithms of AI. What inures creative humans to the threat of artificial intelligence is the inherent unpredictability of art and design's outcomes. Making, investigating and understanding can lead to richer knowledges of self and world, enabling students to make connections between local and global cultures and societies, challenging disadvantage, and prejudice in all its forms. This stronger citizenship could support better mental health and employability for young people as whole but also capitalise on the creative benefits<sup>33</sup> of neurodevelopmental conditions such as ADHD and Dyslexia, which the knowledge-based system puts at far greater risk of disengagement and exclusion.<sup>34</sup> Practical intelligence could be a vital support a more inclusive and interdisciplinary education system, with positive benefits for pupils who choose not to go to university as well as those that do by attributing greater value to the skills and trades that this country relies on.

As 'Requires improvement' argued, reforming the national curriculum would take time and incur cost. Given the House of Common's 2023 report on the scale of the present mental

health crisis, is it not worth considering whether the benefits of reform might offset the costs that will be incurred to benefits, the NHS and the economy if we do nothing?<sup>35</sup> It is time that education policy crafted a national curriculum that is worthy of the young people who study it, and the society to which they belong.

©Vanessa Corby 2024, York St John University.

---

<sup>1</sup> House of Lords, Education for 11-16 Year Olds Committee, Report of Session 2023—24, *Requires improvement: urgent change for 11-16 education*, 12 December 2023.

<https://committees.parliament.uk/publications/42484/documents/211201/default/> Accessed 23/03/2024

<sup>2</sup> HM Gov., Department for Education, *Education for 11 to 16 Year Olds: Government response to the report of the House of Lords Committee*, 19 February 2024.

[https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/65cf4a154239310011b7b8f8/CP1026\\_Education\\_for\\_11\\_to\\_16\\_Year\\_Olds\\_-\\_Government\\_response\\_to\\_the\\_House\\_of\\_Lords\\_report.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/65cf4a154239310011b7b8f8/CP1026_Education_for_11_to_16_Year_Olds_-_Government_response_to_the_House_of_Lords_report.pdf) Accessed 25/03/2024

<sup>3</sup> Corby, V. (2024) 'Art, Prejudice, and Privilege: Disciplinary Elitism, Students from Working-Class Communities, and Epistemic Justice' in Meredith, M. *Universities and Epistemic Justice in a Plural World: Knowing Better*, Springer Press, New York. My professional standing is indebted to the privilege of a Russell Group education and the tutelage of one of the most pre-eminent art historians in the country. From the mid 1990s to the early 2000s I studied under Professor Griselda Pollock at the University of Leeds. Now Professor Emerita of the social and critical histories of art, Pollock was named Holberg Prize Laureate in 2020.

<sup>4</sup> HM Gov., Department for Education, (2010) *The importance of teaching: the schools white paper 2010* <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/the-importance-of-teaching-the-schools-white-paper-2010> and HM Gov., Department for Education, (2013) *Statutory Guidance, National curriculum in England: Art and design programmes of study*: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-curriculum-in-england-art-and-design-programmes-of-study/national-curriculum-in-england-art-and-design-programmes-of-study> Accessed 24/03/2024

<sup>5</sup> HM Gov., Department for Education, (2013) *Statutory Guidance, National curriculum in England: Art and design programmes of study* <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-curriculum-in-england-art-and-design-programmes-of-study/national-curriculum-in-england-art-and-design-programmes-of-study> Accessed 24/03/2024

<sup>6</sup> Ibid.

<sup>7</sup> Read, H. (1941) *To Hell with Culture*, Kegan Paul, London, pp.44.

<sup>8</sup> HM Gov., Department for Education, (2022) *Opportunity for all: strong schools with great teachers for your child*, P.11.

[https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/62416cb5d3bf7f32add7819f/Opportunity\\_for\\_all\\_strong\\_schools\\_with\\_great\\_teachers\\_for\\_your\\_child\\_print\\_version.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/62416cb5d3bf7f32add7819f/Opportunity_for_all_strong_schools_with_great_teachers_for_your_child_print_version.pdf) Accessed 24/03/2024

<sup>9</sup> Brook, O., Miles, A., O'Brien, D., & Taylor, M. (2023). Social Mobility and 'Openness' in Creative Occupations since the 1970s. *Sociology*, 57(4), 789-810. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00380385221129953>

<sup>10</sup> Brook, et al., (2023), p.802. The also affirm that 'gender and ethnicity compound inequalities of access to the cultural sector'.

<sup>11</sup> Read, H. (1941), p.45.

<sup>12</sup> Reay quoted in Mansell, W. (2019) 'Ofsted plan to inspect 'cultural capital' in schools attacked as elitist', *The Guardian*, 3rd September.

<sup>13</sup> Bourdieu, P. (2017 [2013]). *Manet: A symbolic revolution. Lectures at the Collège de France (1998–2000) followed by an unfinished manuscript by Pierre and Marie-Claire Bourdieu*. Trans. P. Collier and M. Rigaud-Dryton. Cambridge, UK, Polity Press. P.372.

<sup>14</sup> Reay, D. (2017). *Miseducation: Inequality, education, and the working classes*. Bristol, Polity Press, p.75.

<sup>15</sup> HM Gov., Department for Education, (2013) *Art and design programmes of study: key stage 1-2: National curriculum in England*, p.1.

[https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/5a7ba810ed915d4147621ca0/PRIMARY\\_national\\_curriculum\\_-\\_Art\\_and\\_design.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/5a7ba810ed915d4147621ca0/PRIMARY_national_curriculum_-_Art_and_design.pdf) Accessed 24/03/2024

<sup>16</sup> Ibid.

<sup>17</sup> Department for Education, UK Gov, (2013) *Art and design programmes of study: key stage 3: National curriculum in England*,

[https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/5a7c4e02ed915d3d0e87b798/SECONDARY\\_national\\_curriculum\\_-\\_Art\\_and\\_design.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/5a7c4e02ed915d3d0e87b798/SECONDARY_national_curriculum_-_Art_and_design.pdf) Accessed 24/03/2024

<sup>18</sup> HM Gov., Department for Education, (2015) *Art and Design: GCSE subject content*

[https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/5a7dcc7ded915d2ac884d9f9/GCSE\\_subject\\_content\\_for\\_art\\_and\\_design.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/5a7dcc7ded915d2ac884d9f9/GCSE_subject_content_for_art_and_design.pdf) Accessed 24/03/2024

<sup>19</sup> Ibid., p.4.

<sup>20</sup> Catherine M. Soussloff, (1990) "Lives of poets and painters in the Renaissance", *Word & Image*, 6, 2, pp.154-162

<sup>21</sup> See Arnold, D. (1995) 'Rationality, Safety and Power: The Street Planning of Later Georgian London', *The Georgian Group Journal*, Vol.5, p.43.

<sup>22</sup> Arnold 1995 p.49

<sup>23</sup> House of Lords, Education for 11-16 Year Olds Committee, Report of Session 2023—24, *Requires improvement: urgent change for 11-16 education*, 12 December 2023, p.3.

<https://committees.parliament.uk/publications/42484/documents/211201/default/> Accessed 23/03/2024

<sup>24</sup> Anon., (1992) Editorial, 'Art History in the National Curriculum', *The Burlington Magazine*, vol.134/No.1068, March. <https://www.burlington.org.uk/archive/editorial/art-history-in-the-national-curriculum>

<sup>25</sup> Steers, J. (2014) 'Reforming the school curriculum and assessment in England to match the best in the world – a cautionary tale', *The International Journal of Art & Design Education*, vol.33. no.1.

[https://www.researchgate.net/publication/264717577\\_Reforming\\_the\\_School\\_Curriculum\\_and\\_Assessment\\_in\\_England\\_to\\_Match\\_the\\_Best\\_in\\_the\\_World\\_-\\_A\\_Cautious\\_Tale](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/264717577_Reforming_the_School_Curriculum_and_Assessment_in_England_to_Match_the_Best_in_the_World_-_A_Cautious_Tale)

<sup>26</sup> See Gaztambide-Fernández, R. A. (2008). The Artist in Society: Understandings, Expectations, and Curriculum Implications. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 38(3), 233–265. <https://doi-org.yorksj.idm.oclc.org/10.1111/j.1467-873X.2008.00408.x>

<sup>27</sup> HM Gov., Department for Education, *Education for 11 to 16 Year Olds: Government response to the report of the House of Lords Committee*, 19 February 2024, p.12.

[https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/65cf4a154239310011b7b8f8/CP1026\\_Education\\_for\\_11\\_to\\_16\\_Year\\_Olds\\_-\\_Government\\_response\\_to\\_the\\_House\\_of\\_Lords\\_report.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/65cf4a154239310011b7b8f8/CP1026_Education_for_11_to_16_Year_Olds_-_Government_response_to_the_House_of_Lords_report.pdf) Accessed 25/03/2024

<sup>28</sup> Ingold has written extensively on the capacity for making and skill to craft new knowledge. See Ingold, T. (2011) *The Perception of the Environment: Essays on Livelihood, Dwelling and Skill*, Routledge, London) and Ingold, T. (2013), *Making: Anthropology, Archaeology, Art and Architecture*, (Routledge, London). More recently he has written on the limitations of knowledge-based education in Ingold, T. (2018) *Anthropology And/As Education*, (Routledge, London).

<sup>29</sup> Ingold, (2013), p.6.

<sup>30</sup> Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA), (2019) Subject Benchmark Statement: Art and Design, P.3. [https://www.qaa.ac.uk/docs/qaa/subject-benchmark-statements/sbs-art-and-design-17.pdf?sfvrsn=71eef781\\_16](https://www.qaa.ac.uk/docs/qaa/subject-benchmark-statements/sbs-art-and-design-17.pdf?sfvrsn=71eef781_16)

<sup>31</sup> UKRI, (2020) *REF2019/01 Guidance on Submissions* <https://2021.ref.ac.uk/publications-and-reports/guidance-on-submissions-201901/index.html> accessed 15/04/2024.

<sup>32</sup> UKRI, (2020) *REF2021 Research Excellence Framework: Panel criteria and working methods (2019/02)* [https://2021.ref.ac.uk/media/1450/ref-2019\\_02-panel-criteria-and-working-methods.pdf](https://2021.ref.ac.uk/media/1450/ref-2019_02-panel-criteria-and-working-methods.pdf) accessed 15/04/2024.

<sup>33</sup> See: Stolte, M., Trindade-Pons, V., Vlaming, P., Jakobi, B., Franke, B., Kroesbergen, E. H., Baas, M., Hoogman, M. (2022) 'Characterizing Creative Thinking and Creative Achievements in Relation to Symptoms of Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder and Autism Spectrum Disorder', *Frontiers in Psychiatry*, Volume 13 <https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/psychiatry/articles/10.3389/fpsy.2022.909202/full> Accessed 19/04/2023

<sup>34</sup> In 2022/23 the suspension and permanent exclusion rate for all children in the spring term in the UK is 3.13% and 0.04% UK Gov. <https://explore-education-statistics.service.gov.uk/find-statistics/suspensions-and-permanent-exclusions-in-england> The UK ADHD Partnership note that for students with ADHD 39% had been given a fixed term exclusion, while 11% have been permanently excluded. They also note that in 2008 the former government paper 'Back on Track' states that 66% of permanently excluded children have special education needs. <https://www.ukadhd.com/adhd-and-exclusion-in-schools.htm> accessed 19/04/2024.

---

<sup>35</sup> Lewis, J. and Bolton, P. (2023) 'Research Briefing: Student mental health in England: Statistics, policy, and guidance' *House of Commons Library*, Tuesday, 30 May 2023 <https://commonslibrary.parliament.uk/research-briefings/cbp-8593/>