Editorial Board

Dr. Isabel Barca, Assistant Professor, University of Minho, Braga, Portugal
Dr. Laura Capita, Senior Researcher, Institute of Educational Sciences, Bucharest, Romania
Dr. Carol Capita, Lecturer in History Didactics, Department of Teacher Training, University of Bucharest, Romania
Arthur Chapman, Lecturer in History Education, Institute of Education University of London, UK
Dr. Hilary Cooper, Professor of History and Pedagogy, University of Cumbria, UK
Dr. Dursun Dilek, Associate Professor, Department of History Education, Ataturk Faculty of Education, University of Marmara, Turkey
Dr. Terrie Epstein, Associate Professor Department of Curriculum and Teaching, Hunter College, New York, USA
Dr. Stuart Foster, Department of Arts and Humanities, London University Institute of Education, UK
Jerome Freeman, Curriculum Advisor (History), Qualifications and Curriculum Education Authority
Dr. David Gerwin, Associate Professor, Department of Educational Studies, City University, New York
Richard Harris, University of Southampton, UK
Dr. Terry Haydn, Reader in Education, School of Education and Lifelong Learning, University of East Anglia, UK
Dr. Jonathan Howson, Lecturer in History Education, Faculty of Culture and Pedagogy, London University Institute of Education, UK
Dr. Sunjoo Kang, Assistant Professor (teaching and research) Department of Social Studies Education, Gyeonin National University, South Korea
Alison Kitson, Lecturer in History Education, London University Institute of Education, UK
Dr. Linda Levstik, Professor of Social Studies, University of Kentucky, USA
Dr. Alan McCully, Senior Lecturer in Education (History and Citizenship), University of Ulster
Professor John Nichol, University of Plymouth, UK
Rob Sieborger, Associate Professor, School of Education, University of Capetown, South Africa
Dr. Dean Smart, Senior Lecturer, History and Citizenship Education, University of the West of England, Bristol, UK
Professor A.B. Sokolov, Dean of Faculty of History and Head of methods of teaching History and Social Disciplines, Jaroslav Pedagogical University, Russia
Sue Temple, Senior Lecturer in Primary History Education, University of Cumbria, UK
Dr. David Waller, Lecturer in American Politics and History, School of Social Sciences, University of Northampton, UK
Gail Weldon, Principal Advisor in History Education, West Cape Province, South Africa, UK
Mary Woolley, Senior Lecturer, Canterbury Christ Church University, UK
Professor Maria Auxiliadora Schmidt, Professor of History Education, Education Department, Federal University, Paraná, Brazil
# International Journal of Historical Learning, Teaching and Research

Volume 8, Number 1 - January 2009  
ISSN 1472–9466

## Editorial

**History Education, Identity and Citizenship in the 21st Century**  
4

## Articles

**Bahri Ata**  
The Turkish prospective History teachers’ understanding of analogy in History education  
6

**Isabel Barca**  
Identities and History—Portuguese students’ accounts  
19

**Keith Barton and Alan McCully**  
When History teaching really matters—Understanding the impact of school intervention on students’ neighbourhood learning in Northern Ireland  
28

**Júlia Castro**  
“We, Them and the Others”—Historical thinking and intercultural ideas of Portuguese students  
47

**Hilary Cooper and Elizabeth Ditchburn**  
Folk Tales—Universal values, individual differences  
58

**Ismail Demircioglu**  
Does the teaching of History encourage active citizenship in Turkey? Perceptions of Turkish History Teachers  
71

**Erkan Dinç**  
Can History be a bridge to get Turkey closer to Europe? The possibility of an inclusion of the European dimension in the Turkish History curriculum  
77

**Dursun Dilek and Gülçin Yapıcı**  
Trainee History teachers’ misinterpretation of sources and a romantic approach to historical understanding—An analysis of examination papers  
96

**Yücel Kabapinar**  
Prospective teachers’ ideas about the methodology of Social Sciences/History and purpose of social studies teaching—Evaluation of “Us” through “Others”  
108

**Linda Levstik**  
Well-behaved women rarely make History—Gendered teaching and learning in and about History  
120

**Olga Magalhaes and Marilia Gago**  
Crossing Voices—History as seen by Portuguese teachers  
140

**Jon Nichol**  
Constructing identity through the visual image—Memory, Identity, Belonging—History, culture & interpretive frameworks  
149

**Gail Weldon**  
156

**Mustafa Safran**  
History Teaching in Turkey—From past to present and expectations for the future  
177

**Salih Özbaran**  
History education in its Turkish perspective  
184

## Reports

**Elif Kilicbeyli**  
Cliohnet—The European History Network  
188

## UHLTR – Author instructions for papers & abstracts

201
EDITORIAL
History Education, Identity and Citizenship in the 21st Century

Hilary Cooper, Dursun Dilek and Jon Nichol

Internationally History has a major role to play in preparing children to be citizens in a world of plural democracies. History Education sits at the most volatile point on the interface between politics and education: its role is hotly contested in all societies, particularly where it is dealing with issues with a temporal dimension and perspective such as beliefs, capitalism, citizenship, community, democracy, family, fascism, fundamentalism, gender, ideology, identity, internationalism, nationalism and nationality, political systems, religion, rights, terrorism, totalitarianism and values.

In a world where History is universally recognised as having a central educational role we felt that the resulting academic discourse had no central forum where its members could discuss, debate, share, report and disseminate its findings. Academic papers that addressed concerns of the History Education community were scattered in generalist journals, often as an adjunct to these publications’ major preoccupations. Yet, History Education is too important to be marginalised: it needs a voice that presents the findings of theory, scholarship and research. Such a voice is not intended to be part of a private, internal dialogue within the closed cloisters of academia: a central issue is for it to inform and hopefully provide an evidentially based body of knowledge and understanding that teachers, administrators, educators, politicians and the bodies that guide and shape the school curricula across the world might heed.

Accordingly, in 2001 the International Journal of Historical Learning, Teaching and Research [IJHLTR] was founded to provide an international medium for reporting on History Education: it in now in its thirteenth volume. To further the vision of IJHLTR, in 2003, Hilary Cooper of the University of Cumbria, UK and Jon Nichol of the Universities of Exeter and Plymouth established an informal body, the History Educators International Research Network [HEIRNET] to give a physical, corporeal manifestation to IJHLTR. HEIRNET has now become established within the community of history educators, meeting annually in a range of locations from Cape Town to Cumbria and Istanbul to Yaroslavl, Russia. In September 2007 HEIRNET held a conference, thanks to the hospitality of Dursun Dilek and his host institution, Marmara University, in Istanbul. There was no better place in the world to hold a conference on the role that History Education can and should play in the modern world: on the cusp of Europe and the gateway to Asia; on the fault line between Christianity and Islam and in the cauldron of competing beliefs, ideologies and political systems.

The Istanbul conference’s theme was History Education, identity and citizenship in the 21st Century. This volume includes a selection of papers delivered at the conference. They cover a wide range of themes including—
- Gender
- Nationalism and internationalism
- Multi-culturalism
- Ethnicity
- Citizenship
- Values
- Beliefs
- Pedagogy
- Academic subject knowledge
- Fundamentalism
- European community

IJHLTR and HEIRNET are proud to be centrally involved in the discussions and debate that are the meat and drink of History Education. Accordingly, we are delighted to announce that the Historical Association of the United Kingdom is taking over the publication of IJHLTR—it will now be accessible to members of the Historical Association as well as members of the HEIRNET community.
The Turkish prospective History teachers' understanding of analogy in History education

Bahri Ata, Gazi University, Ankara, Turkey

Abstract—This paper identifies ways in which analogy may help students to understand the past. It defines different types of analogy and investigates and evaluates ways in which student history teachers might use different types of analogy.

Keywords—Analogy, History Education, History Teachers, Pedagogy.

Introduction

‘The past is a foreign country—they do things differently there’, are the first words of the novel, The Go-Between (1953), written by Leslie Poles Hartley, a British novelist.

History teachers use virtual images and field trips to museums and historical places so that the children can imagine an unknown foreign country in their mind. History teachers usually use analogies for attracting students’ interests and developing their different viewpoints and the skills of making comparisons. Above all, history teachers use analogies because they actually believe in the similarities of two different historical events.

On the other hand, in the History –2 Teaching Program and History Teachers Education Standards of Turkey, the word “connection” is preferred to the word “analogy”. Both texts emphasize the need to develop the student’s ability to discuss the connections between current and historical events.

The word “analogy”, and its various uses, was invented by the Greeks. Analogy was originally a term developed within mathematics to indicate a proportionality—that is a common or reciprocal relation, such as “double” or “triple” between two direct proportions. Analogy came soon to have the now more familiar meaning of a direct comparison between some similar terms, as well as its older sense of a likeness between relations (Ferre, 1967, p.94). As Newby and others (1995) have emphasized, analogies have been employed to teach a variety of subjects including logic, philosophy, social sciences, education, theology, business policy, reading comprehension, composition, computer programming, problem solving.

In logic, analogy is a kind of reasoning to expose deep similarities and even identicalness, above all between observed similarities. In this regard, it is accepted as a basis for many judgments and reasoning (Arda, 2003, p.26).

In the Dictionary of Philosophy, the description of analogy is that if two things have similarities in certain aspects, one concludes that these two things have other similarities or equalities in other aspects (Akarsu, 1998, p.33). In the Dictionary of Social Sciences, analogy is described as that on the base of similarities of two things, the judgment related to the first thing is accepted as valid for the second thing (Demir & Acar, 2005, p.18).

In the following sections of this paper, approaches to analogy in History and Pedagogy are briefly considered.

History and Historical Analogies

In general, in the literature on History Education, the term “comparative historical studies” is preferred to the term “historical analogies”. Professional historians generally evaluate each and every historical event as sui generis. In their comparative historical studies, they underline differences rather than similarities among these historical events.

On this matter, German historian Leopold von Ranke declares that every age is equally near to God, and that the worth of an epoch is to be found in itself, not in anything that derives from it (Stanford, 1998, p.77).

Histories of education in the 1940’s and 1950’s, refer to striking likeness in the educational systems of Sparta and Athens and those of Soviet Russia and USA. Karl Popper (1957) attacked the abuse of such analogy in his ‘The Poverty of Historicism’. Michael Stanford (1998, p.77) in his ‘An Introduction to the Philosophy of History’, discusses the issue under the title ‘The Dangers of Analogy’. He describes analogy as a comparison with something simpler and more familiar. According to Stanford, analogies can be dangerous, never more so than when ideas are drawn from one area and unquestioningly applied to another. R.W. Fogel said that no amount of analogy could prove anything in history. ‘Analogy has its place in history, but it is a very minor one. It can prove a stimulus to thought and enquiry but that is all—such similarities prove nothing’ (Stanford, 1996, p.73.)

Unlike some historians, foreign policy specialists and journalists often enthusiastically use historical analogies in their writings. Analogies are common in articles and books concerning American foreign policy. But there are some academicians just like Jeffrey Record (1998) who warn that arguing by historical analogy can have disastrous consequences for American foreign policy. On the other hand, Paul Kennedy established analogies between the Victorian Period of Britain and the present-day America while being aware of the many real differences between these two countries. During the American invasion of Iraq the problem of historical analogies once more emerged: the media presented historical analogies relating Saddam to figures such as Hitler and Stalin.
Nagorski (2003, p.66), he wrote that there are no perfect historical analogies; each situation is different and has to be judged on its own merits. That is to say, history is the only guide we have to the possible consequences of our actions, and it deserves careful scrutiny, in terms of what happened differently. It doesn’t provide a road map, to borrow a term from the Middle East discussion, but it can help. And it is always a mistake to dismiss the debate over history as a purely intellectual exercise. The implications are practical and sometimes immediate.

In Turkey, journalists like Murat Bardakçı and Soner Yalçın offer similar analogues of current events grounded in the past. Their uses of history for pragmatic purposes promotes public interest in history.

The Place of Analogy in the Pedagogy and in the Pedagogy of History

Analogy can be seen as a teaching technique in books on the teaching methodology of special subjects. The meaning of analogy in the educational sense is defined as an explicit, non-literal comparison between two objects, or sets of objects that describe their structural, functional and/or causal similarities.

The analogies for educational purposes consist of four basic components; the target domain (an unfamiliar concept), the base domain (a familiar one), the connector and the ground. When a teacher says that a red blood cell is like a truck in that they both transport essential supplies from one place to another through a system of passageways, he/she is using analogy. In this example, the target domain is the red blood cell. The base domain is the truck, known by the learner who compares it with the red blood cell (Newby and the Others, 1995, pp.5–6).

A person studying history should compare different periods, different cultures and different social systems. The suitable use of such kinds of comparison is the indicator of having historical consciousness.

While historians regard analogies as dangerous in historical explanations, history teachers feel the need to use analogy in history teaching. History teachers believe that historical facts can be evaluated in their own circumstances, but the teacher faces the problem of transferring the past into an understandable discourse that pupils can grasp. History teachers develop the pupils’ skills of comparison by establishing the connections between an unfamiliar past and a familiar present.

In Turkey, even at the beginning of the 20th century, the Ottoman pedagogues like Sâti Bey grasped the importance of connecting a familiar subject to an unfamiliar subject especially for young pupils. Sâti Bey and his colleagues prepared and applied exemplary history lessons at the Laboratory School of the Teachers Education School in Istanbul. In the lesson example concerning the Conquest of Istanbul (1453), prepared for the elementary school students, he compared the defensive measures taken for the Middle Age city to the children’s houses.

More recent researches show that some Turkish history teachers give great importance to these kinds of connections in historical explanations in their lectures. One of them is Çaydaş. Çaydaş (2003, pp. 74, 80–83) his M.A. thesis discusses the activities of history teachers to develop the students’ skills of historical thinking under the title of the connection of historical events to other similar events. The connections applied by experienced Turkish history teachers are taken into account on three levels. The first is the connection of an event to another in its own period. The second is the connection of an event to others in different periods. The third is the connection of an event to a contemporary occurrence.

Çaydaş observed, for example, that a teacher asked the pupils a question about the educational background of Sultan Mehmet the Conqueror and that of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, the founder of Modern Turkey. He emphasised that both gave great importance to learning foreign languages. Moreover, this history teacher touched on the similarities of the Ottoman çiftbozan with the Israel Kibbutz system. He also said that he discussed Magna Carta in teaching about Turkey’s First Constitutional Monarchy. Another history teacher stated that the Ottoman sadrazam (The Grand Vizier) had similar duties to those of todays prime minister. In the Unit on Ottoman Culture, interestingly one of these teachers asked who today performs the duties of Ottoman kazasker (the chief military judge).

There are studies both for or against analogy as an effective instructional tool to improve comprehension and recall. For example the results of Almuqate’s (1996) research on human physiology show that analogies facilitate student recall, but not comprehension.

The study of Young and Leinhardt (1998) on how American high school teachers used linguistic analogies or metaphors to convey unfamiliar historical information and concepts to their students is important. They describe an analogy as a linguistic comparison that maps features of a familiar concept, system or domain (the base), to an unfamiliar one (the target). According to them, most forms of learning use analogical thinking to establish a connection between new information or ideas and something that people already know. They regarded the teachers’ use of specific terms such as Iron Curtain, Domino Theory as analogies. They also accepted the teachers’ use of literary metaphors such as “the growth of wildflowers” for the spread of democratic ideas, as analogies. According to Young and Leinhardt, the best history courses push students “to understand, challenge and generate analogies that contribute to historical understanding as well as develop a sensitivity for when to use and how not to misuse historical analogies” (Kramer, 2001, pp.95–96).
History teachers deal with three main views of history. The first is scientific history writing in which each and every fact is regarded as unique and historical facts can be evaluated in their own terms. The second is the understanding of pragmatic historiography in which it is claimed that historical knowledge can be used in solving our present problems. The third is the pedagogical approach in which it is underlined that the student should gain the skills of comparison and interpretation beyond just memorizing the historical facts, by establishing similarities between familiar subjects and unfamiliar subjects.

The Research Program and its Significance
This study explores prospective history teachers’ level of understanding of analogy in history education. We aimed to answer the question: if prospective history teachers have no choice but to make analogies, what kind of analogies will they use?

Methodology
In 2005–2006 Spring Semester, data was gathered from 61 prospective history teachers from Gazi University, Faculty of Education. They were studying at fourth and fifth grades in the Department of History. The student sample was gathered from students taking the course on Textbook Analysis. They were asked to write a paper on the question below.

History is a foreign and distant country. A history teacher can develop the students’ reasoning with an analogy by providing an environment in which the student compares the unknown subject to known subject. Keeping in mind the historical explanations of your mentors and of trainers at university, give an example of analogy that can be used in history.

The researcher did not give any information about analogy to the students. The writings of the students were analyzed using content analysis.

Results
After analysis, the prospective teachers’ papers fell into three categories—
1. Analogies between two events in the past
2. Analogies between the current and the historical events
3. Analogies to explain historical terms through comparison with similar contemporary terminology

### TABLE 1. The Varieties of Analogy Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>f</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analogies between two events in the past</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analogies between the current and the historical events</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analogies to explain historical terms with similar present day terms</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As it is seen in Table 1, 32 items in the papers of prospective teachers related to analogies between two events in the past, 17 items are in the category of analogies between the current and the historical events, 12 items are about the statements directed towards the explanations of historical terms in students’ vocabulary.

**The First Category—Analogies between two events in the past**
The analogies used by 32 prospective teachers are in this category.

### TABLE 2. Analogical Expressions as Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expressions</th>
<th>f</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Magna Carta</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Turkification of Anatolia</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Seljukids State</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land System of the Seljukids</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The First Turkish Dynasties before the Seljukids</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Revolt of Babai (1239)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Speech of Farewell by the Prophet Muhammad</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Parliament of Constitutional Monarchy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Foundation of USA</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Treaty of Hudeybiye (628)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mecelle (The Ottoman Civil Code)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swiss Civil Law</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reforms of Sultan Selim the Second</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Revolution</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Papacy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Suez Canal</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Trojan Wars</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Campaign of Roman Army</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osman Beg, the Founder of Ottoman State</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As Table 2 shows, according to these prospective history teachers, the analogy involves comparison that involves chronology. They assume that the first historical events are familiar to the students so that these are the base domain. The second historical events are accepted as the target domain. Analogical thinking of the first group can seen in Schema 1.

**Schema 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The base domain (A familiar subject)</th>
<th>The former historical event such as <em>The Suez Canal (1869)</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The target domain (An unfamiliar subject)</td>
<td>The subsequent historical events such as <em>The Panama Canal (1914)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 3 shows, according to these prospective history teachers, the analogy involves similarities. Like the first category, they also think chronologically. They assert that if the students know the previous historical events such as the First Crusade, they can learn easily the subsequent historical events, in our example, the Second Crusade. Some of them presented reasons for their analogy. For instance, both the Anatolian Seljukid State and the Ottoman State were established by the Turks on the same land so that if one knows Seljukid state institutions, he/she can learn about Ottoman institutions more effectively.

**TABLE 3. Analogical Expressions as Similarity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expressions</th>
<th>The Base Domain (Analogy)</th>
<th>The Target Domain</th>
<th>f</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Military Tactics of Ancient Turks</td>
<td>The Military Tactics of The Modern Turks</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The First Crusade</td>
<td>The Second Crusade</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Turkish State Organization before Islamic Period</td>
<td>The Ottoman State Organization</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The State Administration of the Köktürks</td>
<td>The State Administration of The Great Seljukids</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Military Organization of the Seljukids</td>
<td>The Military Organization of The Ottomans</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Anatolian Trade in the Seljukids period</td>
<td>The Anatolian Trade in the Ottoman Period</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The similarities between the Turkish States in the Central Asia in terms of reasons for their decline</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Feudal Society in Medieval Europe</td>
<td>The period of Tavâf-ı Mülük after the Abbasids</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>İteriş Khan</td>
<td>Mustafa Kemal Atatürk</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The transport of warships on the land by Gazi Umur Beg from the Dynasty of Aydınoğulları</td>
<td>The similar attempts by Sultan Mehmet the Second</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silistre Defense</td>
<td>Gallipoli Defense by the Turks</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 3 shows, according to these prospective history teachers, the analogy means similarities. Like the first category, they also think chronologically. They assert that if the students know the previous historical events such as the First Crusade, they can learn easily the subsequent historical events, in our example, the Second Crusade. Some of them presented reasons for their analogy. For instance, both the Anatolian Seljukid State and the Ottoman State were established by the Turks on the same land so that if one knows Seljukid state institutions, he/she can learn about Ottoman institutions more effectively.

**The Second Category—Analogies between current events and historical events**

The analogies, used by 17 prospective teachers enter into this category. In this category, these prospective teachers put the current events in front of the historical events because they think that every event has its own actors, its own grounds and also secondary causes, but the essential cause of these events, as consequences of human nature or human needs, can be the same.

**TABLE 4. The Current Events and Examples from the Past**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expressions</th>
<th>The Base Domain (Analogy)</th>
<th>The Target Domain</th>
<th>f</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The United States-led invasion of Iraq</td>
<td>The Italian Occupation of Tripoli</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA Middle East Policy</td>
<td>The Oriental Question</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colonialism in the present day</td>
<td>Colonialism at the 19th century</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Policy of USA</td>
<td>The Policy of Entente Powers after 1918</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Current Situation in Iraq</td>
<td>Iraqi Government during the Ottoman reign</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Policies of Great Britain</td>
<td>U.S. Iraq Policy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The United States-led invasion of Iraq</td>
<td>The Emergence of the First World War</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMF policy</td>
<td>Düyun-u Umumiye (the Public Debts of the Ottoman Empire)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The World Bank Policy</td>
<td>Economy Policy of Tarhuncu Ahmet Paşa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU membership negotiations</td>
<td>The Imperial Edict of Reforms in 1856</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU membership negotiations</td>
<td>The Articles of the Treaty of Sevres</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU membership negotiations</td>
<td>Minority Rights in the Ottoman Period</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU membership negotiations</td>
<td>Paris Peace Conference in 1919</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Today's events</td>
<td>Events experienced in the 19th century</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The difficulties experienced by Iraqis in the present time</td>
<td>The difficulties experienced by the Turks during the Turkish War of Independence</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saddam Hussein</td>
<td>Sheikh Said</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Some prospective teachers think that the analogies should be used to connect the current events to the past events. Analogical thinking of the second group can be seen in Schema 2.

**Schema 2**

![Diagram](attachment:image.png)

It seems that they have pragmatic historical understanding. On the other hand, the examples given by this group show how human thinking depends upon the cultural context of the present that influences understanding of the past. The American policy towards Iraq and the relationships of Turkey with the European Union were the top issues on the agenda of the Turkish media. This group of prospective history teachers’ approach is influenced by their political views and the “hot” topics of the present day.

**The Third Category— Analogy to explain historical terms with the students’ vocabulary**

The analogies used by 12 prospective teachers are in this category. This group placed great importance on the principle of currency in educational practices, but they perceive analogy as a language issue. Like the second group, they believe that analogies stem from human nature and needs which are the main drivers of history.

**TABLE 5. Analogies to explain historical terms in accordance with the students’ vocabulary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expressions</th>
<th>The Base Domain (analogy)</th>
<th>The Target Domain</th>
<th>f</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factory</td>
<td>The village mill</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Campus</td>
<td>Külliye (A collection of buildings of an institution)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Council of Ministers</td>
<td>Divan-ı Hümayun (The Imperial Chancery of the Ottoman State)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prime minister</td>
<td>Sadrazam (The Grand Vizier)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministers</td>
<td>Divan üyelerı (Members of Council of the Ottoman State)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union of Chambers</td>
<td>Lonca Teşkilatı (Guild System)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ağalık system (Nobility System)</td>
<td>Feudalism</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Funeral Ceremony of Modern Turks</td>
<td>The Funeral Ceremony of Ancient Turks</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Results of the Communication Revolution</td>
<td>The Results of Geographical Discoveries and the Industrial Revolution</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceremony for military services in the current days</td>
<td>Ceremony for military services in the Turkish War of Independence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The present constitutions</td>
<td>The past constitutions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protest meetings at the present time</td>
<td>Protest meetings during the French Revolution</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analogue thinking of the third group can be seen in Schema 3.

**Schema 3**

![Diagram](attachment:image.png)
This group concentrated their attention upon the explanation of the historical terms, not the historical events themselves. A prospective history teacher in his paper wrote that a history textbook writer has used the term “Belediye Bağkanı” (Mayor) equivalent to “Muhtesib” (The superintendent of police who has charge of examining weights, measures, provisions, etc.) which is also new vocabulary for the students. He recommended that history textbook writers should mention that the title of Muhtesib passed through evolutionary stages until it acquired its current meaning.

Discussion and Conclusion
The prospective history teachers experienced the ebb and flow between the historian’s craft and pedagogy. They became entangled in contradictions between the approach of academic historiography to analogy and a pedagogy that encouraged the use of analogy as a teaching technique. Some of them considered analogies as making comparisons, others as determining similarities.

They generally think chronologically, so that the base domain is the former historical event, the target domain is the subsequent historical event (Table 3 only - not Table 4/ Schema 2). A prospective teacher states that human nature and needs do not change in the course of time so that human beings in different parts of the World and at different times construct similar structures and systems. Another prospective teacher claims that if the geographical place is the same for past and present events, the problem and its causes in this place have got similar aspects. One of the prospective teachers claims that for teachers it is important to use students’ present knowledge in order to explain historical facts. For example, to explain Feudalism, teachers should mention the applications of Ağaçlı which is mostly known by the students.

Interestingly enough, unlike the American school teachers, most Turkish prospective history teachers did not use historical analogies like the comparison of Hitler with Napoleon or literary metaphors such as “wildflowers.”

In Turkey, today, the History 1–2 teaching program covers the period until the year 1945 officially. This paper’s findings indicate that history teachers will use current events as analogical subjects in their history courses, often inappropriately. To prevent using inaccurate analogies a History of the World and Turkey from 945 to 2000’s should be introduced into the secondary school curriculum.

At the universities prospective history teachers should study the historian’s craft and how history is constructed through ‘doing history’. In history departments there should be expanded courses on history methodology. There is also an urgent need for new books on history teaching for prospective history teachers.

I wish to thank Miyase Koyuncu who reviewed parts of this paper, for her friendly assistance.
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**Identities and History—Portuguese students’ accounts**

Isabel Barca, University of Minho, Portugal

**Abstract**—Recent empirical research in history education has focussed on how students can develop more powerful ideas in history. Such a concern has emphasised the need to explore not only students’ second-order ideas (the use of evidence, explanation, narrative), but also students’ substantive ideas—and how far they might convey a coherent, plausible and evidentially grounded picture of the past. Moreover, there is a growing preoccupation among history education researchers with issues linked to the function of the temporal orientation of young people and how far it relates to their historical thinking.

The present study shares this theoretical framework, in the line of debates led by Jörn Rüsen and Peter Lee. And, within the scope of the HiCon Project (Historical Consciousness—Theory and Practices), it intends to analyse Portuguese students’ accounts of national and world contemporary history and understand them in terms of senses of identity and meanings of history. A sample of 120 students, aged 14–17 years, attending grade 10 in six schools was asked to construct two short accounts of the last 100 years in Portugal and in the world. Different levels of narrative structure as well as different master narratives across the two tasks were given. Results are discussed in the light of key ideas related to historical consciousness.

**Keywords**—Historical consciousness, History education, Identity and history, Internationalism, Narrative, Nationalism, Portugal, Rusen, Second order concepts, Students’ accounts, Substantive knowledge, Uses of history.

**The research background**

A vast amount of research in the field of history education has shed light on different patterns of historical thinking when students deal with challenging questions about history (Ashby, Lee and Shemilt, 2005; Barton and Levstick, 2004; Cooper and Dilek, 2004; Lee, 2002). Those patterns might appear more or less elaborate at the epistemological level since they imply a certain construction of meta-historical (or ‘second order’) concepts related to the nature of the discipline (explanation, empathy, evidence, narrative). Intending to skip out of the traditional way of ‘measuring’ the extension of historical knowledge in substantive terms—such as probably is mostly practised in history classroom across many countries—a considerable part of research in this area has focussed on the meta-historical thinking of children and adolescents, suggesting a logical, but not linear, progression of students’ ideas, showing main trends by age and school grade and highlighting some amazingly sophisticated and diverse ideas that a few, sometimes very young, students reveal. Researchers have emphasised the need to explore those conceptual patterns since history teachers will have to be
aware of students’ preconceptions if they want to intervene in the construction of young people’s historical ideas as Lee (2005) points out.

There is evidence confirming that the same conceptual patterns can emerge from data in diverse countries (see, for instance, Cercadillo, 2002; Barca, 2005 and Hsiao, 2005). At the substantive level, however, irrespective of indicating a more or less valid, coherent and contextualised knowledge, different accounts of the past naturally emerge (Wertsch, 2004; Barton and McCully, 2004). These findings are congruent with the genuine nature of historical thinking: there is no single way of interpreting the past. Recently history educators have been emphasising that it is desirable students gain not only a high-level of tacit understanding of history in terms of interpretation, explanation or evidence but also a coherent, plausible and evidentially grounded picture of the past to guide their needs of orientation in the present and future.

The epistemological background

According to the challenging idea of historical consciousness as discussed by Rüsen (2004), different ways of interpreting the past are related to different ways of looking at the present and, conversely, the ways of making sense of social life in the present and the expectations we create in relation to the future are intertwined in our understanding of the past. Thus historical knowledge is not, or should not be, an inert knowledge since it is explicitly or implicitly entangled with our view of the present world. It is fostered by everyday life assumptions and needs, functioning as a guide to understanding the present and its future implications and to make decisions accordingly. But not all the meanings we give to the past, and to the present and future, are historically grounded: they might arise from myths, propaganda or fiction, as Lee reminds us (2002). It is useful to keep in mind a theoretical discussion about the ‘practical past’, which he conceived as a fancied past serving specific interests, usually political or religious. But the practical function of narrative discussed by Rüsen assumes a historical sense: a narrative consistent with the evidence available can simultaneously reinforce individual and group identities.

Rüsen asserts that the accounts of the past that people construct constitute an indicator of their historical consciousness, that is, the meanings they attribute to relationships between past and present. Wertsch (2002) points out that in order to understand the meanings of narratives of the past it is necessary to analyse them in terms of their schematic narrative templates, beyond the formal structure they present. These underlying conceptual/paradigmatic schemes might implicitly convey a master narrative shared by members of a group, representing a specific social function irrespective of their level of formal structure. These templates, linked to the identity of a particular group in place and time may tend to fix an inaccurate and unhistorical narrative.

Under this theoretical framework it is useful to know a) what types of accounts the youngsters construct to make sense of the past and b) to question what meanings of identity operate in their construction of pictures of the past. This is the basis for the problem to be explored in the present study—

**What do the accounts of previous Portuguese students suggest about the meanings of historical consciousness?**

**Methodology**

The empirical study was designed in a qualitative approach and intended to investigate the meaning of the accounts produced by students as indicators of their historical consciousness. It searched for answers to the following specific research questions—

1. What types of accounts of the contemporary national and world history do Portuguese students construct?
2. What sense of identities do these accounts suggest?
3. What master narratives do they convey?
4. Which kinds of ideas about change do they imply?

**Participants**

Students attending public schools in grade 10 were the targeted population. History is a compulsory subject in grades 5 up to 9 (Barca and Magalhaes, 2004). A sample of 120 students was selected in six classes, three out of them being constituted by students attending history classes. Two of those schools are located in the north, two in the middle and two in the south of the country.

**Instruments and procedures**

Students in each class were asked to write two brief historical accounts, one about the last hundred years in their country, one about the last hundred years in the world. As there was some previous information provided by PISA researchers in Portugal about a frequent students’ reaction against participating in tests not related to their own assessment, attention was put on how to propose the tasks to the participants in a manner that could stimulate individual writing. Thus those tasks were devised as follows—

Imagine that you are on an international camping holiday and one evening you decide, together, to each tell the history of your own country in the last hundred years. What will you present?

Then, after listening to each one’s account, you together decide to give an individual account of the last hundred years of the world. What will you tell?
Students seemed to adhere to the tasks proposed and, being previously informed about the aims of this research, they naturally agreed to participate. The written tasks took about one hour, half an hour each.

Data were inductively analysed in terms of narrative structure, scheme, ideas of change and historical markers, trying to make sense of the written accounts as indicators of their relationships with historical consciousness.

Students’ accounts of national and world contemporary past
At a first glance, one feature of the students’ productions seemed obvious: while their ‘national accounts’ looked reasonably substantiated, the majority of students gave the history of the world in a few lines. In a more systematic analysis, it was possible to categorise this data into five levels as far as historical narrative structure was concerned, thus taking into account its form and content—

1. General considerations
2. a-chronological list
3. Chronological list
4. Emergent narrative
5. Full narrative

Students’ national accounts were mainly categorised as emergent or full narratives, followed by general considerations, and a few a-chronological or chronological lists were given. One student wrote about the history of Brazil, one gave a fictional account and another two presented no response.

Examples of structured accounts of the contemporary past in Portugal were given by Alice and Joana. Alice, 5–years old, wrote a ‘full narrative’ in the sense that she selected a set of events conventionally accepted by several historians as significant milestones that have shaped Portuguese twentieth-century history and intertwined them in a narrative causal web of political and social (sometimes economic and cultural) markers—

_In 1900 Portugal still lived under a monarchy becoming a Republic by 1910. Later on, because of Portugal’s entry into World War I, there was the loss of many lives and the country suffered hard times during this period. In the 30’s, Salazar entered the government (which was chaotic by this time) and brought about years of dictatorship, inspired by the Italian fascist regime. In spite of the dictatorship, Portugal was neutral during the five years of World War II. During those years of oppression, the Portuguese saw their freedom of speech censured and their men leaving for the colonies to impose Salazar’s colonial ideal. After years of lost fights, on 25 April, 1974 the people rebelled and put an end to the painful years of dictatorship, installing a democratic regime. Another important step for Portugal was joining the European Union in 1986. Ever since, Portugal, in spite of being a free country, has lived with some negative aspects._

Joana, a 17–year old, wrote what was categorised as an ‘emergent narrative’, distinct from the former text in the sense that it focussed on a particular chronological period presenting a sequence of key events and interwoven markers functioning as causes and consequences of diverse kinds—

_I would tell that the history of Portugal has gone through many changes specially on the 25 April when the country became independent, that is, a democratic country, in 1978 [1974]. Ever since everything turned out to be different, women were allowed to vote for the government, the Portuguese could express their opinions while before the 25 April people were not allowed to speak about the government and for those who dared to do it the political police would come and arrest them, sometimes killing them. There was no freedom of speech, we Portuguese had to do what they ordered, but all that has changed, there was a revolution, there was the 25 April, ever since we are allowed to speak about everything coming into our minds. And now here we are, the Portuguese._

The milestones common to almost all the national accounts focussed on the dictatorship years and the conquest of freedom in April 1974. An homogeneous ‘us’ overcoming their own problems, with common adventures and misadventures, is the dominant, driving ‘agent’ in this master narrative. Mentions of the fight for women’s rights, independence of the former African colonies, the joining to the European Union are occasionally integrated into the narratives; but in the ‘big’ picture’ multiple identities are not apparent. How far other specific key-events were present in the students’ accounts is still under current data analysis.

Political and social implications were the main implications suggested but some economic and cultural consequences were sometimes discussed too. The main underlying scheme might be synthesised in the following way—

After the Salazar dictatorship, the 1974 Revolution (on the 25 April) brought freedom and democracy back to the country although currently an economic crisis is at stake.

In this master narrative an underlying positive idea of change is suggested. But among some students, this idea of political and social progress is permeated with economic concerns about the present.

Individual characters were not frequent and those who were mentioned tended to be seen as villains or victims. But one character was present in almost all the students’ productions: Salazar was responsible for the dictatorship, censorship and repression although a very few also stressed his economic measures as positive to the country. King Carlos, the king who was murdered, and the first and the current presidents of Republic were also mentioned. And Saramago, the Nobel Literature Prize holder, and football players like Figo and Eusebio were included in some accounts.
Contrasting with the overall picture of students’ national accounts, their ‘history’ of the contemporary world took massively the form of brief, general considerations. Rachel, aged 17, gave one example of it—

*In the last 100 years, many important things happened on our planet. One of the biggest problems of the world has been growing worse – the misuse of non renewable resources, like crude oil, which pollute and people use it in big quantities and this makes the ozone hole bigger. In the last 100 years there has been great progress in technology. There are more and more means of communication and many other objects, important to people’s lives. The massive use of means of communication, like mobile phones, computers (internet), TV, etc., implies that our planet is turning into a “global village”.*

The most elaborate texts produced by students took the form of emergent narratives as they usually accounted for a specific period in the last hundred years – the World Wars I and II —then immediately skipping to current key events usually disseminated by the media, not taught in school history. Carlos, aged 15, gave an example of these narratives—

*In the last 100 years there were two world wars. The World War I (1914–18) was the Austro-Hungary Empire against France and England, because of conflicting interests. The World War II (1939-45) was due to the fact that Adolph Hitler invaded Poland and wanted to conquer all Europe. He was defeated in Russia because of the cold weather and then committed suicide. By 1991 there was the first Gulf War and in 2001 the second Gulf War. On September 11, 2001, at New York, there was a terrorist attack to the Twin Towers, claimed by Al-Qaeda.*

General considerations, lists of events or emergent narratives about the contemporary world tended to stress violent features such as wars, terrorist attacks and natural catastrophes, but a few texts also recognised and acknowledged scientific and technological progress, as the general considerations given by Rachel, above, shows. Such accounts imply a negative, in some cases linear, in some cases balanced, tendency in students’ ideas of change in the contemporary world.

From those tendencies the master narrative of the contemporary world might be synthesised as the following—

*Here, in Portugal we have democracy but an economic crisis; all over the (outside) world we have technological advance but war and terrorism.*

As in the national accounts, in the world accounts individual characters did not appear much, and those who were mentioned tended to be seen as villains or victims—Hitler, Bin Laden and Saddam Hussein, and much less frequently, the Archiduke Franz Ferdinand of Austria, murdered in Sarajevo, the Pope John Paul, who suffered an attempted murder in Lisbon, or media figures such as the football player Maradona.

*Students’ accounts: a mirror of history and identity?*

Data suggest that students could construct a clear representation of contemporary Portuguese national history. The majority of their texts were formally structured as narratives and grounded on conventional key events that shaped the country as far as historians and textbooks have recognised it. A recovered freedom after the dictatorship and the quest for welfare seem to be the main values implicit in the master narrative conveyed by their texts.

The students’ accounts suggest a clear historical consciousness about the recent past of the country. As Rüsen suggested in his matrix on historical consciousness, memories coming from everyday life might have stimulated the construction of students’ pictures of a common past and, simultaneously, the historical narratives constructed will function as means for temporal orientation related to a common present and future.

Nonetheless, one feature deserves to be stressed here: unlike the young Russians’ accounts investigated by Wertsch (2002, 2004), the old master narrative of the great Portuguese opposed to other targeted, external enemies, which was taught for several generations till 1974, does not emerge in these accounts. Although no systematic studies exist about the remembrance of such a mythic account conveyed by the official and thus curriculum history for four decades since the 1930s, a recent controversial TV program might suggest that such a master narrative is not completely eradicated, at least among an older, pre 1980s generation. The new historical interpretation taught in schools and, probably, within the domestic family settings, deconstructs the pre-1974 account, opposes it and reconstructs the story in the light of different, democratic values.

A collective memory related to a sense of victory of freedom and aspiration to social justice over dictatorship in terms of national identity seems to be predominantly transmitted through the contemporary cultural setting mediated via the mass media. Teachers’ implicit presuppositions may play a role as well. Although studies on teachers’ accounts of the past do not exist yet, a small-scale research on in-service teacher trainees suggests that their master narrative on the recent national past is coherent with the one implied in the younger students’ accounts (Barca, Magalhaes and Castro, 2004). Wertsch also found a common master narrative in older and younger people’s accounts.

The accounts about the recent global past given by the students diverge from that related to the national past both at substantive and meta-historical levels. Their master global narrative is based on the idea that the world is a non-secure place in spite of scientific and technological progress, suggesting a negative view of change. And as students’ ideas of the recent world history appear poorly substantiated, their construction of accounts are replaced with general, often very brief comments. Collective memories conveyed by the social settings, in these cases, seem not to provide enough clues to constructing a clear picture of history. And the permanent dissemination
by media of overwhelming violence and catastrophes all over the world focuses young people's attention on the negative side of life and might contribute to a sense of useless individual action.

Accordingly, these findings suggest that history education in Portugal, in compulsory school years, tends to provide students with a fair picture of the contemporary past in the country, enhancing basic values of freedom and social justice on the national identity scale. A more complex sense of identity seen as a web of human multiple interactions at several levels, the national and global levels included, and historically well-grounded, might be a desirable aim to pursue. Young people need to feel themselves part of the wider world and to construct strategies for active engagement in a global society.
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When History teaching really matters—Understanding the impact of school intervention on students’ neighbourhood learning in Northern Ireland

Keith C. Barton, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati
Alan W. McCully, University of Ulster, Coleraine, Northern Ireland

Abstract—This paper reports research on Northern Ireland students’ attempts to reconcile school and community history. Previous research has shown that many students in Northern Ireland combine these competing influences in a process that can be viewed in terms of the development of what Bakhtin (1982) refers to as “internally persuasive dialogues.” The current paper illustrates that process through analysis of a sample of four sets of student interviews with eight students. Findings indicate that although students are committed to “trying to look at both sides of the argument,” they often have difficulty overcoming commitments to their own community’s historical perspectives. The dominant factor is a master vernacular narrative that reflects the underlying political and religious values and beliefs of their domestic communities. However, school history does help provide insight, deeper understanding and perspective that can help soften and ameliorate entrenched opinions and positions.

Keywords—Beliefs, Catholic, Culture, Family history, Identity, Master narrative, Nationalist, Northern Ireland, Official history, Orientation, Protestant, School history, Unionist, Vernacular history.

Background and theoretical framework
Student ideas about the past and school history research has demonstrated the impact of students’ backgrounds and of broader social contexts on their ideas about the past (e.g., Seixas, 1993; Barton & Levstik, 1998; Epstein, 2000, among many others), particularly the ways in which school or “official” history supports or differs from alternative or “vernacular” histories that students encounter outside school. Northern Ireland is widely recognized as an area in which competing historical perspectives have significant contemporary relevance, as both Nationalist and Unionist communities make frequent use of past events to justify contemporary positions or to bolster a sense of identity, usually defined in sectarian terms. Yet school history in Northern Ireland, since the introduction of the national curriculum in 1990, aims to provide an alternative to partisan views of the past. The secondary history curriculum is meant to expose students to a more systematic and comprehensive treatment of the region’s history than they are likely to encounter through family stories or local traditions, and it does not include an official narrative that aims to justify current political arrangements.

School history
Rather, school history focuses on engaging students in examining evidence and multiple perspectives, and there is a tacit expectation that by the end of the final year of study, history should contribute to greater understanding of a variety of cultural and political backgrounds and that it should therefore provide an alternative to the presumably partisan and sectarian histories students encounter outside school. Schools’ challenge to popular historical perspectives in Northern Ireland to date, however, remains almost entirely tacit, with no alternative historical narrative presented and few direct connections to the present. The alternative that school history provides lies not in a different narrative but in a different way of approaching history—one that involves a distanced, analytical perspective and a balance among conflicting viewpoints. Our aim in this study, then, was to investigate how children make sense of these competing approaches to history, and in particular how they understand the relationship between histories they encounter in school and elsewhere.

Dominant Narratives
Previous research in other locations has shown that when students encounter conflicting historical narratives, they typically appropriate one narrative and resist others, even though they may master the details of both (Wertsch, 2002). In some cases, students’ religious or ethnic backgrounds provide a particularly salient source of identification that leads them to resist interpreting history in the format they encounter in schools (e.g., Epstein, 2000; Mosberg, 2002; Porat, 2004; Spector, in press). Research in Northern Ireland, however, suggests that students there often engage in a more complex process.

Complex contexts and narratives
The knowledge and interests they develop in one setting lead them to seek additional information in other contexts, and they struggle to integrate the ideas they encounter in each. Although some students simply assimilate this information into dominant community narratives, most are aware that such narratives can be used for contemporary political purposes, and they appreciate the fact that school history encourages a more complete and balanced historical perspective, particularly by exposing them to the motivations and experiences of the other community. Even as they aim for expanded historical viewpoints, however, they are unwilling to abandon the political commitments of their communities, and they seek greater contemporary relevance for history than they are likely to encounter in school. Rather than “appropriating” or “resisting” either school or community history, students’ historical understanding in Northern Ireland can best be characterized as involving the development of “internally persuasive dialogues” (Bakhtin, 1982), in which they combine elements of both in unique ways.

The research study and methodology
The current study illustrates the process by which students attempt to draw from competing school and community discourses in order to develop such internally persuasive dialogues, through an in-depth analysis of interviews with four pairs of students drawn from a larger sample of 121 interviews, stratified by age, gender, religion, school type, and geographic region. These open-ended, semi-structured
Findings—Amber and Joyce

Amber (14 years old) and Joyce (15 years old) were fourth-year students at a Controlled (largely Protestant) Grammar School in a relatively prosperous area, directly adjacent to the main Dublin road, south east of Belfast. The town is on the edge of what has been termed Ulster’s “Bible Belt” and is associated with a robust brand of Unionism. The school was deemed by the researchers to be in an area of conflict. The countryside and towns to the west are characterized by residential segregation along religious lines and over the last thirty years have been the scene of sectarian tension, including paramilitary activity, shootings and territorial disputes. Characteristically, grammar school pupils like Amber and Joyce have gained entry to their school through a process of academic selection in the form of province-wide tests in English, mathematics and science at the age of 11. Such schools are excellently equipped and have well established traditions. Their students are representative of families from higher socio-economic groupings. Both girls were talkative and enthusiastic, and they contributed in nearly equal measure to the interview (although their voices are virtually indistinguishable on the tape, and so their responses here are not differentiated by name). Not only was the interview one of the longest we conducted, at well over half an hour; it was more dominated by student talk than most, and less dependent on probing questions; the girls also asked more questions about the pictures at the end of the interview than most others had done. Both said they liked studying history, and both had chosen to continue the subject as an elective. One reported defending her interest in history at lunch that day: When a friend learned she would be doing this interview, “She just goes on, ‘...how could you do history?!,’ and I always get that,” but as she pointed out, “…I really like history, and I don’t mind all the revision and things that you need to do.”

Extra curricular history

Like most of the students we interviewed, Amber and Joyce reported learning about history not only in school but from a variety of other sources, including family, print and electronic media, and the built environment. Much of this related to Unionist symbols seen in murals and posters—a Union Flag, a paramilitary acronym, or the red hand of Ulster. One girl also pointed out that they had heard about King William “since we were really young” and that “…you would have seen a picture like that in a lot of places,” and one noted that she had learned about Edward Carson “just sort of from family, my older brother and things like that.” Not all of their encounters with history outside school, however, were of a partisan nature. They pointed to the importance of family members who talked about the Second World War (“what happened to relatives in the war, like why did their grandfather die in the war and what for”), and one noted that she was interested in the Titanic because “there’s been a film about it and all, [and] there’s been numerous books about the Titanic.”

Poverty of knowledge

Yet despite their interest in history, and despite the variety of sources of information to which they had been exposed, Amber and Joyce provided little evidence of deep or extensive historical knowledge during their interview. They could not remember, for example, when World War I took place, and they could not think how Carrickfergus Castle might be related to the history of Northern Ireland. They thought the Irish Famine and a photograph of a hiring fair were from about the same time, although they were separated by nearly a century (and the hiring fair photograph included a picture of an automobile). They expressed an interest in learning more about the history of Northern Ireland’s conflict, but when asked what aspects they needed to know more about, they could not think of anything specific; nor, when asked which other historical images might have been included in the set, could they think of any. Moreover, most of their groupings of images were made on fairly superficial grounds. They placed a Mesolithic hut and a crannog together “because they’re both of huts” and later added a photo of an archeological site because “it seems to be a dig of a hut”; they grouped the Battle of the Somme, US troops in Northern Ireland during the second World War, and British troops in Londonderry in the 1970s “because they’re all pictures of violence or fighting”; and they put a modern church together with a round tower (with gravestones visible in the foreground) because churches and graveyards are “linked.” And more than most students, they left several pictures ungrouped because they could not see any clear connections to the others—Carrickfergus Castle, the Titanic, a nineteenth century factory, a Northern Ireland Civil Rights march, and most notably, a mural of the Siege of Derry. Only one group of pictures—all related to the conflict over home rule in the late 19th and early 20th century—had a strong thematic or chronological basis, and these were practically the only pictures that led the girls to make specific historical references.

The purpose of history

This seeming inconsistency between the girls’ high regard for history and their relative lack of knowledge was especially clear when they talked about the purpose of studying the subject and its role in addressing community division in Northern Ireland. Like many of the students we interviewed, Amber and Joyce were loyal to their own political and religious community, but they expected school history to deepen and expand their understanding of the conflict, as well as to make them more appreciative of the perspective of Catholics. They chose a group of murals as being related to themselves, for example, because “they’re both things from Ulster, and that’s where we live, and you know they’re just about what we live and what we grow up with.” As one girl said, “It’s something we have to sort of live with, the divide, every day, and it’s interesting to know how it started … and why we have to live with the divide and why it’s all happening.”

One girl, in describing why she thought history was interesting, noted, “I just think the Protestant/Catholic thing in Northern Ireland, it just gives like some background information and stuff like how Northern Ireland was formed.”
Values and beliefs
Throughout the interview, though, Amber and Joyce made their identification with Unionism clear, and the image they said had the most to do with them was a photograph of unionist leader Edward Carson behind a prominently-displayed Union Flag. As one girl pointed out, “It’s about the history of your country,” and one said that she’d “seen like quite a few pictures of him...he helped form Northern Ireland.” In discussing how Catholic and Protestant views of the period differed, they pointed to their own commitment to the unionist side—“A key point for me that happened in history would be...the signing of the Solemn League and Covenant.” They also took a less critical view of murals than many other students, and they seemed to accept their content at face value; one girl suggested that murals are important “to remind people of what happened, maybe to remind people of why they’re doing it, of why they’re fighting and why they’re painting murals and you know, saying, ‘We’re not just doing this for nothing, we have a reason for doing it.’”

Political commitment—orientation and school history’s role
These girls also were confident that their political commitments would not fundamentally change, even though they hoped that studying history at school would provide a fuller understanding of Northern Ireland’s past than they were likely to encounter outside school. When asked how learning about Carson or events related to contemporary murals changed their views, both stated clearly that their views had not changed. As one explained, “It didn’t. I know more now than what I did know before, and before I just sort of knew a few wee things, but now I know sort of like the whole picture, really.” Similarly, one girl noted that before studying the Siege of Derry at school, she had “maybe heard a bit about it, but I wouldn’t really know nothing,” and her partner agreed, “Yeah, just really know something happened, but you weren’t sure.” They said much the same thing about King William and the Battle of the Boyne: After studying it at school, “You just had more facts” and “You sort of had more to know about it,” but “your views didn’t really change about it...” In each of these cases, Amber and Joyce expected school to help them better understand the bits and pieces of history they had picked up in their community, rather than to challenge their views. As one of them put it, “I know I’ve heard a whole lot of different people from where I live, talking about things, whenever I was younger, and I was like, ‘Why? Why is that there so important?’ And now you’re getting to find out a lot about a whole lot of the things... School History, enhanced understanding and judgement. And yet, when asked about the purpose of learning history at school, both girls were committed to the idea that it should expand their understanding beyond narrowly sectarian perspectives. One girl pointed out that it’s important to study history,

Because it could change your views on how you feel about something that’s happened in history, if you knew the background information on it and things like that. [What do you mean?] Like say you know something, but the background information, on like Ulster and that, and then something happens in Ulster, you might take a point of view of something, but if you had known the background information, you might have a different view on it, you might be totally loyalist or totally Catholic, but now you’ve seen both sides of it, so you wouldn’t be as sectarian.

Her partner agreed and added,

I think that it would help you to have your own views and things and not follow other people or your family. [What do you mean?] Well, I know myself I’ve heard about a whole lot of things that have happened from my family and I was sort of starting to just take over whatever they said, and now after learning about it more at school, I’ve got my own views on it and I know how I feel about things.

Viewpoints and interpretations
For both girls, a critical element of this enhanced understanding was the chance to learn about both Protestant and Catholic viewpoints, and they thought that understanding multiple perspectives would lead to reduced prejudice. One explained,

Whenever you’ve been studying history you maybe take both sides of the situation more, maybe see it from both sides of the situation more cause you’ve been doing that in class, then you know whenever you’re coming to your own views.

She went on to explain that this is important “because, well, you can’t grow up completely biased against some people.” Her partner agreed and added, “Yeah, it’s just something we’ll have to live with, and it’s good to know about other people’s views whenever, you know, you get older and things.” The interview returned to the question of whether learning about history at school would change their views or simply increase their background knowledge. One girl explained, “It depends on the subject, probably on some things maybe change your own views, but I’d say probably on most things just the facts and stuff.” Her partner added,

It really wouldn’t change your view but expand it...You know, make it, I don’t know how to put this, like you have your view, but you also know that there’s something else, other people have their views and that you can change your view from just being one thing to saying, ‘Well, yeah, I think that there, I also think this as well’...you might say something, like be totally [one-sided], but you might also see another side of it."

Asked why it would be important to know other people’s views if they are going to continue to be loyal to their own communities, one girl explained, “Well, knowing other people’s views, it would mean you don’t say something that would like hurt them, or say something that’s really...” “...That they might feel prejudiced against,” her partner added. The first girl continued, “Or they might feel that because you said this here that you are making a deliberate sort of dig at them and you’re being prejudiced against them, because you have different views and if you know they have different views than you, then you can say, ‘Oh, I’ll not say that right now.’”
School history’s value
Both these girls, then, identified with the Protestant community and its historical symbols, and they seemed confident that their identifications would not change. They, nevertheless, considered school history valuable in two ways. First, it provided a more complete picture of the history of Northern Ireland’s conflict, and this not only led to a better understanding of topics they had encountered only superficially but also allowed them to develop their own perspectives, rather than simply adopting others’ views uncritically. Second, it exposed them to nationalist perspectives (which they always referred to as “Catholic”); they appeared to think this was valuable in its own right—as a way of expanding their understanding—but also that it would help them avoid offending members of the other community.

Sectarian ignorance
Upon closer inspection, though, Amber’s and Joyce’s interview was notable precisely for its lack of insight into nationalist perspectives. They knew that nationalists were in favour of a United Ireland, and they knew that Charles Stuart Parnell and the Easter Rising were part of that attempt—and that these took place at about the same time as (and in opposition to) speeches by Edward Carson and the call to “Defend Ulster” (although Parnell was active a generation before the other events in this group). Beyond this, however, their grouping and discussion of images showed little awareness of the substance of nationalist history. For instance, they failed to recognize, and had no associations with, images of a Northern Ireland Civil Rights march, the “Native Irish” in the sixteenth century, or nineteenth-century nationalist leader Daniel O’Connell—they placed these last two together only because they were both “cartoon drawings.”

More strikingly, they had no sense of the role of the Irish Famine in nationalist views of the past. They had studied the topic in primary school, and at least one had read a work of children’s fiction on the period, and they recognized that a mural of the Famine was more likely to be seen in a Catholic neighborhood—but when asked why, they could only explain that most people in the South are Catholics and “people in the South think about the Famine more”; they knew that the Famine also affected the North, but “you sort of think it’s going to happen more in the South.” Absent was any recognition that the Famine figures in nationalist history as an example of British indifference to Irish suffering. Similarly, in discussing a picture of British troops in Londonderry in the 1970s, one girl said, “Maybe it’s just people in violence,” while the other suggested, “I think probably just something happened, maybe shooting, or a bomb, and it’s the army going to try and sort it out.” Not only did they not associate the photograph with Bloody Sunday—a connection many other students made—they failed to connect it to the turbulent relationship between British troops and the Catholic community more generally, for these girls, the troops were simply going in “to try and sort it out.”

Janice and Niamh
Janice and Niamh were completing their third year at a non-selective girls’ maintained (Catholic) school in the heart of a mid-Ulster town. The school was categorized as being in an area of conflict. The town is a deeply divided and segregated one with clearly identifiable nationalist and loyalist areas close to its centre. The school, itself, is near a community “inter-face”, which has seen frequent street violence over the years. This violence has been particularly associated with opposition to contested Orange parades. Non-selective or “high” schools in Northern Ireland usually serve local neighborhoods and draw their students mainly from lower socio-economic groupings. Students would be regarded as less academically able and, therefore, less likely to continue to third level education.

This was not an especially long interview, but both girls were cooperative and willing to answer all our questions, usually without hesitation. Niamh tended to dominate throughout, and we usually had to address questions directly to Janice if we hoped to get a separate response—and when we did, her answers sometimes demonstrated a different perspective than Niamh’s.

Historical knowledge—school and vernacular history
Both girls displayed specific knowledge not only about topics that they had studied in school (quickly recognizing Parnell as a “leader looking for home rule” and Carson as someone against it, for example), but also about topics that were not part of the curriculum. Niamh, for example, gave two extended explanations of the purpose, process, and outcome of the hunger strikes in the early 1980s—at a combined 136 words, this was one of the longer historical descriptions we found in any of our interviews. When asked where she had learned about the topic, she pointed to both her family and her own reading: “The whole family is into history. They sit and discuss it. I have read a few books on the hunger strikes as well.” As with many of our participants, historical interests developed in one context—family discussions—led Niamh to seek further information from other sources.

They sorted the images into groups that had broad topical similarities, including wars, murals, royalty, “action pictures,” and industry. Most of these groupings drew from different time periods and/or included both nationalist and unionist figures, and when we probed their answers, they showed a clear awareness of these distinctions. They pointed out that the “action” category included both pro- and anti-Home Rule images, and that the “wars” group had images of the Easter Rising and “the Battle of the Somme in France.” As they added pictures to their initial groupings, however, they began to modify some categories to more directly reflect community differences. The initial category of “royalty,” for example, included King William and Queen Elizabeth, but they added a photograph of a contemporary Anglican Church and re-dubbed this group “Protestant.” Similarly, an initial category of older images was simply “historical,” but they then removed a round tower (“the legacy of the monks”) and placed it along with a drawing of the “Native Irish” and one of Daniel O’Connell, who they thought might be an Irish MP. Overall, then, their categories reflected a combination of two approaches: sometimes they
used topical groupings that subsumed both traditions (wars, murals, etc.) or that were largely independent of the conflict (industry), whereas at other times they applied religious/political distinctions—which they usually denoted as “Protestant” and “Irish.”

Community perspectives—religion
Janice and Niamh clearly were aware that the two communities had differing historical perspectives. In discussing the events of 1916, for example, they noted that the nationalist community would remember the Easter Rising, while Protestants would commemorate the Battle of the Somme, and they knew that the subject of a mural would differ depending on which community it was located in. They also thought that students at a Protestant school would respond differently in the interview than they had—Niamh thought that students would know about the Titanic, but not as much about the Famine or its associated workhouses. She explained, “They wouldn’t learn much about that because it was the majority of the Protestants hired the servants and the majority of Protestants built the Titanic so they would have a different view on it.” When asked why there are different views of the past, Niamh responded simply, “Because of religion. Catholic & Protestant teach different religions. One believes one reason and one the other.”

Orientation beliefs and values
Like several of the students we interviewed, these girls thought that history in the schools of the other community might be taught from a biased perspective, at least in part, but that in their own school there was no partiality. Their views, however, were heavily influenced by a nationalist perspective, and while they frequently demonstrated knowledge of people, events, and symbols important to nationalists, they rarely displayed a similar familiarity with those of Unionism. In addition, Niamh quickly noted her identification with a mural of Bobby Sands—

“The hunger strike one because they died for their rights. They had no other way of showing their strength. They went on the blanket for a few years previously but it didn’t seem to work, and it was the only way they could show their strength, by going on hunger strike, and if they died then it would make the British Government give them their rights, and then all the dying would end—but unfortunately it didn’t. So that is very important because it shows their bravery.

This description not only demonstrates Niamh’s identification with a nationalist narrative of the hunger strikes—a subject she would not have studied in school - but reflects her familiarity with specific ways of talking about the event. The phrase “went on the blanket,” for example, would only be used within the nationalist community. This orientation was much less evident in Janice’s responses. She identified with a mural of the Famine, for example, not because of its nationalist associations but because “it remembers the problems of people with no food,” and when asked the purpose of school history, she simply noted, “I just like to know about history.”

Nationalism and school history
The resilience of Niamh’s Nationalism was especially apparent when she talked about the purpose of school history. She thought that the subject should expand community perspectives, and she consistently equated the experiences of Protestants and Catholics. She showed little insight into unionist viewpoints, however, and she was only minimally critical of the nationalist perspective. Indeed, it seemed at times as though school history had served primarily to deepen her community identification rather than to complicate it. When asked what the purpose of school history was, Niamh explained—

“It’s to show that—you know the way the communities are divided? And the Protestant community call us “Fenians?” Well, actually the first Fenians were Presbyterians, and it’s to show us that no side was, they don’t go back into their history and we don’t, so I think that’s one of the purposes.

At first glance, Niamh seems to be equating the limitations of contemporary unionist and nationalist perspectives and suggesting that both sides need to better understand their pasts. Yet her example points only to Unionist blind spots—their failure to recognize that some Protestants in the past were also nationalists—and so we probed her response further by asking, “Can you think of any examples that might go the other way, where it might help enlighten nationalists where they might have gone wrong?” Niamh replied—

“The famine, because both Catholics and Protestants died in it and it shows that there is two sides and they both suffered.

Again, Niamh equates Catholics and Protestants and notes their mutual experiences, and she may be mildly critical of nationalists for failing to recognize Protestant suffering, but here, too, she assimilates the Protestant past to her already-established view of the deprivation of the Famine. In a sense, she does not so much identify differing perspectives on the Famine but rather argues that Protestants had the same experiences as Catholics—just as she had noted that Protestants were the first nationalists.

Similarly, in discussing the Battle of the Somme, Niamh recognized that current nationalist and unionist perspectives differed because “the Irish didn’t want to recognize that all the Irish soldiers died,” and she suggested that students in a Protestant school were likely only to learn about the participation of Protestant soldiers. She was critical of Protestants, then, for failing to recognize Catholic suffering, and she was critical of nationalists only to the extent that they also failed to recognize the suffering of their own people. In each of these instances, Niamh suggested the need to move beyond simplifications in traditional nationalist and unionist perspectives, but only by equating the experiences of the two communities—not by recognizing legitimate differences between the two.
Community master narrative
The acceptance of community representations was also evident when Niamh talked about murals. She and Janice initially grouped all murals together, and while they recognized that the purpose of murals was to show a community’s “strength,” they did not seem to problematize their content but, simply, to accept them at face value. This was especially evident as Niamh talked about the Bobby Sands mural, as in the extended quote included earlier. At another point in the interview one of the girls described a set of images as “represent[ing] history in murals and remembering what has happened,” and when asked whether murals are a good way to learn history, Niamh’s only criticism was that, sometimes, they might not have enough writing, and so “you might just get the gist of it but you still have to go and ask questions about it.” The salience of community history was also evident when we specifically asked, “If something in school challenged something you heard outside school how would you cope with that?” Niamh responded, “I would ask questions about it. I would ask the teacher, then I would ask Mummy and then ask about.”

Rory and Dermot
Rory and Dermot were third year students in a maintained (Catholic) non-selective, single sex school in Belfast. The area in which the school is set is in the heart of nationalist/ republican territory in the west of the city. Here, the Catholic population lives in a large but homogeneous community which is, to a great extent, self-sufficient in terms of services. Young people tend not to travel out of the area often and, therefore, are unlikely to come into direct contact with the Protestant population. The area is highly politicised as evidenced through wall murals, posters and other symbolism, which mainly express republican viewpoints. During the Troubles the area was regarded as a stronghold of the provisional Irish Republican Army (IRA) which, with the breakdown of normal statutory provision, came to have an important influence on the way the community functioned. Political representation over the last twenty years has swung from a narrow majority for the moderate nationalist Social Democratic and Labor Party to widespread support for Sinn Fein. The leader of Sinn Fein, Gerry Adams, is the area’s Westminster Member of Parliament. The school is a large one which, alongside an adjacent Catholic boys’ grammar school, educates most of the young men in the area.

Master narrative—nationalist orientation
The interview with Rory and Dermot, unsurprisingly, reflected this political environment. For example, in his initial reactions, Rory immediately associated pictures of British soldiers with “Bloody Sunday”. The boys grouped this image with those of the Easter Rising, 1916 and the Civil Rights movement of the 1960s as about “Irish Politics”—but, significantly, each event was then explained in the context of IRA associations, real or perceived. Hence, civil rights was “mainly nationalists marching here, the IRA mainly controlled it”, and Bloody Sunday was “where the IRA and the police had a shootout”. Not only are these interpretations challenged by scholarship but fascinatingly, politically, even Sinn Fein propaganda would be very reluctant to subscribe to these versions of the events as they would be regarded by unionists as a vindication of their opposition to republicanism. Rory acknowledged, peremptively, that the Easter Rising provided the genesis of the IRA but then connected it directly with the recent conflict—“cause this gave the opportunity for this to happen [the outbreak of the modern Troubles], and this is 50-odd years later”. Thus, he was conflating the Irish nationalist struggle of the Twentieth Century with the actions of the IRA and Republicanism, alone.

This dominant narrative recurred throughout the interview and was particularly reflected in Rory’s responses. Dermot shared many of his partner’s views though, at times, displayed a greater desire to move beyond the Irish context to wider events. Even when discussing the pictures related to early settlements or monuments Rory specifically related them “...to old Irish history” or giving “…a good sense of Ireland”. With the political images this became even more obvious. For instance, he linked the Famine picture to that of Bobby Sands as mural pictures representing old Irish history with Dermot then adding “Bloody Sunday” in conversation even though that picture had been placed in another group. Even Nelson Mandela was seamlessly integrated into the story using civil rights as a connection because “…he fought for his freedom the same way as the Irish are here.”

Rory and Dermot had no difficulty in identifying pictures which they saw as “…very deep in Protestant history”, such as the Siege of Derry, King William and the Union Flag, but these did not represent their story, therefore they generated only cursory attention. For example, despite having studied Edward Carson during that year at school, initially, they failed to identify him, with Rory venturing that it might be Churchill. Indeed, having done so they then managed to incorporate three of the images that might be closely linked to unionism into their own narrative. The Battle of the Somme picture was deemed significant only because the First World War established the opportunity for the 1916 leaders to plan rebellion. The Siege of Derry, studied in second year, was “…when Catholics were locked inside by Protestants” whereas the reverse was the case—thus Catholics were envisaged as victims. And, it was seen as of little consequence that Henry Joy McCracken was from a Presbyterian background because “…he fought for the nationalists.”

Community history—republicanism
The republican perspective dominated when questions were asked as to what the boys felt was closest to them, and what was most important in historical terms. As to what was closest to them, both boys chose civil rights and linked it to other pictures that contained republican imagery. Rory’s reasons were “…because of where we live this is very, very, this is Irish history for us, this is civil rights march—IRA, again Bloody Sunday.” Replying to what was important, he returned to the Easter Rising to reiterate the continuing national struggle, “…the Irish eventually go and try to break free from the British, I think that’s got the most significance to me.”
School history’s role vis-a-vis vernacular history

The republican narrative, then, ran throughout the interview. The one tension arose when the boys discussed the purpose of learning history at school. At first their answers were entirely consistent with the view of history they had expressed up to that point. For Dermot it was “...to know what you are and all that” and for Rory “...to give you a purpose of identity [Interviewer: What do you mean?] You’ve got a belief, you’ve got to hang on to it, it’s yours, it’s what makes you, it shapes you, it forms you.” Yet, they were adamant that history learned in school was more considered than that learned at home and in the community. For them, the former was more informed and it better balanced different viewpoints. In Rory’s opinion school history “...gave insight on what happened, a lot of it you will learn outside anyway but it gives you, it tries to make the facts as even as it can, it’s not one-sided, it tries to look at both sides of the argument”. Dermot agreed and he went on to recognize the limitations of history learned in the community by pointing out that through school “...some people get to know that the right thing happened, because some people believe what other people say but it’s not that true.”

Dominant narratives

Further, both boys were forthright in agreeing that school history could change views. Yet, when asked again if history could alter those who held strong views Rory fully realized the power and importance of dominant narratives within the two communities,

Rory: Definitely, but that won’t be admitted outside theirselves, they’ll think deep down, but they’ll not admit that.

Interviewer: Explain what you mean?

Rory: If you are a deep down Protestant or a deep down Catholic, you’re not going to say, well maybe in front of people, maybe they were wrong, maybe they were right, you’ll keep that yourself, but you’ll still be a strong Protestant or Catholic at the end of it.

School history—interpretations and perspectives

In effect, the substance of the interview revealed very little evidence that either student had actually dwelt long on alternative perspectives. When asked for an example of how school history had influenced him Dermot explained how knowledge of the First World War had helped him grasp the motives for those who led the Easter Rising – in other words he was using the knowledge he had gained to achieve a better understanding of the nationalist perspective, rather than how others regarded the event. Similarly, Rory clearly enjoyed historical study and was excited by the prospect of learning more about the recent past. He talked, expectantly, of lessons “building up” towards the Easter Rising and Civil Rights and, later, of wanting to know more about “1969 and stuff like that, the hunger strikers”—but, again this curiosity was confined to events associated with the dominant narrative of his community. That Rory was committed to that narrative was confirmed when he moved from the third person to the personal to explain why the Famine and the Hunger Strike were commemorated in his community,

To show people that they’re strong, to show the other side we’re not defeated, look what happened to us, we had one of our best leaders killed, we had millions of people killed in the Famine, but we’ve come back, we’re strong from this, we’ll keep fighting.

Thus, he was aware that historical events were potentially an important political tool—or in his words “spearheads”—to rally the community.

Rory and Dermot were bright young men who were enthused by the history they had encountered in school. They both appreciated the open and informed approach that was taken by their teachers and were prepared for it to have an impact on how they saw past events. Yet, to date, there was little evidence that it had significantly challenged the dominant narrative they encountered in their local environment. It appeared that the prevailing political ethos around them was over-riding the impact of what was experienced in the history classroom even though they had sympathy with what was being attempted in the latter. The result was that they were tending to draw on their expanding knowledge to substantiate the view of the past which best supported their emerging political position within the community.

John and Ted

John and Ted were fourth year students at a Controlled (Protestant) high (non-selective) school. The town in which the school was set is a pre-dominantly affluent area, some sixteen miles from Belfast. During the conflict families from a mainly Protestant background migrated there from Belfast as it was perceived as a ‘safe haven’ from violence. This migration was largely middle class but there was also a significant movement of working class Protestant families to public housing estates on the outskirts of the town. Subsequently, these estates came under the influence of loyalist paramilitary groups. The school attended by John and Ted drew it students from these estates and from private housing developments in the town. At the time of the interviews it was experiencing enrolment difficulties and was subject to ‘special measures’ to raise its level of educational achievement. Within two years of interviewing it was merged with a larger Controlled non-selective girls’ school.

Prior to the interview the class teacher described Ted as the best history student in the school. Both he, and John, displayed great enthusiasm for the picture-sorting task. They talked at length about each picture and how each was connected, explaining everything they knew about each one and how it related to the others. So much so, that there was an Irish political perspective, with only a passing interest in those pictures relating to ancient or social history. Social history was considered mainly in the context of indicating ‘progress’ through time, a theme the boys returned to later in the interview.

When treating the political images, two major categories emerged. One involved a
large collection of pictures which they grouped as “...people working together and pulling together and fighting for their beliefs”. The pictures included both unionist and nationalist leaders, William of Orange, Carson, the Siege of Derry, Parnell, the Easter Rising and the Civil Rights movement of the 1960s. Interestingly, it appeared, at first, that their second classification, ‘hardship’ was going to be used to encompass all these political images but having settled on the first category three other pictures were included in a ‘hardship’ group: the wall mural of the Irish famine, the painting of the Battle of the Somme and the photograph of British troops on the streets of Derry. The latter, they interpreted as Bloody Sunday and, together, the three, according to Ted, represented “…the bad times in Irish history, they symbolize a great loss of life and bloodshed”. Their deliberations over the political pictures indicated that they associated political action in Ireland through time with individual and collective struggle and sacrifice.

**Dominant Catholic and Protestant narratives**

Note that John and Ted made no attempt to separate the pictures into Protestant/Unionist or Catholic/Nationalist categories (like most other students they used the religious rather than the political labels throughout), even though it is clear that they would have had no difficulty in doing so if they had been asked. Rather, in justifying their classifications they demonstrated a sound understanding of the dominant narratives of each of the two traditions. When speaking about each of their selections mention of one tradition was balanced, almost routinely, by a corresponding example from the other. So, when referring to those “…fighting for their beliefs”, Ted maintained, “…you’ve got Carson over there fighting and rallying people against home rule, and you’ve got Charles Stewart Parnell fighting for his belief that home rule should be kept in place”. John, when asked what pictures had most to do with him, also picked Parnell and Carson because “......it [home rule] sort of determined whether we would be Protestant or Catholic, and stuff like that”. This cross-referencing continued consistently at each stage of the interview. What emerged, then, was a view of Irish history as a battle of political wills leading to strife, as each side sought dominance over the other. Picking up on John’ remarks, Ted articulated this position by pointing to the Parnell and Easter Rising pictures because—

*It shows that there was Irish resistance to the British Government’s desire to keep hold of Northern Ireland, people’s rebelling with a different side of politics, and that shows me that if it wasn’t for both sides disagreeing with each other, then we wouldn’t have had such bloodshed and uproar, if there was just one equal side where everybody seemed to have the same beliefs.*

That the boys were fixed on this idea of struggle between the two traditions is further illustrated by Ted’s difficulty in placing the images of St Patrick and Queen Elizabeth. He clearly saw them as important but “felt they were the hardest ones to join together”. Yet, he persisted and by identifying St Patrick as Catholic and Elizabeth as Protestant he connected them through the struggle of reformation and counter-reformation in England.

**Historical perspectives—culture and politics**

In working with the pictures John and Ted gave little away as to their own cultural and political allegiances. Perhaps, Ted’s use of the term “Northern Ireland” in a pre-partition context might be construed as such but it was as if, by alluding to the two perspectives at each stage, the boys were able to keep any personal views in check. Yet, at the interview stage, when they were asked about the sources of their historical knowledge, they were happy to make it clear that they came from the Protestant tradition. At first John attributed his knowledge of Irish history to school, alone. It was only when Ted talked of visiting Belfast when he was younger and getting an insight, albeit a “...very one-sided one” into the “events … happening around you” from those on the streets, relatives and peers, that John, enthusiastically, related similar experiences. He acknowledged that “your grandparents and all, just say they’re Protestants, they’d tell you their story more effectively than the Catholic side and that “...when I was a kid I thought that we [Protestants] were treated badly and all.”

**School history—fluence and impact**

Both boys were adamant that school history had had an impact in challenging their views. Ted declared that school history was “…different because it’s [what you learn from the family] very one sided”, whereas John was of the opinion that school tackled issues “equally from the two points of view”. Recognition that history in school is valuable for its multi-perspective approach was common amongst most students interviewed. What made John and Ted unusual was that they credited learning history in school with bringing about changes in their attitudes toward Catholics. Both went into detail on this. John, following his statement that he had been brought up to believe Protestants had been treated badly, was of the view that,

*Now that I’ve seen the Catholics’ point of view, they’ve also had the hardships and the bad times as well, I don’t really don’t care about if someone’s a Protestant or Catholic now, I just give them equal respect.*

Ted concurred,

*I think history has pretty much given me respect for other people, when you look at their past and what they have gone through, how they’ve fought through it, I mean, I realise that when you look from your parents’ [position] about how they’ve had it, all these killings and every thing from their side, when you come into school, well the Irish [had a] hard time, the Dublin GPO, I mean they got executed, all the bombers, and its just terrible from both sides.*

**The value of history**

Yet, when the boys were asked a specific question as to the value of history they chose not to stress its multi-perspective aspect but, instead, placed importance on the lessons
it could teach you as to future actions. As Ted put it “…we can’t go forward if we don’t know about the past”. Such sentiments were common in other interviews but, again, what made these two distinctive was that they displayed consistency by pursuing this theme later in the interview when they were asked what they would want to know more about in history. In Ted’s case—

I would like to know more about, less of the origins, but more of what might happen in the future, what future and what prospects the future holds for what we’re talking about, basically, I want to know where the peace process might be going in a few years time.

John agreed with this but added that it was also important “…to know what’s going on around you, not just your own civilisation, but others.”

John’s and Ted’s liking of history was allied to their keen interest in the evolving political situation around them. For them history was important because it broadened their understanding and helped them make sense of the present, including the restricted outlook of those in their own community. Through their study of history they recognised that seeking political change was often a painful and divisive process, yet they had a sense that people could learn from the past and that a less contentious society might be the result. Both boys had shown an impressive level of historical understanding, which belied their placement in a non-selective school.

Discussion

Cross-case analysis of the larger body of interviews has been previously presented, but this in-depth analysis of a limited number of interviews illustrates the difficulty students have in reconciling school and community history effectively. Although nearly all these students were committed to retaining their original political allegiances while at the same time “…trying to look at both sides of the argument,” the conflict between school and community history was generally too pervasive for them to completely achieve such goals. Rory and Dermot recognized the value of seeing multiple perspectives and even admitted that school history might challenge their ideas, but they consistently demonstrated a nationalist interpretation of the past that showed little complexity or ambiguity; they even suggested that if school history did lead them to alternative ideas, they would be likely to keep it to themselves rather than admitting it in public. Janice and Niamh were much more likely to equate the experiences of Catholics and Protestants and to see the value of learning about both, rather than coming to grips with alternative perspectives, they assimilated Protestants’ experiences to the nationalist narratives with which they were already most familiar. Amber and Joyce were, perhaps, the most convincing and articulate in explaining the need to understand multiple perspectives rather than being limited to sectarian views gained through their own community, but despite their commitment to this goal, they displayed almost no specific understanding of the other community’s historical symbols and perspectives. Finally, John and Ted almost completely dismissed community history and spoke in the “academic” register of schooling, suggesting that they were able to incorporate school history only by ignoring their community background.

This study further illustrates the process by which students combine multiple sources of historical information in order to develop their own historical understandings; understandings which are never simply mirrors of any one of those sources. Optimistically, it demonstrates that school history in Northern Ireland can be a powerful way of helping students understand the importance of overcoming narrowly sectarian perspectives. More cautiously, however, this study illustrates just how difficult it can be for students to achieve the goals that they themselves consider important. Although they believe that school history can, and should, challenge community perspectives, such challenges are difficult for them to reconcile with their prior ideas, and they may either ignore them, reinterpret them in terms of their own backgrounds, or ignore their backgrounds altogether. Ultimately, although the students in this study see themselves as “…trying to look at both sides,” they have trouble doing so. They can hardly be faulted for failing to fully achieve more sophisticated understandings, for even educated adults in Northern Ireland struggle to make sense of the region’s difficult history. By understanding the limitations in students’ thinking, however, educators there may be better prepared to help students work through these tensions. In addition, educators in North America or other locations may be able to use these results to better understand the complexities that students in their own locations face in trying to balance the demands of competing historical perspectives.
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“We, Them and the Others”—Historical Thinking and Intercultural Ideas of Portuguese Students

Júlia Castro, University of Minho, Portugal

Abstract—The paper focuses on some of the issues related to an intercultural approach that has arisen in the context of history education in Portugal. It considers the possible links between second order of ideas in history such as empathy and significance, on one hand, and multicultural and intercultural conceptual matrices (difference / diversity and relation, culture/ culturality, universal / universality), on the other hand.

The empirical study of a descriptive, mainly qualitative nature, examines Portuguese adolescent students’ ideas related to this theoretical framework. The participants (N=130) were attending classes in grades 10, 11 and 12 in schools located in the north of Portugal. They were asked to discuss two pairs of accounts on historical encounters, one within a peaceful, intercultural context in the sixteenth-century, and the other during a conflict in the nineteenth-century. The arguments given by the Portuguese students suggest that they use ‘historical thinking’ in regard to a set of concepts related to historical empathy and significance which seems simultaneously to be linked to concepts of multiculturalism.

Keywords: Culture, Difference, Historical thinking, Interculturality, Multiculturalism, Universality.

Introduction: Multicultural and Intercultural approaches—two paradigms and a challenge to history education

The multicultural paradigm
It is important to clarify the concept of multiculturalism, because while it is a frequent element in the discourse of different disciplines and used by social actors, it is often used for contradictory purposes (Alcina, 1999; Wieviorka, 2002).

The concept of multiculturalism is linked to ideas of cultural characteristics as fundamental markers to define groups and communities and used simply to emphasize the coexistence of cultural forms or groups characterized by different cultures. The multicultural way to approach the complexities of societies is grounded in the reductionist principle that modern societies are marked by the coexistence of distinct cultures in the same space. As Alcina (ibid.) points out:

The multicultural or pluriculturality marks the state of a plural society from the point of view of the cultural communities with differentiated identities (p.74).
From this perspective, the term multiculturalism is also used as a generic concept to make sense of heterogenities, using some kind of mathematics of differences. In this model the heterogenic reality is divided into diverse, homogeneous cultural units and perpetuates the well known metaphor of the cultural mosaic. Multiculturalism, while a cultural model, points to incommensurable distinctions between different cultures. This vision of human beings (humanity) and society in general leads to the notion of the world as a mosaic of cultures whose tesserae have well-delineated borders, preventing interaction or inter-understanding (Abdallah-Pretceille, 1996, 2003).

The intercultural paradigm
According to Abdallah-Pretceille (2003), the inter prefix of the intercultural term indicates the central idea of relation and focuses on interactions between groups, individuals and identities. Considering this presupposition, the intercultural approach moves away from the mere identification of the other on the basis of a comparison to find out existing differences, which is a key-stone to an ethnocentered perspective:

The intercultural approach starts with thinking of people as unique beings interfused with the cultural ambience of their community. This proposition gives special attention to the way that people assimilate the-other in themselves (Abdallah-Pretceille and Porcher, 1996, p.57).

The classification, the inventory of cultural characteristics as justifications of stereotyped behaviours, does not allow access to multiple perspectives. It is necessary to find abutments that allow us to understand that principles of otherness and plurality have universality as a fundamental axiom of humanity.

The intercultural approach implies a form of questioning in different areas of knowledge. It is therefore an epistemological imperative whose saliency has been pointed out by different authors in different fields. The reflection on concepts like difference and diversity, culture and culturality, relation, universal and universality has been a central focus of authors like Paul Ricoeur, Emmanuel Lévinas, Francis Jacques, Marc Augé, Michel Wieviorka and, in Portugal, A. Dias de Carvalho.

The intercultural approach moves away from the idea of culture (with a set of fixed data) as a determinant of behaviour, and focuses attention on how the individual uses the cultural data to express him/herself socially and personally. The core of the intercultural approach, when emphasising an anthropology of relation (Jacques, 1982), looks to the analysis of interactions and to relations between individuals and groups. Such a perspective is diametrically different from a causal, linear and determinist paradigm. It implies an understanding of humanity in its diversity, plurality, and universality (Abdallah—Pretceille, 1992).

The work of Martine Abdallah-Pretceille is an important theoretical source for the present study. It is marked by a balanced perspective and considers an analytical approach to different educational paradigms. Its theoretical framework suggests challenging ways of questioning, based on a fresh paradigm concerning contemporary pedagogy (Gonçalves, 2004). Its logic does not aspire to being a new discipline, rather it acts as a referential space for other disciplines (Abdallah-Pretceille, 1996). It is therefore a challenge to education in general and to history education in particular.

Youngsters’ historical thinking and interculturality—is there a connection?
Some studies on interculturality highlight history as one of the human sciences where the experience of the otherness and diversity emerges most frequently. Martine Abdallah-Pretceille and Louis Porcher (1999) underline the idea that history, considering its humanistic dimension, its objects, its methods, its purposes and social challenges is marked by the experience of the other.

No matter what historical issue is involved, the pressure of the present on the past is a phenomenon that focuses attention on the role of history as a school subject. The main question is whether this pressure is frequently put on the history curriculum through the inclusion of the history of minority or ethnic groups. The educational models that underline this kind of intervention are supported by the idea that substantive knowledge is enough to understand the complexity of social, cultural and political phenomena within a multicultural context.

In Portugal history as a school subject is frequently called upon to include cultural and ethnographic topics or to participate in intercultural/multicultural school projects (those terms are both used without considering that we are dealing with completely different approaches). In this sense, the use of history in school seems to be quite problematic because those experiences and activities are made in an impressionist way, without knowing students’ knowledge, understanding, interests or orientation. Such projects and practices fall frequently into a folk approach to cultures, emphasizing differences and stereotypes about peoples in the past. Once more they give the false impression that more substantive knowledge about other cultures or communities is enough to understand how people in the past related and interacted among themselves. From this perspective, groups and communities are presented like closed cultural units. Diversity as a fundamental axis of universality is completely outside the conceptual framework used to understand the complexity of humanity.

Cultures don’t interact; only people do (Abdallah-Pretceille, 2002). According to this point of view the concept of relations between individuals is central to understanding the idea of diversity. The concepts of relation, diversity and universality are the main keystones of the intercultural matrix, and thus they mark a difference between intercultural and multicultural approaches in the educational field.
Why should we consider the intercultural paradigm in the educational field, particularly in history education? The conceptual matrix proposed in the intercultural approach points to the idea that some of those concepts shape the way people think about otherness. Those concepts are central to understand how culture is marked by a dynamic, always changing process; people always interact by using elements of their culture, and this is why humankind is marked by universality.

Students in history classrooms deal with the idea of historical relationships between people and the way those relationships have influenced diversity in both the past and the present. Although this conceptualisation arises from a framework based on academic dialogue on the nature of history, its status suggests congruence with the status of meta-historical ideas as defined by Peter Lee (2004). In fact, while structuring and shaping ideas that are present in the process of understanding the other, they are part of the conceptual apparatus essential to explain human behaviour through time.

The present work focuses on the hypothesis that conceptual dynamics exist and that these imply some conceptual understanding of interculturality in students’ historical thinking. In connection with second-order ideas like empathy (Lee, 1984, 2003; Ashby, 2001) and significance (Cercadillo, 2000), concepts like diversity, relation and universality may be essential to understanding the way students think of ‘otherness’ within the disciplinary context of history.

The Study

The Research questions
— Is there a link between second–order ideas in history like empathy and significance and the ideas of difference and diversity, relation and universality?
— Is it possible to establish a model of progression of students’ historical knowledge that might inform an understanding of their multicultural and intercultural ideas?

The participants
The participants in this study were 130 secondary school students aged 15 to 18, and attending classes in grades 10, 11 and 12 in 7 schools located in the north of Portugal.

The research instrument
Participants were asked to individually respond to a written questionnaire where they should discuss two pairs of primary sources on historical encounters, one within a peaceful, intercultural context in the sixteenth-century, the other during a conflict in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

The historical materials

Task 1: Sources

Source 1
These men [the Portuguese] are traders. They can understand the distinction between superior and inferior up to a certain point, but I do not know if a system of rules for social behaviour exists among them. They drink by cups, without offering it to the others. They eat with fingers and not with small sticks like us … They do not understand the meaning of the written characters. They are people that spend their life travelling, … they exchange the goods they have for those they do not possess, but they are not bad people.

Teppo-ki (Japanese chronicle, 16th-century)

Source 2

The majority of people in Japan are of average height, robust and very strong for work … They are very polite. When we go inland, even the most honoured invites you to eat and sleep at his place. They are very curious on all things about us and about our lands. At home, they have the habit to sit down with the legs crossed … They eat on the floor, like the Muslins, and use sticks like the Chinese. They speak quietly and they think that we are not polite because we speak loudly. They wash themselves twice a day.

Jorge Alves (Portuguese chronicle, 16th-century)

Task 2: Sources

Source 1

The Portuguese seem friendly, but their pleasantness does not go beyond their words. They are very gentle with foreigners, but they do not invite anyone to their homes and meetings. They are very proud of themselves, their country and their traditions, and they consider themselves superiors […] They try to look modest, but their pride is clear in every word they speak, and in all their actions. They have an appearance of peaceful people but in reality they are aggressive; they seem quiet and pacific souls however their passions are violent.

Pierre Carrère (French author, 1796)
Source 2

The Frenchmen are weaker than the peoples of other nations, they are liars and really very mean [...]. their protection is robbery, their happiness is misery, and their softness is fear and weakness. The Frenchmen who still live with us are like a little group of children for which just one Portuguese is enough.

Frei João Soares (Portuguese author, 1808, during the Napoleonic invasions)

Questions
Some of the questions used in Tasks 1 and 2 were:

Question 1
What differences and similarities do you see between the two sources?

Question 3
What kind of influences might have influenced those authors when they wrote their descriptions of other nationalities?

Question 9
What kind of reactions might people have had at the time towards those descriptions?

Question 6
Do you think that these sources are enough to understand what people thought about each other at the time?

Question 10
How could those contacts have contributed to people’s ideas about each other at the time?

Analysis of Students’ Ideas

The data analysis was carried out on a qualitative basis, inspired by Grounded Theory (Strauss & Corbin(1991). The analytical process hoped to identify a pattern or patterns of ideas in relation to empathy and significance, considering the theoretical framework proposed by Peter Lee’s (1984a & b, 2003) and Lis Cercadillo’s (2000) research vis a vis a multicultural and intercultural conceptual matrix. The analytical constructs used to analyse student responses were:

1 Use of information;
2 Ideas about significance;
3 Ideas about empathy;
4 Ideas about difference, relation, diversity and universality.

Level 1—Restricted understanding

The ideas of these students concern the description of events, they focused on the authority of the source. These students are indifferent towards people in the past. “The other” tends to be seen as an object and the difference is the centre of these students’ attention, the use of comparison shows an auto and/or ethnocentered attitude. The ideas of these students emerge around a limited conceptual framework of multicultrality. For example, Celso, Maria and Ana gave the following thoughts:

Celso (task 2)
“Those descriptions are the reality as it was”
“I don’t know how people reacted to this description, I don’t have a clue.”

Maria—Task 2
“People didn’t like to listen to such things, because if they love their country they don’t like to hear comments about themselves and about its life style. No one likes to hear bad things about themselves and their country.”

Ana—Task 1
“I think nowadays Portuguese culture is much better than Japanese culture”

Level 2—Conditional Emergent Understanding

The ideas of these students are centred in causal and justification explanatory models. Ideas expressed by these students about people in the past are based on the concept of strangeness. “The other” is marked by the notion of object and, through comparison, they look for a positive or negative evaluation. The idea of diversity is static, therefore ideas only relate indirectly to a multicultural framework. For example Mara, Emanuel, and Fernando gave the following thoughts:

Mara – Task 1
“Through those contacts we understand why some nations are rivals or friends nowadays.”
“For knowing someone time is necessary in order to classify and judge.”

Emanuel—Task 1
“The reactions of people must be very negative because for the people in that time everything that was strange was negative.”

Fernando—Task 2
“These sources speak about different nations. They speak about differences. Portuguese are different from French. Portuguese are courageous and proud …”
Level 3—Decentred Emergent Understanding
This involves a critical positioning through sources, with a selection of information. A multi contextual analysis may emerge, but still with the constraints of the present. In the explanation of the past they search for detail grounded in contemporary experience and logic. The concept of diversity emerges, but still in a static form. From the ideas of these students emerge some implicit limited knowledge of an intercultural framework.

For example, Sónia, Patricia, Tiago and Nelson gave the following thoughts:

Sónia—Task 1
“These sources are good to start to understand the way people relate each other, they help us to understand the way people live […] and allow us to make comparisons.”

Patricia—Task 1
“The factors that have conditioned the descriptions of this author have been the economy, development of society, and the discoveries […]”

Tiago—Task 1
“The King, in that time, suggested the invention of utensils to eat in order to improve education.”

Nelson—Task 2
“I think that these sources are not enough to understand what people think about others, because there are different regions with different ways of living”

Level 4—Decentred Understanding
For these students there is a critical, considered selection of information with consideration of the context of the message’s origin and production. Students looked for the context to attempt a “reconstruction of past situations”. The concept of relation is clearer and the concept of diversity is explained in terms of a dynamic process. Students show an understanding of the conceptual framework of interculturality.

For example, Ricardo and Marlene gave the following thoughts—

Ricardo—Task 1
“People that lived in the time of discoveries had only the time to trade and to rest in foreign lands. The short period of time that they spend in those places was only enough to make superficial descriptions.”

“Those men had been visitors, they didn’t live in those distant places, so they didn’t communicate with people in order to know their ideas and their problems.”

Marlene—Task 1
“The Portuguese King understood the superiority of Japanese people and did not try to dominate them. Instead he reinforced the commercial relations.”

“I think that information in these sources is the result of an interaction between people of two nations but their relationship doesn’t have the purpose of knowing deeply, the habits and the way of life. Their information is a set of impressions of contacts between people (probably through trade).”

Level 5—Decentred and integrative understanding
In the ideas of these students there is a critical and more consistent selection of the information, considering the context of message. The attempt of “reconstruction” of the past is made in a contextualized form. The concept of relationship is central and open, and links to the idea of universality. Therefore, the framework of interculturality implies an understanding of a plural universality.

For example Mafalda, Joana and Tânia gave the following thoughts—

Mafalda—Task 1
“These descriptions are the opinion of people about other cultures. Therefore it is natural to have different and partial versions that are superficial. The ethnocentric perspective leads to incomplete information about others.”

Joana—Task 1
“The cross information is possible if people have an everyday relationship. Through communication people developed their own mentalities and introduce new cultural aspects in their own society. These exchanges are always the best way to a better knowledge.”

Tânia—Task 1
“The richness and cultural practices are shared by peoples in all times. Therefore the culture of some countries is very rich.”

Reflections
The research data and its analysis suggests some key points that might highlight future reflections about interculturality and children’s historical thinking:
—Students operate with a set of ideas which seem to be related to multicultural or intercultural conceptual frameworks.
—These notions may generate elements of a model of historical thinking from a Restricted Understanding to a Decentred and Integrative Understanding of people’s interactions in the past.
—The ideas related to the concept of difference are connected with historical thinking that is less sophisticated and consequently more restricted.
— Students who show more sophisticated historical thinking present ideas like diversity, relationship and universality, fitting their vision of the world in an intercultural perspective.

— This study indicates that for these students situations of cultural dialogue are a bigger cognitive challenge than situations of conflict between people.

The main results of this study suggest a possible connection between the students' historical thinking and multicultural and intercultural ideas. To ignore this possibility will perhaps lead to consequences like the following—

1. marginalising the importance of research findings on students' ideas on diversity and relationships may validate impressionistic, superficial comments about the importance of history in the context of the contemporary universality agenda;

2. not considering explicitly an intercultural approach might mean missing the opportunity to enlarge the scope of inquiry in history education in response to children's needs and entitlement.
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Abstract—This paper is about using folktales to introduce young children to the past. It examines the ways in which folk tales reflect the different types of people found in the past and now, in all societies and how folk tales reflect universal values as well as differences between societies. It considers how folk tales can encourage young children to find out about past times, using processes of historical enquiry: concepts of time and change, similarity and difference; making inferences from sources; understanding why accounts may differ. Turkish and English folk tales are taken as examples. Finally, a case study demonstrates how a folk tale was used to help a class of English 8 – 11 year olds to understand that traditional values in Turkey still apply to their own lives today.
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Introduction: folk tales as oral history and Turkey
This paper is concerned with the traditional folktale, or folk legend. Folk tales have their origins in oral history although they may also include the supernatural. Walker (1990) explains how eagerness prompts the teller to embroider the story. Since folk tales were transmitted orally, they evolved over time. Evidence of the longevity of the Turkish tale can be found in episodes from the Gilgamesh epic, from the times of Alexander, Attila and Tamerlane. There is also evidence of contacts between the Turcic peoples with the multi-ethnic residents of eleventh century Asia Minor (Walker990). However many tales transmitted orally, they evolved over time. Evidence of the longevity of the Turkish tale can be found in episodes from the Gilgamesh epic, from the times of Alexander, Attila and Tamerlane. There is also evidence of contacts between the Turcic peoples with the multi-ethnic residents of eleventh century Asia Minor (Walker990). However many tales can be found in episodes from the Gilgamesh epic, from the times of Alexander, Attila and Tamerlane. There is also evidence of contacts between the Turcic peoples with the multi-ethnic residents of eleventh century Asia Minor (Walker990).

Learning historical thinking through folktales
Folk tales, young children and history
History involves the interaction between content and the processes of historical enquiry. Young children, because of their immaturity and limited knowledge, may not be able to undertake genuine historical enquiry but they can begin to learn about past times and to apply embryonic historical thinking through folk tales. The process of historical enquiry includes—

1. recognising that some things change and others remain the same, whether social structures, ways of life or values
2. sequencing events, recognising cause and effect
3. understanding motive, reasons for people’s behaviour
4. understanding that there may be different interpretations of an account, told from different perspectives and in different times

Each of these four processes can be applied to folk tales.

1. Folk Tales: values, continuity and change
Briggs (1991) explains that, as extended families, clans and tribal groupings developed, folk tales carried the ground rules for peaceful coexistence. They codified a system of values that made peaceful inter-communal living possible. Adults told folk tales to each other in order to interpret, reinforce and perpetuate communal values, beliefs and identity. As proto-law, the folk tales embedded and transmitted cultural messages of action that were applied, interpreted and enforced in the community. Values in folk tales include persistence, courage, soundness of character, curiosity, compassion, concern for those outside the family, cleverness and religious mores and behaviours. Folk tales elaborate and define the meaning of a value or values.

Beauty is one such value
Max Luthi (1986) claims that in folk tales ‘beauty’, which occurs frequently, represents goodness and perfection. Beauty is a universal concept in folk tales. It is usually only described through its effect on others; the reader must imagine it because the folk tale aims for universal validity and essence, not for the particular. Beautiful girls take on magical radiance of the other worldly. Concern with beauty reflects a fascination with the absolute. Beauty is associated with gold, with silver and glass; there are associations with the sun, the sublime and the pure. Beauty therefore represents goodness and perfection. But goodness is also linked with its opposite, evil, with dragons, giants, cruelty. Ugliness and misshapenness are often juxtaposed with beauty. Ugly is associated with grey, black, dirt, lice. We may talk about, ‘ugly as sin.’

Beauty also brings man and nature together. It is often associated with the sky, the sea, the stars. Feelings are often tied to the season or time of day. Clouds, birds, mist, gardens have a universal aestheticism. Luthi argues that nature is beautiful and that beauty in folk tales is associated with light, with the divine and is grounded in the spiritual needs of life. Beauty can also define gender boundaries and behaviour: the tale of Actaeon enshrines a set of rules about male behaviour and the transgression of boundaries—in Actaeon’s case, with fatal results.

Folk tale characters tend to be universal
in that they reflect human traits, beliefs, values and behaviours. They are often couched in abstract terms. And, being thus abstracted, they can operate at a meta-level with resonances outside their original location. The folk tale characters’ universality can analogically relate to similar characters in other cultures with their specific contexts and relationships. Universal characters can be active agents for the transmission of universal beliefs and values. Thus Beowulf has resonances that appeal across international boundaries.
Values in Turkish Folk Tales
Walker (1990: xxviii) identified, in an analysis of 131 Turkish Folk Tales, values she finds particularly characteristic of Turkish Tales: persistence (37), soundness of character (26), curiosity (26), love of family (22), compassion (20), concern for those outside the family (20), hospitality (19), respect for elders (19), trust in Allah (18), obedience (14), helpfulness (14), charity (13), friendship (12), gratitude and cleverness (12). Such values, she says, ‘have marked the Turks both as a people and as a part of the human community throughout the many centuries of their history.’ In the Arabian Nights beauty is described in the magnificence of cities and buildings, representing timelessness and perfection. In oriental folk tales music and fragrance, smell and taste play an aesthetic role: objects such as golden bowls, silver chandeliers, flutes, harps, lutes and fiddles also have aesthetic markers and connotations.

2. Folk tales: sequence, cause and effect
Children can explain sequence and causes and effects of events through folk tales. For narrative depends on sequences of events, each event leading to the next. Folk tales are a particularly good genre to discuss and rewrite because they generally have a simple structure which listeners and tellers can remember. Stories are linear, sentences are simple, every adventure is a unit, characters are one dimensional. Objects have clear outlines: nuts, eggs, little boxes. Castles are stylised. Structurally, in terms of the relationship between the author and the intended audience, folk tales deal with causation in a simplistic way: motive, action and outcome occur in simple, clear sequences. Actaeon’s behaviour leads to Artemis’ action of turning him into a deer, which in turn results in her hounds tearing him to pieces!

3. Folk tales and motives
As the Actaeon example suggests, children can consider motives, reasons for behaviour in simple stories in which motive is clear.

4. Folk tales and interpretations
Folk tales, because they evolved over time and in different places also provide an ideal context for understanding why interpretations or accounts may be different. For example, Philip (1989) recorded twenty variations of the story of Cinderella which illustrate its development through the centuries from ninth century China to the seventeenth century French court.

Similarities across cultures
Folk tales are also timeless: past flows effortlessly into the present. Their settings are timeless: ‘long, long ago’. The substantive element can provide a bridge between the timeless context and the present: kings, princes, castles. Beowulf’s great hall is a contemporary building to its 9th century audience. Everyone understands ‘king’ even in places where there are no kings.

Folk tales are also universally understood because of the genre’s stylistic similarities. Folk tale formulae give security to narrator and listener and are memory props in an oral society. In European folk tales the genre often takes three as a key number: three brothers, princesses, incidents. Oriental tales prefer four or forty. The numerical sub-structure provides the listener with a sense of expectation: they are eagerly anticipated by the listener. Openings and closures are formulaic, taking the listener into the ‘other world’, then returning them to reality. European tales may begin, for example, with ‘Once upon a time,’ or ‘Long, long ago’. Turkish tales may begin, ‘Once there was and once there was not’… Turkish endings encourage listeners to pass the story on, or end, ‘May we share in their happiness/ good fortune’. The European formula is often, ‘And so they lived happily ever after.’

Folk tales in all cultures include cross sections of society and different types of people: rich and poor people, wise and foolish people, stupid and clever, good and wicked people. In folk tales social structures can be challenged and a person’s role can be seen to change: the simple son wins the fortune and the bride. Virtue is rewarded and wickedness punished.

Folk tales also reflect the daily lives of ordinary people, their hopes and fears. They carried details dear to the listeners: settings, forms of work, customs, dress, housing, conflicts between the powerful and the powerless, festivals, rites of passage. Folk tales encode and reflect a society’s perception of its own social structure, mores and values. Therefore much can be learned about everyday life as well as values and beliefs. Folk tales reflect the multitude of jobs people did, which were the same in most societies: tasks related to going on journeys, to fishing, to farming, buying and selling in markets.

Turkish Tales relate to actual farming (The Farmer and the Pradishah of the Fairies), to fruit growing (Pears and Pears), horse herding (The end of the Tyrant Bolu Bey), shepherding and goose herding (All for a Wrinkled Little Pomegranite) (Briggs 1991: 79–98). English tales about farming include: Devil and the Farmer, Farmer and his Ox, Farmer and his Wife, Hunted Hare, The Giant of Dalton Mill, Miller of Abingdon.

At a fundamental level children are being introduced to vocabulary which underpins key concepts which run through all societies: communication, trade, agriculture, defence and attack, belief systems. They find out that universal human needs such as heat, water and food, were obtained by universal methods in the past. Flour was ground by windmills and watermills. Ships were moved by sails. Carriages and carts were pulled by horses. And such work activities involved children: scaring birds from the crops, watching the sheep, looking after the geese, building a haycock. Yet mundane lives were also refreshed by the need for wish fulfilment, by seeing power reduced by some failure, and by the need to share heroic adventures.
The Case study

The aim of the case study in an English school was:
• to find out whether English 8–11 year old children could assimilate and translate the values at the centre of a Turkish tale into a contemporary familiar context;
• if, in doing so, they could apply the processes of historical enquiry: sequencing events and understanding cause and effect;
• understand motives for behaviour;
• construct a variety of modern interpretations.

The folk tale—The Authority of the Host

This story (Walker 1991) was selected because it is about the importance, firstly of hospitality, and secondly of the reciprocal need to respect the customs of your host.

There are six events in the story. A Sultan and his vizier travelled around their country in disguise. When night falls they have nowhere to stay so a shepherd invites them to stay in his simple hut and kills a lamb for a meal in their honour. In the morning when they are leaving he asks his son to kill a goat for their journey but the Sultan refuses saying that a goat is far too much to eat. So the shepherd slaps the Sultan’s face. However the Sultan recognises him and invites him inside. He is given a bath and clean clothes, followed by a meal. The Sultan and the vizier decide to play a trick on the shepherd because he slapped the Sultan. They start to throw the porcelain and gold and silver from the table into the street. The shepherd quietly accepts this because, as a guest, you do not tell someone what to do in his own home.

Folk tales, customs and mores

This story provides an example of the customs attached to hospitality. Travellers, whether beggars or nobility, can be certain of a warm welcome as ‘guests of Allah’ but they must respect the customs of their host, even if they seem strange. The story serves to reinforce in the minds of the listeners the worth of hospitality and the customs attending it.

The teaching context and aim

The lesson on the Turkish folk tale came at the end of a 2 week unit of study on Myths, Legends and Fables, during which the 8–11 year old pupils read legends originating from a variety of sources, from England to Kurgistan. These legends had a common theme—

Next Spring the shepherd sets out to find his guests in Istanbul, taking a goat for a meal. As he passes a grand house with guards outside, who challenge him, the Sultan recognises him and invites him inside. He is given a bath and clean clothes, followed by a meal. The Sultan and the vizier decide to play a trick on the shepherd because he slapped the Sultan. They start to throw the porcelain and gold and silver from the table into the street. The shepherd quietly accepts this because, as a guest, you do not tell someone what to do in his own home.

The story to develop pupil literacy, ending in their own writing in the folk tale genre and art, through pupil representation of their perceptions of ‘exquisite’ and ‘magnificent’ objects that are a central element in the Turkish folk tale.

The lesson

The lesson aimed to use the folk tale to develop both pupil understanding of the conceptual and cultural issues that relate to personal and social development and to use this to develop pupil literacy, ending in their own writing in the folk tale genre and art, through pupil representation of their perceptions of ‘exquisite’ and ‘magnificent’ objects that are a central element in the Turkish folk tale.

The teaching context and aim

The lesson was introduced by asking who knew where Turkey was, how many pupils had visited Turkey on holiday and what their memories of the country were. The lesson continued with a Powerpoint presentation of modern day Turkey, reinforcing some of the memories but also challenging others. Yes, in summer Turkey is hot; yes, there are beautiful beaches, but not everyone earns money through working in holiday resorts.

Story-telling

The story of “The Authority of the Host” was told orally in the traditional Turkish manner, plus additional images. The use of Powerpoint allowed the story to be embellished iconically at the point where the descriptive elements of the story come into play. The adjectives ‘elaborate’, ‘magnificent’ and ‘exquisite’ were used to describe tiles, artefacts and architecture; through the use of pictures on screen we ensured all pupils were able to visualise and appreciate, not just imagine, how magnificent and possibly overwhelming the palace would seem to the shepherd. The pupils had to have the experience of viewing artefacts in the same way as the shepherd viewed them on his visit to the palace. This was important—as the inequality of status had to be fully understood by the pupils in order for them to be able to include that in their own stories.

Writing—group work

To ensure all pupils contributed to the writing the pupil groups were composed of similar ability pupils, not similar ages. Each group composition was four or fewer, with less able groups being supported by an adult to introduce the scenario, appoint a scribe and keep the discussion focused. They were asked to write a story based upon the theme of The Authority of the Host with the values recognised in that story transferred into a modern day setting. They were allowed to discuss and develop their own themes of respect for hospitality given and a responsibility to honour the authority of the host. The more able groups were supervised by a trainee teacher who encouraged their exploration of the storylines through drama. After an agreed time for thinking, discussion and practicing, all groups were encouraged to record their ideas in writing.

Art

Throughout the story-telling process the pupils had their own ideas of exquisitely coloured tiles and magnificent plates and jugs supplemented by pictures of these items. This was to ensure an understanding of the interpretation of ‘exquisite’ and
‘magnificent’ in the folk tale when describing artefacts, as each person will interpret these words in different and varying manners. After writing stories on the transference of values into modern day settings the afternoon was dedicated to transference and interpretation of the art the pupils had enjoyed viewing in the morning. Templates of jug outlines were produced for the pupils to create their own inimitable versions. Small parts of larger pictures were taken and reproduced with some variation as ability allowed. The pupils were shown how a seemingly complete picture can be a very small detail in a much larger work. Patterns from individual tiles were sketched, and coloured in vivid detail, sometimes accurately, sometimes loosely interpreted. Each pupil produced one piece of art based upon the artefacts.

Presentation of interpretations
The day chosen for the research was the 10th Anniversary of World Book Day (1st March, 2007) and a whole school assembly took place in the afternoon to share and celebrate the work produced during the day. The 8–11 year old pupils read their versions of “The Authority of the Host”. Each setting was present day but with a variety of themes.

Analysis of 8–11 year old children’s interpretations of the Turkish Tale, transposed into contemporary contexts.
All twenty-seven stories were analysed; seven fitted best into level 1, eleven into level 2 and nine into level 3, see below. These levels were largely, but not entirely age related. Key aspects of historical enquiry given above were identified as categories for the analysis. These are—

1. The ability to recognise that some things may change but others remain the same (values: continuity and change).
2. The ability to sequence events, recognising that one event may lead to another (cause and effect).
3. Understanding motives, people’s reasons for behaving as they did.
4. Understanding that there may be different versions/interpretations of the same story.

Level One
Parallel of the first 3 frames in the Turkish Story in modern contexts (concept of hospitality)

Category 1. Continuity and change, values
Children were able to transpose the Turkish story into modern everyday contexts, recorded as story boards. At this level children could identify and transpose into a modern context either ‘hospitality’ or ‘respect for rules in other people’s houses’ but not both. Their stories were based on personal experiences: visiting friends whose families have different house rules. Some families expect you to eat what is put in front of you, others do not. Some children are allowed to get dirty, others are not. Some families say grace before a meal, have rules about bed time, and about watching television. Others do not. Two stories were based on a familiar common occurrence (a car accident).

Category 2. Sequence, cause and effect
When working on the original Turkish story, the pupils could put 6 cards in order, each card describing one of the events in it, and they could explain the sequence. When they transposed the story into a modern setting however, they could only sequence and model the first three events in their story to reflect the events in the Turkish story. They were unable to mirror the remaining three events. For example, ‘Troy has two friends, Joe and John. Troy normally eats off his knees. Joe and John don’t. Then they go for a walk…’

‘Wayne Rooney’s car goes in the river. The farmer lets him sleep in his barn. In the morning the farmer pulls Wayne’s car out of the river…’

Category 3. Motives
Pupils were able to explain why characters in the Turkish story behaved as they did but found it more difficult to explain behaviour in the modern story. Maybe this was because it was more difficult to mirror the structure of the Turkish story when their own characters developed motives of their own.

Category 4. Interpretations
The younger/less able children decided on a story based on visiting friends, (see 1 above). They produced a number of different interpretations of the Turkish story. Abigail is allowed to get dirty when playing but her friends are not, so they take a bath before they go to Abigail’s house. The children who decided to work on a car crash theme developed it in several ways: the car goes into the river and the footballer is rescued by a farmer and sleeps in his barn; a man walking his dog invites the two drivers to stay the night because it ‘is raining like mad’. In another version ‘Max and Ruby’ are offered hospitality but are told the house rules: ‘no shouting, no talking with your mouth full, no misbehaving, keep your room tidy.’ But they break the rules and are asked to leave.

Level 2
Parallel of all six frames of Turkish story in modern contexts; causes, effects and motives understood

Category 1. Continuity and change: values
In one story, based on a public life/fairy tale setting, which is a mirror image of the Turkish tale, Queen Elizabeth II of England decides to go shopping in disguise. (There is a tradition that the Queen does not carry money because her courtiers pay) Therefore she does not pay for the goods she takes. When the shop owner asks for the money she slaps him. Later the Queen invites the shop owner to her palace for tea. She decides to play a trick on him. She throws her jewels out of the window, thinking that he will stop her. But he respects her right to do as she wishes in her own palace.
Another story was set in a familiar context: this was about Jake, who goes to Dialah’s house for tea. Dialah’s mum goes to the shop to buy meat for tea but Jake will not eat it because he says that he is a vegetarian. Dialah’s mum tells him off. Next week Dialah goes to Jake’s house. Jake decides to tip water over Dialah because her mum had told him off but Dialah does not do anything. She just says, ‘Oh dear. These things will happen.’

Category 2. Sequence, cause and effect
All of these children were able to explain how each event led to the next in both the Turkish story and their own version.

Category 3. Motives
They could explain why people behaved as they did, in both the Turkish and the new version.

Category 4. Interpretations
There were several versions of the story about the Queen in which she went into different types of shop and ‘bought’ items ranging from a dress to breakfast cereal. Different exchanges with the shop keepers ensued. In other stories hospitality was rejected for a variety of reasons; food was perhaps, too hot or too tough.

Level 3
Parallel Turkish and modern stories; passing of time, cause, effect, understanding of feelings underpinning motives; detail in settings and dialogue; characters developed; differences in status clear

Category 1. Continuity and change, values
Children developed a shared theme which they developed in different ways. The setting is the hosting of a television cookery program by a less well known television personality (the shepherd). The host invites a celebrity television chef and his younger colleague, (the sultan and the vizier) to cook on his show, which usually hosts amateur cooks. The host is insulted on his own television show. Later the guest chef and his colleague invite the television host onto their show to their studio/comic relief program, and try to trick him into retaliating by expecting him to eat hot sour chilli/Brussel sprouts/burnt food/or by giving their best food to the audience. But he eats it politely because he is a guest. ‘You must like cooking with sour chilli so I shall try it.’

‘He smiled sweetly and said that the Brussel sprouts looked gorgeous—well I respect what you do. It’s your show after all.’ ‘In your studio/home, you can do as you please.

Category 2. Sequence, cause and effect
One of the stories began with the Turkish introduction, ‘Once there was and once there wasn’t a chef called Gordon Ramsey…and ended, ‘May we share their happiness.’

These children wrote detailed stories which clearly demonstrated understanding of sequence and cause and effect, using time vocabulary and causal connectives. ‘So the next day… Then the director shouted, ‘Action’ so they all began to cook’… ‘That was when…Then… So… off Jamie and Gordon went…And the next day…So then…’

‘When… So… So… So…’

‘Once upon a time… received a letter…The next day… It was then that trouble started… This made Gordon madder than usual… When they got there… When the two woke up… So…”

‘One day… Then… Just before Gordon and Jamie leave the studio… Then… next Sunday… While Ainsley is driving…”

‘One day…

Category 3. Motives
These children devised clear and amusing motives for the television host to feel insulted, which show some understanding of the feelings which underpin behaviour.

‘That was when their chopping boards started to fly…’

‘We don’t need your amateur skills, you apprentice.’ ‘Then Ainsley snapped like a cheap plastic plate. He grabbed two pancakes and slapped Gordon’s and Jamie’s cheeks.’ ‘How dare you embarrass me on my own show?’ Another example of understanding human behaviour is use of sarcasm.

‘Welcome my friend,’ said Gordon sarcastically. ‘What would you like for your feast?’ Jamie asked, with a devilish gleam in his eye.

Category 4. Interpretations
Although the children agreed the setting and characters they interpreted this through a variety of different events.

Conclusion
All of the children were able, with progressing competence, to apply, at varying levels, the key strands of historical enquiry to the Turkish tale. This endorses the findings of others.
Values, continuity and change
Holdaway (1979) describes how stories enable children to escape from the bonds of time, to explore human intention, behaviour and purpose in the past as well as now. Stories, he said, extend first hand experiences of the world and so extend children’s perceptions of the world. Folk tales introduce children to powerful perennial ideas and emotions. He described how stories enable children to create images of times and places they have not experienced in reality and so to explore emotion, intention, behaviour and human purpose. Erikson (1965) found that if children are encouraged to reconstruct scenes from folk tales these stories serve as metaphors for their own lives, concerns and interests and help them to engage with the mainstream of human emotions in times and places other than their own. The children in this study certainly made connections between their world, their behaviour and emotions and the world of the Turkish tale.

These 8–11 year-olds also reflect the stage at which Piaget (1932) suggested children are able to see reasons for people’s behaviour, but think that rules must be rigidly obeyed. Diğek and Yapıcı (2007) have challenged the notion that learning always develops from the concrete to the abstract. Drawing on the research of Egan (1988) they suggested how a concept they called, ‘abstract thinking specific to childhood’, might be developed through stories about the past. They read a story about “Grandfather Seljuk” to the class. They wrote the story to include descriptions of artefacts based on museum photographs. When the story was over children were asked to draw the artefacts described. They found that, at the lowest level, children drew the artefacts correctly reflecting the description. At the next level they added appropriate detail not mentioned in the story. At the highest level pupils devised historically acceptable symbols representing abstract concepts: a symbol of sovereignty on one side of a coin and of the state on the reverse. There are similarities here with the children in this case study who were, at different levels, able to abstract the concepts of hospitality and respect for a host from the Turkish tale and translate them into other contexts.

Sequencing, cause and effect
Langley-Hamel (2003) says that stories reflecting other cultures allow children to increase their knowledge and understanding of the world by moving from the familiar to the unfamiliar and that traditional stories, with their traditional language and structure, help children to retell rewrite and recreate their own versions of these stories. The children were able to conceive what is not actually happening here and now and this requires knowledge and skills. This involves imagination, an aspect of work on children’s thinking which is often neglected (Meadows 1993:361).

Pupil modelling genre
All of the children were able, to some extent, to model the Turkish story genre in a modern context. This is encouraging because telling a story is a skill which develops gradually. To begin with, events may be linked in a chain but have no point, purpose or causal links. This was true of the level one stories. Children only gradually begin to understand the structure of a story and to see the links between problem, cause and action. They find it easier to listen to stories than to make them up (Temple et al. 1982:154). Crowther (1982) found that children between 7 and 11 regard cause and effect as the result of a direct action or the substitution of one thing for another. A folk tale was therefore a good context for considering cause and effect. Harpin (1976) showed how, with growing maturity, children’s syntax reflects their increasing ability to use conjunctions related to time and to cause and effect. Piaget (1926, 1928) found that after about seven years old children begin to use ‘because’ and ‘therefore’ correctly.

Motive
Young children’s understanding of stories shows that they are able to discuss motive and how people’s behaviour influences events (Cooper 2002:14). As children retell stories using language of motive and cause and effect, moving from simple to predictable tales to more complex ones, they learn to create images of other places or times.

Interpretation
Bage (2000:26) has said that leading learners willingly into worlds different from the societies in which they exist is a ‘moral and creative act of the highest order’. Bruner (1964) suggested that children need to learn to extrapolate from particular examples, from a memorable, specific instance in order to transfer the thinking processes learned to other similar situations; they can transfer reasoning from one situation to another.

Donaldson (1978) Borke (1978) and Flavell (1985) found that even young children are capable of seeing more than one viewpoint, of comparing different versions of a story. Evidence in History in the Early Years (Cooper 2002) shows that young children can (and need to) learn the processes of historical enquiry, first in embryonic, then in progressively more complex ways. They need to understand that history is an interpretation reflecting the viewpoint and goals of its creators. In a political context, there is no single ‘grand narrative’ which a ruling regime can control and manipulate. Countries as diverse as the previously Fascist regimes of Spain, Portugal and Brazil, previously Communist regimes of Eastern Europe, countries where history is a contested concept such as South Africa and Northern Ireland are all currently looking for ways of developing teaching and learning about the past which is constructivist. This depends on children, from the beginning, learning, in embryonic ways, the processes of historical enquiry and dealing with its protocols, procedures, first and second order concepts within a constructivist paradigm.

We believe that an indication of what is possible comes out of the analysis of the pupil responses to the folk tale lessons. The processes these children used in rewriting the Turkish folk tale begin to develop the kind of understanding that is essential for plural democracies within a multi-national and interdependent international world. The study also, we hope, encourages pupils to recognise that there are shared, universal values across cultures and across time.
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Introduction
In the last two decades, citizenship education and active citizenship have been given considerable attention, and they have been intended to educate the younger generation in the democratic process and values in the developed world (Council of Europe, 1993). Active Citizenship can be defined as follows (Audigier, 1998, p.13).

Since the citizen is an informed and responsible person, capable of taking part in public debate and making choices, nothing of what is human should be unfamiliar to him [sic], nothing of what is experienced in the society should be foreign to democratic citizenship.

References
According to the governments of the developed world, students should be aware of the social, political and environmental problems of their society, and they should be educated to struggle with these issues. With this in mind, students should be given a healthy citizenship education, which can prepare them for the responsibilities of adult life in a global society (Holden, 2003). Furthermore, citizenship education aims to develop in students an understanding of the following (Holden, 2003, p.196)—

- their own values and the relationship of these to behaviour and action
- democratic systems and the individual’s role within them
- their community and the part they can play within it
- topical events and controversial issues
- the causes (and possible solutions) of social and environmental problems.

A healthy citizenship education should be given to educate active, creative and problem solving citizens. Such education should consist of three strands (Phillips, 2003):

1. Social and moral responsibility: In citizenship education students should be given some skills—self-confidence; social and moral responsibility towards each other, adults and authority.
2. Community involvement: Students should be taught how to become involved in the life of their community.
3. Political literacy: Students should be taught how to be effective in public life, and learn the importance of the vote and other means of political participation.

Citizenship Education and the Teaching of History

Citizenship education can be supported by other school subjects, one of which is history. The teaching of history has been seen as a school subject which can develop the values of citizenship in the modern world (Phillips, 2002). In the United Kingdom there is a clear relationship between the teaching of history and citizenship education. History lessons can contribute towards active citizenship, and historical knowledge and skills can help students to become active citizens in a democratic society. The teaching of history can contribute to this in the following ways (Phillips, 2002).

Aims, Methods and Purpose

The aims, methods and purposes used in the teaching of history can contribute towards both the understanding of issues and the questioning, sceptical mentality required for active citizenship in a plural democracy. Developments which have taken place in Britain in the teaching of history since 1970 have required students to develop higher order thinking skills, and to learn history in a constructivist way. Students can develop the following skills via the teaching of history (Phillips, 2002)—

- To think independently
- To present substantiated arguments
- To communicate effectively

- To co-operate and learn from each other
- To be curious
- To interrogate evidence
- To appreciate more than one point of view and a range of different interpretations.

Values

History is an important subject in schools for teaching cultural values. Through history lessons, students can be taught cultural knowledge and experience, and learn how their culture has developed. Besides this, to understand current social values, students should be taught how those values have evolved. Values are also important in citizenship education. Students should be taught the values of their society and those of humanity in general in their history courses, lessons which then support their development into healthy citizens.

Concepts

History has many concepts that we must learn if we are to understand the past and the present: some are directly related to citizenship (Davies, 1992; Phillips, 2003). Among these concepts are power, force, authority, order, law, justice, representation, pressure, natural law, individuality, freedom and welfare, democracy, fascism and communism. These concepts help us understand how democracy and the political structures of the modern world have been reshaped. If students learn history as a process of enquiry that deals with substantive concepts like those above they will also develop the skills of active citizenship.

The purpose of this study

The main purpose of this study was to investigate history teachers’ attitudes about whether or not teaching history in high schools encourages active citizenship. This small-scale research project was carried out with 10 high school history teachers in the city of Trabzon in Turkey.

Methodology

Research context, participants and data collection

The research was a small scale case study that used a qualitative approach for data collection. An initial literature review surveyed Citizenship and History Education, focusing upon the relationship between them. The research involved a semi-structured interview to gather data about history teacher attitudes towards Citizenship Education and History Education’s relationship to it. Semi-structured interviews were chosen as the preferred method because of the possibility they give for high quality, detailed and rich information about perceptions, attitudes and orientation (Bell in Cohen and Manion, 2007). The interviews followed protocols for the use of appropriate language, wording, and avoidance of leading questions (Drever, 1997). Preparation of the interviews had two phases: firstly, a pilot study and review and then the interviews. The pilot study involved ten student teachers evaluating and commenting on the original schedule; in the light of feedback the questions were modified. The final set of questions were—
1. What do you think about civic education?
2. What do you think about active citizenship?
3. Do you think there is any relationship between civic education and the teaching of history?
4. Do you think the teaching of history supports civic education?
5. Do you think your teaching supports civic education?

The interviews with the ten Trabzon history teachers were taped and then transcribed. The responses to the semi-structured questions were summarized and classified into specific categories of answers, to create a systematic analysis of the data.

Findings and Discussion
The ten transcripts were extremely rich in revealing the history teachers’ attitudes regarding whether or not the teaching of history in high schools supports active citizenship. The interviews revealed that the teachers shared the following points of view—

1. Civic education’s importance
The Turkish history teachers thought that civic education is important. All 10 history teachers stated that pupils should be given a healthy civic education in schools. One teacher said that:

*Civic education is important and students in schools should be educated about civic education. In a democratic society, individuals should know the rules and structures of the society. Besides this, students should be given education about their rights and how to use these rights.*

Another teacher made a similar statement, saying that:

*Today, civic education is very important, because we live in a democracy and people should know and use their rights. For this reason, students should be given proper education about citizenship in primary schools.*

2. There is no direct relationship between the teaching of history and citizenship education
The data reveal that the majority of history teachers (8) thought that there is no direct relationship between the teaching of history and citizenship education. According to them, history is about the past, and it has no bearing on modern civic life or civic education. One teacher stated that—

*History is about the past, and in Turkish high schools we mainly teach knowledge of the past. Civic education is about the present and about the current situation of society. For this reason, I think there is no direct relationship between citizenship education and the teaching of history.*

Another teacher said—

*Actually, I do not think that the teaching of history has a direct relationship with civic education. Our responsibility is to teach students about the events and cultures of the past.*

The interview data suggest that Turkish history teachers have not considered that there is a relationship between the teaching of history and civic education.

3. History teachers in high schools do not have the detailed knowledge, nor do they have the inclination, belief or desire [orientation] to encourage active citizenship through the teaching of history
As mentioned earlier, the teaching of history can support citizenship education, and the history teacher can play an important role in supporting active citizenship through the teaching of history. In the light of the data, however, it seems that many Turkish history teachers do not know how to do this. All 10 history teachers said that they did not have knowledge and experience on this issue. One history teacher said that—

*We have not been taught how to use the teaching of history to encourage and support active citizenship. For this reason, we just teach the past, and we do not try to encourage active citizenship in history lessons.*

Another history teacher made a similar statement, saying that—

*It is not our job to teach history for the sake of citizenship education. Actually, we have not been given this kind of responsibility. The objective in teaching history requires us to teach the knowledge of the past.*

In the light of the data, it can be said that Turkish history teachers have not been taught how the teaching of history can support and encourage active citizenship. Besides this, it is clear that these history teachers in Turkish high schools do not have any wish to support active citizenship in their history lessons.

Conclusion and recommendations
History educators in Britain and the English government, through its national history curriculum, argue that twenty-first century history teachers are expected to educate students to become creative problem solvers, socially aware and democratic. In addition, the teaching of history is supported as a school subject which can develop the values of citizenship in the modern world (Phillips, 2002). Although in developed countries, such as England, the teaching of history is seen an important subject for supporting and encouraging citizenship education, based on this case study it seems that, in Turkey, the teaching of history has not been given this kind of responsibility.
Although case studies suffer from the problem of over-generalization, the results of this case study suggest that the following recommendations can be made:

- History student teachers should be taught during their teacher training how the teaching of history can support and encourage citizenship education
- History teachers should be taught how the teaching of history can support and encourage citizenship education via in-service education
- History teachers should be required to teach history in a way that supports and encourages citizenship education.
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Introduction
Historical background
Located in Asia Minor, at the edge of two continents, Turkey is a country that has long been aiming to become a part of the western world. This ambition has taken various shapes or come to light in different ways. In the Eighteenth Century for example, this aim came to fruition as reforms in the system and order of the Ottoman Army and Navy. It appeared in the changes to the Ottoman government, bureaucratic system and social order in the Nineteenth Century. The goal of getting closer to the western world, particularly European civilisation did not change at the beginning of the Twentieth Century, not even after the collapse of the Ottoman Empire and the foundation of the new Turkish Republic. Conversely, the new regime gave importance to integration into Europe.

However, this policy has aroused a degree of suspicion, which has mostly arisen from the European view of Turkey and Turks, and the question of Turkey's political, economic, social and cultural integration into Europe. Among these elements, the social and cultural integration of Turks is generally considered problematic because Turkey has a mainly Muslim population and its historical and cultural background is different from the rest of the Europe. The challenges here are how Turks perceive Europe and Europeans in the context of history and how Europeans define and form their conceptions of Turks. Despite the fact that Turkey has adopted policies of modernisation, taking western civilisation as its model of development for centuries, the mutual perceptions of Europe in Turkey
Turkey in Europe still depend on social and cultural factors stemming from history. Naturally this has implications for the construction of historical accounts about ‘the self’ and ‘others’ and particularly transmitting these accounts to future generations.

Turkey and Europe
The process of Turkey's integration into Europe through joining the European Union (EU), which was put into practice after the 1999 Helsinki Summit, restarted the discussions about whether Turkey and Turks are modernised and able to take part in the western civilisation. There have always been opponents, problems and challenges coming from outside the country as well as those arising from within Turkey itself. On the one hand, while some groups in the international community, particularly in the west, support Turkey's process of getting closer to western civilisation and its participation and integration in the wider global community, others oppose this process. The pro-Turkish groups argue that Turkey's modernisation and its integration to modern civilisation can set an example for other societies and countries in the Middle East and Asia, particularly for Islamic countries. However, the anti-Turkish groups maintain that Turkey does not fulfil the requirements of democracy, human rights and other conditions of modern civilisation. Therefore, it should not be given a prominent place in the modern world order.

On the other hand, there is another version of this political and intellectual clash which has been going on amongst Turkish politicians and intellectuals for decades. While some uphold that Turkey's future is dependent on its integration and participation in modern civilisation and the new world order, others contend that Turkey's independence and sovereignty are more important than any other issue. This second group views the development of global organisations and international communities as a trick of imperialism and regard the issue of Turkey's participation in a broader community as a threat towards Turkey's existence.

Turkey, Europe and the Educational System
The ongoing Turkish intention and the new policies towards its integration into the EU that came into existence at the beginning of the Twenty-first Century, required Turkey to carry out essential transformations concerning legislative and economic issues including its educational system. The history curriculum and history teaching in secondary schools constitute two problematic areas within the sphere of Turkish education that require attention and improvement. These two areas have been critiqued by many authors. The critics comment that the history curriculum and history teaching are insufficient, out of date and do not give pupils an objective perspective of history encouraging them to become conscious and critical citizens in a developing society (Dilek, 1999; Kabapınar, 1998; Demircioğlu, 1999; Silier, 2003). Furthermore, the formation of the history curriculum and history teaching in schools is considered crucial for the process of Turkey's integration into the EU, since they are closely linked to individuals' perception of Europe. Moreover, as Safran (2003) points out, the realities of the Turkish history curriculum and the recommendations on history teaching made by the Council of Europe (COE) in 2001 (COE, 2001) demonstrate almost completely opposite perceptions and perspectives of history teaching. The idea of suggesting an inclusion of a European Dimension (ED) in the Turkish history curriculum might be considered appropriate to develop a better understanding of Europe and European history during the processes of Turkey's integration into the EU.

The European Dimension in Education and History Teaching
The review of relevant literature shows many different understandings and definitions of the concept of the ED and its usage in educational contexts and particularly in history teaching (Dinç, 2005b; Convery, 2002; Barthélémy, 1997; Bordas and Jones, 1993; Feneyrou, 1993; Pingel, 2001). Considering all those definitions and descriptions, the concept of the "ED" in this paper is used to refer to an awareness of Europe and European matters, and to consider them in relation to other issues in local, national and global contexts. Stemming from this perspective, “the ED in education” is defined as:

an approach to education from a European perspective that aims to raise an awareness of Europe and European related issues, in order to develop positive or at least neutral/unbiased attitudes towards Europe, which will help young people form their understanding of European identity and European citizenship (Dinç, 2005b: 39).

And the ED in history teaching is used to refer to the place and importance of European history within a variety of historical dimensions and contexts, and the pedagogical methods developed or adapted in various European countries to form objective, fair, tolerant and peaceful approaches to history teaching. In a broader definition:

The ED in history teaching is a relatively new approach to history teaching that aims to create and develop a sense of European identity and European citizenship by emphasising the political, social, economic and cultural knowledge of Europe, and the values of humanism, democracy and tolerance. The ED in history teaching endeavours to eliminate bias and prejudice from history teaching in order to reconcile the conflicts and disagreements between European countries by emphasising the historical unity and diversity of the continent. It also intends to provide a balance between the contexts of local, regional, national, European and global history; to reflect political, social, economic, intellectual and cultural dimensions of history from various perspectives to reflect the multi-cultural structure of Europe; and to improve learners' intellectual and social capacities, such as the skills of empathy, critical thinking and the competence of collaborating in group work (Dinç, 2005b: 45).

As it can be seen in the above definitions, the ED in education and the ED in history teaching are closely linked to two important concepts: European identity and European citizenship. These two concepts are very important for the overall aim of including an ED in any particular school curriculum or teaching activity in order to initiate and accelerate the process of integration. In other words, developing a common and shared European
identity and European citizenship consciousness is thought of as the final objectives of the ED in education in history teaching. Nevertheless, there is no consensus on the description or understanding of these concepts.

The European Dimension [ED] and Identity
Some authors and official documents of the EU, the Council of Europe and other European-wide organisations state that European identity is the second strand of a dual identity collaborating with a national one (Castells, 1998), while other authors locate it in a list of multiple identities (Convery, 2002; Berting and Heinemeije, 1995). There are also others arguing that European identity is a new version of a national identity to create a European super-state (Delgado-Moreira, 1997; Tonra and Dunne, 1997). Some of the authors underline the importance of the values and principles as the criteria or the conditions of European identity, whilst others criticise this viewpoint from various angles (Ding, 2005b). The holders of all these conceptions think that there are strong connections between history, history teaching and developing a European identity.

Similar to European identity, European citizenship has been considered as a part of the European integration project. Osler and Starkey state this as: “Citizens of European states have to acquire a feeling of European identity and citizenship in order for political developments to progress” (1999: 199). As the above quotation shows, European citizenship is generally perceived as a process of building a concept of belonging based on political, social, cultural and religious commonalities as well as segregations in order to contribute to the formation and development of an integrated Europe (Dekker, 1993).

ED and European Citizenship
As discussed earlier, introducing the ED by means of education, particularly through history teaching, has been given a role in the project of building a European identity and European citizenship, or at least raising the awareness of European issues throughout the continent. Creating and transmitting a common and shared European heritage and identity is one of the building-blocks of this project (Von Benda-Beckman and Verkuylten, 1995). Rusen (2000) calls this the ‘cultural currency’ of the European integration process necessary to accompany the common currency, the Euro. Various authors and documents assert that there is a close mutual intersection and/or relationship between history and identity and therefore between European history, history teaching in Europe and formation of a European identity and European citizenship (Von Benda-Beckman and Verkuylten, 1995, Castells, 1998; Council of Europe, 2001; Macdonald and Fausser, 2000).

Some argue that the search for building a common European identity by means of a shared European history is a genuine appeal for intercultural communication (Macdonald and Fausser, 2000; Rusen, 2000), while others refer to this as the process of the “Euro-centrism of European integration” (J. Saramago, 1999) cited in Macdonald and Fausser, 2000: 17; Koulouri, 2000). The adherents to European identity argue that the process of identity construction is ‘relative’ rather than exclusive, i.e. people’s sense and consciousness of belonging can be monitored at different levels, such as one can feel herself/himself English, British and European at the same time (Macdonald and Fausser, 2000). However, their opponents claim that creating a European identity by means of history and history teaching implies a process of exclusion (Ahonen, 2001; Lowenthal, 1997; Koulouri, 2000). Pingel (2001) states that in many of the Community of Europe’s official documents on history teaching, the main themes or components of European history are evaluated as basic factors that figure in the formation of a European identity. However, the place and use of history in the process of building any identity, including a European identity, has been a matter of question.

History Education—the political agenda
Most of the criticisms come from the viewpoint that the nature of history is liable to distortion or alteration in order to arrive at some particular desirable end. Hobsbawm (1997) argues that an identity culture attaches itself to the past through history which is actually formed from myths of nationalism. Therefore, they believe that history and history teaching have been used and abused for creating or strengthening a particular entity, which is also a possibility in the process of building a European identity through history teaching (Hobsbawm, 1997; Low-Beer, 2004). Eric Hobsbawm puts this as—

Why do all regimes make their young study history at school? Not to understand their society and how it changes, but to approve of it, to be proud of it, to become good citizens of the USA, or Spain, or Honduras, or Iraq. And the same is true of causes and movements. History as inspiration and ideology has a built-in tendency to become self-justifying myth (Hobsbawm, 1997: 357).

Lowenthal (1997) in contrast, makes a distinction between two conceptions and uses of history: ‘history as inquiry’ and ‘history as heritage’:

In fact, heritage is not history at all: while it borrows from and enlivens historical study, heritage is not an inquiry into the past but a celebration of it, not an effort to know what actually happened but a profession of faith in a past tailored to present day purposes (Lowenthal, 1997: x).

School History and national identity
Lowenthal also indicates that school history is more a question of heritage than history with a role for the creation and maintenance of national identities. Thus the attempts to create a European identity through history teaching will initially require the generation of a European heritage (Lowenthal, 1997). Koulouri (2000) points to the assertions that make connections between the processes of building a national identity and creating a European identity. She argues that in those situations the teaching of history focusing on ethnic, national or cultural distinctiveness functions as an agent to establish the hegemony and cultural superiority of political and economic powers over other nations and cultures. According to Koulouri if the pursued European identity is as exclusive
as national identities the inclusion of an ED in history teaching may serve for a Euro-nationalism or Euro-centrism.

On the other hand, drawing from the arguments of Paul Kennedy, Jensen (2000) states that in the western world, there is a transition towards a post-national phase in history. He argues that history teaching can no longer meaningfully define and legitimate its main task: the transmission of a specific and dominant culture, heritage or identity particularly in relation to multi-ethnic, -cultural and -religious areas of Europe (Jensen, 2000). The reason is that the processes of moving towards some prevalent and individualised version of history diminishes the power and importance of national histories. Gillis puts this as “national history is no longer a proper measure of what people really know about the past” (Gillis, 1994 cited in Jensen, 2000: 92).

**History’s role in European identity**

The above arguments give rise to the question of the function of history teaching in the formation of a European identity. Will history teaching act to construct a new kind of ‘national identity in a supranational milieu’? Or will it build interactions between various versions of local, national and regional histories in Europe by enabling students to question, analyse and interpret different versions of national histories and arrive at their own conclusions? The investigation of the relevant literature demonstrates that the COE, EUROCLIO and other relevant organisations’ approach to ED in history teaching intend to take the second approach, which may also be projected to include the Turkish context (COE, 2001; Stradling, 2003; Van der Leeuw-Roord, 2004). However, some authors draw attention to the danger of constructing a European ‘national’ or ‘supranational’ identity because the recent history of the continent is dominated by ‘national’ and even ‘nationalistic’ versions of history, whose role is the politically oriented formation of national identities (Van der Leeuw-Roord, 2004; Pingel, 200).

While history teaching played an important role in the development of European identity, the place given to it in the formation and advancement of European citizenship is rather limited. Research results indicate that among five school subjects, history occupies the last place in promoting the ED in education and consequently education for European citizenship (Convery et al, 1997). Nevertheless, history’s importance in citizenship education in general is asserted by many authors (Arthur et al, 2001; Brett, 2004; Crick, 1998). As the Crick Report (1998) puts it—

*The emphasis in History on the use of evidence and processes of enquiry can help pupils to discuss and reach informed judgements about topical and contemporary issues which are the lifeblood of citizenship and to develop the confidence to take informed action.*

Brett supports this perspective by indicating that the role of history in citizenship education should be viewed as a “vehicle to help students develop their skills of analysis, critical judgement and expressing a point of view” (2004: 15). Walsh (1993) also adds that history teaching contributes to citizenship education in terms of “understanding the human present in the light of its past, or more fully, the desire to understand, assess and direct the human present – and thus shape the human future” (cited in Brett, 2004: 16).

**Models of History and Citizenship**

According to Brett (2004) four elements of history teaching can contribute to citizenship education. They are community involvement through the teaching of local history, developing an idea of historical significance, the teaching of historical interpretations, and generating moral outrage. On the other hand, Osler and Starkey (1999) propose a model of education for European citizenship, which involves acquiring knowledge, reflecting on identity, living in a community and developing skills for participation. Analyising Osler and Starkey’s (1999) model of European citizenship Arthur et al (2001) argue that there is a multidimensional relationship between history teaching, and the development of a European identity and European citizenship. They point out that history teaching can help pupils build up a notion of European citizenship by introducing opportunities to develop some capabilities and notions. Arthur et al argue that history teaching contributes to the training of European citizens and thus helps the wider efforts to reduce prejudice and discrimination. Moreover, they point out the danger of the use and abuse of history teaching as an agent of socialisation, and the potential of history teaching in developing critical attitudes about Europe.

The above discussions revealed that through the inclusion of an ED, history teaching can be given an important role to develop a consciousness of Europe and consequently a European identity and a perception of European citizenship. However, there are also criticisms directed towards the use of history and history teaching for the same purposes. Bearing all these issues in mind, it is seen necessary to investigate how history and history teaching are utilised by Turkish people, particularly those involved in history teaching in relation to the matters discussed above and Turkey’s integration into the European Union.

**Methodology**

This study aims to explore Turkish history educators’ (student history teachers, practicing history teachers and teacher educators) views on the potential implications of including the ED in the Turkish secondary school history curriculum. This work employs qualitative research methods using a semi-structured interview schedule. The research instrument addresses two main research questions.

1. What are the views of Turkish history educators about the potential inclusion of a European dimension in the secondary school history curriculum and related issues?
2. According to history educators, in what ways does the Turkish curriculum need to be improved to bring about a better understanding of a European dimension?
The interview schedule of fifteen key items aimed to gain insight into the participants’ views on the issues covered by the main and subsidiary research questions of this study. Thirty-three interviews were conducted with participants selected from three groups named above on a voluntary basis. NVivo qualitative data analysis software was used to analyse the interview data for this paper.

Findings and Discussions
The main and subsidiary research questions were used as frames for the analysis of available data and discussions here. Firstly, the views and perspectives of the participants revealed through two subsidiary questions are evaluated in order to interpret response to the first main research question concerning Europe and the ED in education and history teaching. The first subsidiary question is:

1. How do history educators view Turkey’s position in Europe, its relationships with European countries and European-wide organisations, and the issue of Turkey joining the EU?

Turkey and Europe?
The findings revealed these viewpoints: although they considered the geography of Turkey as a part of Europe, the participants of this study did not see it as a European country, mostly because of cultural differences. This can be explained by the impact of dominant political and educational ideologies on the participants’ conceptions of Europe. However, regardless of the grounds [religious (Islamic) or secular in connection with Turkish nationalism] on which they establish their cultural identities the majority of participants stressed the differences between Turkish and European cultures, the historical roots of those differences and the European view of Turks. As one of the student teachers says:

*I still think that Europe abstains itself from Turkey. Europeans still consider Turks as potential danger. I also believe that our Islamic religious identity has got an influence on them. I suppose the spirit of Crusaders is still engaging the minds of Europeans too.* (ST3)

Moreover, this finding indicates a clear-cut difference between European and Turkish identities. Based on this point, most of the participants construct their identities in opposition to Europe and the underpinnings of a projected European identity discussed earlier. The findings also imply that the participants view education and history teaching as a means to construct and reinforce a national identity and a conception of Turkish and universal (global) citizenship, whilst opposing the idea of developing a European identity and a consciousness of European citizenship. In parallel with Rusen’s (2000) perspective, they particularly reject the idea of a top-down project proposing to introduce uniform conceptions of European identity and European citizenship.

Cultural and religious issues
Secondly, the participants thought that the relationship between Turkey and European countries and European-wide organisations was insufficient because of a number of factors: differences in economic development levels, cultural and religious differences, political states of Turkey and European countries and lack of knowledge and understanding of the other side.

While taking history teaching into account, cultural and religious differences were seen as very important for the limited relationship between the two sides. According to the participants these differences stem from history and affect both Turks and Europeans negatively when viewing each other. This probably arose from the general conception of history in Turkey, which views the past as an on-going conflict since the time of the crusades. In this conflict, Turks represent Asiatic culture, tradition and the Islamic religion, whilst Europeans stand for western values, liberalism and Christianity (Yurdusev, 1997). Looking at history from this perspective, the participants, as expected, develop a historical perspective through which they feel the pride of the past as being the inheritors of the Ottoman Empire and Turkish history before the Ottomans.

Turkey and the European Union
Thirdly, despite the fact that some participants supported Turkey's membership of the EU, others opposed it. Supporting or opposing the idea of Turkey’s membership of the EU, most participants did not believe that this will be realised in the near future. Participants who favoured Turkey’s membership of the EU supported this idea mostly because of economic reasons. However, there was another group of participants who had no hope of Turkey becoming a member of the EU. Overall, this group’s supportive views were based on the values institutionalised in the EU, such as democracy, human rights and civil liberties as well as economic considerations.

The second subsidiary research question in this section is—

2. What do history educators understand by the concept of ‘European dimension’ and what do they think about the potential inclusion of a European dimension in the secondary school history curriculum?

The European Dimension [ED]
According to the findings the participants conceptualise the ED as a European way of life or the standards of life in Europe. The concept of the ED has been used to refer to various aspects of European-wide policies, practices, activities and relations. These aspects can be categorised as the pillars of the standard of life in Europe. The same understanding also shaped some participants’ conception of the ED in education as the quality and standards of education in (western) European countries. Another group of participants asserted that the ED in education is something related to education for
European citizenship, multiculturalism, democracy, peace, tolerance and human rights. These are the issues mentioned in the official documents and the related publications (Dinç, 2005b). This position of the ED in promoting European citizenship has also been emphasised by authors and official publications in order to improve learners’ knowledge and awareness of Europe and the concepts shaping our understanding of today’s Europe, such as multiculturalism, democracy, peace, tolerance, human rights and so on. Nevertheless, some participants were aware of the contrast between this conception of the ED and the realities in the Turkish context. One participant expressed this as follows:

The ED in education makes me think of raising European citizens who are peaceful, tolerant, respectful to the others and other cultures etc. But the aims and objectives of Turkish National Education are still out there. (PT6)

On the other hand, a third but smaller group of participants defined the same concept as a Eurocentric approach to education. As the interview extract below shows, this conception of the ED reveals the suspicious, pessimistic and reactionary view of ‘the other’ in the Turkish context. Participants holding this perspective look at the international issues from the point of national security and their perspective includes prejudice and stereotyping about Europeans.

The concept or idea of the ED reminds me of the Euro-centric world view. I think Europeans look at everything from a very European point of view that can be described as ‘the white, intelligent man has done everything.’ Of course I must underline the word man as male, mostly or only white and intelligent male. Although they seem to give importance to the others and other cultures, it’s just to show off. By means of introducing different cultures in their curricula, the Europeans want to just say that they, ‘the others’ exist, but it’s still the Europeans who have done everything, who have materialised all those developments. I understand the ED as Euro-centric view of the world, education or history. Therefore, it doesn’t seem to be logical or understandable for me. Instead of an ED, we should try to develop a universal dimension or approach. (TE1)

The European Dimension and history teaching
Concerning the ED in history teaching, four main conceptions emerged from the study. According to the first conception, the ED in history teaching means teaching more European history, which confirms that the place allocated to Europe and European history in the current secondary school history curriculum is limited. The second one considers the concept as a tool for improving the quality of history teaching in schools. The above findings on the ED in history teaching show that some participants considered the ED as a means of improving curriculum content and the state of history teaching.

On the other hand, the third conception defines the ED in history teaching as a neutral and objective approach to teaching history that considers respecting the others in history and avoiding bias, prejudice and stereotyping against them. It is understood that participants holding this view had information/knowledge about European works and projects on history teaching and could make connections between the purposes of those European-wide projects and the ED in history teaching.

Alongside those participants who had positive attitudes about the ED in history teaching, there were some participants suspecting its conception and functionality and criticising the approach of history teaching that the ED introduces.

In my view, the ED intervenes in our conception or understanding of history, particularly Turkish and Islamic history. I want to just call Hz. Ömer while talking about Islamic history or I’d like to say the Conquer of Istanbul, not the Second Istanbul War. I think that the ED in history teaching is an interventionist and limiting approach. This approach aims to re-conceptualise history from a European point of view. (TE3)

As the above extract shows, it is viewed that the ED in history teaching has got an invisible side, aiming to reshape the conception and understanding of world history around the concept of European citizenship.

The European Dimension and the Turkish History Curriculum
The second main research question consists of the participants’ suggestions on a potential inclusion of the European Dimension in the Turkish History Curriculum. The data revealed several issues arising from the participants’ perspectives. They are the necessity of developing the history curriculum, the key elements of the ED in history curriculum and the potential impact of the inclusion of an ED in the Turkish history curriculum. Various deficiencies of the current history curriculum led the majority of the participants to hold the view that it should be developed urgently with or without the inclusion of the ED. However, many participants found the potential inclusion of the ED necessary and useful for the improvement of the history curriculum and history teaching.

1. What do history educators see as the key elements of the European dimension in the history curriculum?

Discussions here focus on the participants’ suggestions for components of the history curriculum that would be improved through the inclusion of the ED. They are: aims and objectives of history teaching and main characteristics of the curriculum content. The findings regarding the aims and objectives of history teaching revealed that the participants did not all agree on the rationale for teaching history. Five different propositions for the aims and objectives of history teaching emerged from the findings.
1. History teaching and national identity
The first proposition envisaged that history should be taught to develop a national identity. This is the dominant perception of the purpose of history teaching that has shaped Turkish history education since the 1930s (Dinc, 2005a). Corroborating the analysis of Lowenthal (1997), one participant asserted that—

An important point about the aims and objectives of history teaching is the fact that history is a kind of cultural heritage. It includes many different aspects and characteristics of that culture. I believe history accommodates various dimensions, values and characteristics of the cultural heritage that is essential for learning about your own cultural and national identity.

History teaching in Turkey has been influenced by a nationalistic approach that highlights the idea of developing a national identity. The centralised characteristic of the TES and school curriculum has also facilitated this approach through introducing a nationalistic version of history to all school pupils. As a result, this finding can be interpreted as the impact of the overriding notion of history teaching in Turkey on some of the participants’ perceptions, because all participants of this study were subjected to this influence at least once, as pupils.

2. History and orientation
A second group of participants maintained that the aim of teaching history in schools is to take lessons from the past in order to orientate ourselves in today's world and to be able to predict what would happen in the future. Although this conception has some connections to the previous one, it attributes a broader notion to the teaching and learning of history.

3. History and citizenship education
According to the third proposition the purpose of history teaching is to serve as an efficient mode of citizenship education. Similar to the previous two perceptions, making use of school history in citizenship education is not an unfamiliar idea in the Turkish context (Dilek, 1999).

The main motive for introducing history as a part of the school curriculum has been to contribute to educating better citizens in any given society or nation (Slater, 1995; Dilek, 1999; Phillips, 2004). However, the participants of this study underlined the fact that the education for citizenship introduced through history teaching should encompass national characteristics within a global/universal dimension, not just a European feature. Citizenship education has been a part of the Turkish school curriculum, but attributing a democratic character to it, which emerged from the findings, is a relatively new idea.

4. History and humanism
The fourth proposition foresees developing a humanistic and tolerant approach that can be achieved through eliminating nationalistic and chauvinistic elements of the history curriculum as the purpose of history teaching. This is the opposite of the first proposition discussed above, because it does not develop a national identity through history teaching, it proposes to eliminate these elements from the curriculum. In contrast to the approach of the current Turkish history curriculum which emphasises political, diplomatic and military matters, the supporters of this perspective defend the idea of teaching the human side of history.

5. History and cognition: Historical thinking, critical thinking and thinking skills
The fifth and last proposition holds that history should be taught to develop historical and critical thinking skills through stressing the methodology of history. This view can be evaluated in a different category from the other four views discussed, since in essence it has a unique character. Whereas the other four propositions perceive school history as a means to change the learners’ general world views and their attitudes to specific issues, this proposition intends to change the way the learners perceive and think of the world around them by helping them to acquire and develop certain skills, such as empathy and critical thinking (Lee, 1992; Slater, 1995). In this context, the first four views can be seen as application of the ‘extrinsic purposes’ of history, whilst the last can be classified as the proposal for the fulfilment of the ‘intrinsic purposes’ of history teaching (Slater, 1995).

From Lee’s perspective the former suggestions propose to change society through history teaching, whilst the latter aims to change what learners see in their surroundings and how they see it (Lee, 1992).

Multiple perspectives
The participants of this study did not hold any one of the specific views above, whilst rejecting others. They sympathised with more than one view. For example, developing a national identity and improving learners’ historical and critical thinking skills were both suggested by the same participant as the purposes of teaching history. It shows that some participants uphold two seemingly contradictory propositions together at the same time. Similarly, the present curriculum embraces aims and objectives dominated by extrinsic purposes of history teaching but it also includes some intrinsic ones as well. One teacher educator commented thus:

...one of the objectives of the present curriculum is to develop pupils’ critical thinking skills, but the same program also aims to make pupils comprehend how noble the Turkish nation is. What happens, if a student reaches a conclusion that Turks are not noble by thinking critically?

This interview extract clearly highlights the dilemma in the definition of the aims and objectives of history teaching in the Turkish context. Although there was an attempt to put the intrinsic purposes of history teaching into practice, it is not a straightforward process to abandon the extrinsic ones, particularly in a centralised and politicised educational context, such as the Turkish one.
Curricular factors
The participants' suggestions concerning the key elements of the ED in the history curriculum referred to several aspects of the curriculum content, namely historical contexts, dimensions and periods of the content. According to the findings, the curriculum should include more social, economic and cultural dimensions of history selected from a balanced perspective of local, national, European and world history contexts. This suggestion arises from the state of the current curriculum that mainly introduces political history selected from the past of the Turkish nation. The data also highlighted the view of Stradling (2003) that in order to grasp pupils’ attention and help them to make sense of the past, it is necessary to introduce various dimensions of history together in a coherent and meaningful way. Besides, the participants suggested that the cause, consequence and implications of historical events should be evaluated in local, national, European and world history contexts and linked to one another.

Historical periods are a further issue of the curriculum content. The participants suggested that the curriculum should represent different periods of history in a balanced and fair way. There is no such balance in the current curriculum, especially contemporary history, which has been omitted from the content. The need to include more contemporary history, particularly very recent times, was emphasised with the assertion that recent history is crucial for school pupils to make sense of what is happening around them and to understand today's world. The findings here comply with Slater's (1995: 117) suggestion that history syllabuses in Europe should “include substantial elements of contemporary issues studied in their historical context.”

Contrasting with the general view arising from the findings, a minority of participants defended the idea of excluding a certain period of recent history from the school curriculum. This is a perspective probably stemming from sensitive and controversial characteristics of contemporary historical issues (Van der Leeuw-Roord, 2004). The presentation of more economic, social and cultural history from a multiplicity of perspectives can be suggested as a way to make contemporary history a natural and functional part of the curriculum.

Sensitive and controversial issues
The place of sensitive and controversial historical issues in the current curriculum is the last theme amongst the participants’ suggestions for the curriculum content. According to the findings it is necessary and important to include sensitive and controversial historical issues in the curriculum. The current curriculum does not include this sort of topic mostly for political reasons. The findings establish that school pupils learn about sensitive and controversial historical issues outside formal education, mostly through following the mass media. According to most of the participants, it would be better to introduce them to sensitive and controversial issues within the school. This may not only help pupils become informed but also enable them to develop historical and critical thinking skills (Stradling, 2003).

Conclusion: History and the history curriculum: an agenda for change
As seen in the previous pages, many participants perceived the discipline of history as a field to create a suitable and agreeable past to build up a sense of nationhood and national identity under the presumed criteria of Turkey's political and ideological dynamics. History teaching was also viewed as a means to make accessible the above socio-political notions, particularly in terms of guiding pupils to develop a national identity. Raising school pupils as the citizens of the ideal society within this context is another idea ascribed to history teaching in Turkey, where the history curriculum is imagined as an apparatus that provides all the necessary information/knowledge and presents it in a scientific and objective way.

A second conclusion was that the participants held differing views on European issues. The analysis showed that two particular perspectives arise from the participants' general world views, which were partly shaped by the formal education, including history teaching in schools. In other words, it can be argued that the general understanding of history and history teaching in Turkey not only determines Turkish people's perceptions of the past and how these perceptions are transmitted to the new generations but also they have an impact on their view of Europe as 'the other side', Europeans as 'the others' and related issues.

Some of the participants, whose world views were shaped by the general understanding of history and history teaching, viewed the ED in education as a Eurocentric approach to education and the ED in history teaching as introducing more European history.

However, the findings revealed that there are other participants who had optimistic and unbiased attitudes towards Europe and European matters, such as Turkey's integration into Europe and the concepts of the European Dimension in education and the ED in history teaching. The views discussed first are the ones that actually represent popular perspectives and attitudes to Europe and Europe related matters in the Turkish context [even though I might personally regret this finding]. Consequently, it seems necessary to spread out positive and unbiased perspectives about Europe and Europe related matters through changing and challenging the content and view of Europe, Europeans and European history in the curriculum. In my opinion however, the essential requirement is to equip pupils with the necessary skills and capacities to look at the past critically and to help them build up their own perspectives about ‘the others’ without being influenced by bias, prejudice or stereotyping coming from any particular understanding of history or any particular world view. Therefore, history and history teaching in schools need to be focused on introducing Europe and European history in their authentic historical, physical, social and cultural contexts as a part of the curriculum to represent the Europeans or ‘the others’ not the image of ‘European others’ stemming from the existing traditional perspectives.

According to the findings of this study discussed earlier, the secondary school history curriculum is inadequate. It focuses on the transmission of given historical information/knowledge from a predetermined perspective that codifies a master narrative that
is even largely mythical in nature. There is no place allocated for developing pupils’ historical skills and cognitive abilities of problem solving, decision making or thinking critically, which should constitute an important part of history teaching (Dilek, 1999; Lee, 1992; Husbands et al, 2003). In relation to the same issue, the aims and objectives of Turkish education in general and history teaching in particular should be reconsidered. The place of extrinsic purposes needs to be restricted while the intrinsic ones should be included and put into practice in a more concrete manner. As pointed out by some authors, changes on the level of intention and purpose are indispensable, and they are the preconditions for innovation in the application level (Slater, 1995; Husbands et al, 2003; Van der Leeuw-Roord, 2004).

The content of the present history curriculum constitutes another problematic area. There is too much content and too many details, which are repeatedly introduced at different levels of schooling. Moreover, various topics or different dimensions of the same topic in the curriculum are not connected to one another. For instance, study units were formed on the century basis; national history and non-national history of the same epoch are presented in separate study units; or political and socio-cultural dimensions of a certain period or context of history introduced in different places. In order to overcome these problems, the general characteristics of the TES and the curriculum should be considered first. Giving teachers the authority of syllabus design and content selection appears to be an alternative way to change the current system and solve the problems arising from it. Under the current circumstances however, it does not seem possible and feasible to expect any change in the centralised characteristics of the TES and the school curriculum. Thus, seeking solutions within the current system seems to be a realistic way to improve the Turkish curriculum.

First, the findings of this study indicate that history in the Turkish school curriculum should be taken as a whole. Considering pupils’ age and abilities in each stage, the curriculum content should be divided amongst different stages of schooling, if the selection of the content by the central authority is necessary and inevitable. Second, the curriculum content can be selected through a holistic approach making connections between various perspectives, contexts, dimensions and periods of history. The lack of contemporary history forms another problem of the curriculum content. Ideological anxieties stemming from contemporary politics constitute the main reason for excluding recent and contemporary history from the curriculum. This is regrettable as ideological anxieties stemming from contemporary politics constitute the main reason for excluding recent and contemporary history from the curriculum. This is regrettable as excluding recent and contemporary history from the curriculum can yield a further outcome; it may facilitate the use of historical methodology in the classroom by allowing pupils to use written historical evidence they can read, understand and interpret because before 1930 written resources for Turkish history are in Arabic script Turkish pupils cannot now read.

The curriculum space for Europe,
European history and other related matters also emerged as an issue from the findings. As discussed earlier, the inclusion of more European history from various perspectives is required in order to make it possible for pupils to learn and better understand Europe’s past; and to comprehend the European Dimension in education, the ED in history teaching and other contemporary European and world issues surrounding themselves. Besides, as in most other topics there is no provision made in the current curriculum to relate European history to pupils’ lives, which causes a lack of motivation amongst pupils towards the study of such topics. Despite the fact that this problem arises from the pedagogy as well as the curriculum, content is an important educational component for pupils’ cognitive and academic development.
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Abstract—This study aims to identify the difficulties that trainee history teachers experience when they study women in history using historical sources. For this purpose exam papers based on interpreting sources over three years were studied by researchers. Seventy five of 250 exam papers, which had similar misinterpretations and anachronistic inferences, were selected as the sample of this study. They were examined by using content analysis, a qualitative research technique. It was concluded that trainee history teachers had difficulties with identification, corroboration, analysis and contextualization of sources. In addition, they had difficulties in understanding the content of some sources because of inadequate language skills. Sometimes their tendency to question the official history discourse leads them to anachronistic and misinterpreted inferences. Trainee teachers also tend to interpret some historical facts in a romantic way. This study shows that trainee teachers should be taught how to work with sources. Philosophy of history and historical methodology courses should be reorganized and in addition new courses, such as the history of ordinary people and women’s history should be included in history teacher training programs.

Key Words—women’s history, source-based learning, trainee history teachers.

Introduction
This research derives from the researchers’ experience of examining the historical interpretations and understandings of trainee teachers who took a history methodology course and have historical knowledge of different periods of the past. It investigates papers set to examine the history course over a three year period. Three years ago the researchers assumed that trainee teachers could make valid historical interpretations from given evidence, understood the difference between primary and secondary records, could analyze a document from different perspectives and could understand chronology, for example in terms of events and individual lives. Questions asked were related to curriculum objectives based on a constructivist approach. This also led the researchers to expect trainee teachers to be able to design teaching activities using a source-based approach when they begin teaching in schools. These were the researchers’ expectations because they were based on the course objectives.

The exam papers were about the lives of women under the Ottomans between the 19th century and first decade of the 20th century. Sources in one exam included documents about Refia Sultan, who was daughter of Sultan Abdulmecid and Belkis Seuket. She was the first woman to travel by plane in 9 and was engaged in the struggle for women’s rights during the Era of the Second Constitutional Monarchy (1908–1922).

In the other exam there were documents about the actions of other women during the Era of the Second Constitutional Monarchy. The aim was to evaluate the trainee teachers’ knowledge of women’s history, which is thought to be disregarded, as well their procedural skills in interpreting the documents.

There is a short literature review that simplifies the interpretation of the findings below.

The Position of Women in the Eras of Administrative Reforms and during the Constitutional Monarchy.
The process of modernization, which started in the year of Administrative Reforms (1839) in the Ottoman Empire Era, continued with the changes that occurred in social and political fields during the Constitutional Monarchy. While some rights were given to women the subject of women’s legal status was controversial (Tekeli, 1982, pp.195–6). In the late Imperial period (1869–1923), especially in the Era of the Second Constitutional Monarchy, women started to struggle for their own rights and liberty in the relatively liberal environment introduced by the constitutional monarchy. In this process, recently named Ottoman Feminism, in the Era of the Second Constitutional Monarchy, women (mostly upper-class) demanded some rights of education, involvement in working life made possible by having higher education, taking part in the public sphere, wearing modernized clothing (such as leaving off the veil and wearing modern outer garments). They publicised various methods of meeting their objectives and they established some useful associations that enabled them to take part in public life. As a result of their work and struggles, they had some success, (for example Ottoman—Turkish women were accepted as employees in the telephone office which was the first public service to allow this). During this period The Ottoman Community for the Defence of Women’s Rights (Osmanlı Müdafaà-i Hukuk-i Nisvan Cemiyeti) was created. This was an association struggling for equality between women and men. At this time, the magazine named Women’s World Magazine was published (Çakır, 1996; 2007).

Whilst the members of this association tried to work for equality between women and men, they had to struggle for this just as women of the Western World did. In this period, which was the beginning of aviation, women pilots were trained. They attended flying contests in the West. The Association of Turkish Women wanted to be seen in the sky (1). The Association thought that one of their members could fly with an Ottoman pilot, to show that Turkish women did not just follow the improvements passively. On 18th November 1913, after being granted permission by the authorities, Ms. Belkis Seuket, a member of the Association, flew with the pilot Mr. Fethi Bey. Belkis Seuket wrote about her experience in Women’s World Magazine. This event was one of the most important during this period and was given extensive coverage in Women’s World Magazine, it had important repercussions at home and abroad (Çakır, 1996, pp.59–62). The two sources given in the exam, which are the subject of this research, are related to the event described above.
Women had their civil rights and reached a position of equality with men in public life when Turkey became a Republic in 1923.

**A Systematic Approach to the Use of Historical Sources**

Drake and Drake Brown (2003 p. 475) suggest an “heuristic strategy”, a method of enquiry which can be used in teaching history, based on the ways in which historians work. They believe that this strategy, in which students work on historical enquiries in a similar way to historians, can make historical thinking more systematic. This strategy depends on two key concepts which are central to Wineburg's analysis of historical enquiry.

The approach is explained in detail below.

Heuristic Strategy for using sources: Analysis of primary sources includes considering the reliability of the writers of the document and their motivation, their participation in the events of the period and asking questions about what they intended readers to think about the source. In summary, it is work which the historian does before analysing the content. In this process the following questions can be asked:

- Who is the author?
- Which era does the source belong to?
- What kind of a document is it?
- What can be said about the mass of the readers?
- What are the factors that led it to be created by the authors?

It is possible that the questions that Drake and Drake Brown suggested (2003 p. 471) can be expanded as far as the source allows. In the first process named identification of the document, there are the writers and/or name of the source, date and type of the document; in the second process named analysis of the document, there is the main idea of the source, its relationship with other sources, the main influences that motivate the writers, their intention, aim and bias and the questions that can be asked of the writer.

This process involves both asking questions about the document and making inferences about it.

The third process is named historical context. The historian focuses on the content of the document in its historical context. In this analysis, thinking from within the circumstances and perspectives of the period, instead of thinking from current perspectives, becomes important. Teachers and students can create disparity between their own points of view the viewpoints of people in the past. In this process, an historian considers local, national and world contexts. The question is “Who were the important people, and what were the important events and ideas, in the local, national and world context during the period in which the document was written?”

An historian evaluates the information by comparing related documents which are primary sources, as well as interpreting the sources. In summary, an historian makes connections between these documents (Drake & Drake Brown, 2003 pp. 473-78). This makes the interpretation more robust.

Consequently, as Wineburg said, identifying the evidence, associating, supporting or corroborating the evidence, contextualization and comparative thinking are essential factors in an historian's thinking process (Drake & Drake Brown, 2003).

This systematic approach informed the analysis of the exam papers.

**Method used in this study**

Research data were gathered between 2005 and 2007 from trainee teachers’ exam papers, which were prepared using a source- based approach. Document analysis, which is one of the qualitative research techniques, is used in the study.

This study focused on misinterpretations and anachronistic answers. For this reason, 250 exam papers were scrutinized. Seventy-five exam papers that have similar misinterpretations and anachronistic inferences were identified. Therefore the sample of this and anachronistic inferences were identified. Therefore the sample of this study is limited to 75 trainee history teachers. This is a small sample. However, the findings make some generalisations about history education possible.

Content analysis was made for coding similar misinterpretations and anachronistic conclusions in the exam papers. These were numbered and classified as: misunderstandings, misinterpretations, over-interpretations, chronological errors and misclassifications of sources. Some sub-classifications were also made.

At this point, the data was coded according to pre-determined concepts; it is necessary to make a code list before the data are collected in order to construct the framework for the research. (Yıldırım & Simsek, 1999, p.165).

The related data are marked according to these codes, in order to re-use them if necessary. At the same time, on the data coding schedule, they are listed under the concept to which they belong. These concepts and codes are: “Misunderstanding (MU); Misinterpretations (MI), Over-interpretations (OI); Chronological Errors (CE), Misclassifications of sources (MS).

Some sub-codings were done when required, for example where two kinds of chronological errors are detected, they may be coded “CE1 and CE2”. The results obtained are classified under the headings stated above and if necessary, there is supporting information and discussion of quotations taken directly from exam papers.
Findings

Misinterpretations and over-interpretations
Did women attend the faculty of medicine in the Era of the Second Constitutional Monarchy (1908-1922)?

One of the visual sources is a photograph about an anatomy lesson that was taken in the school of arts for girls in the Era of the Second Constitutional Monarchy. But the name of the school is given in Ottoman Turkish, which translates into English as “fine (arts) industry school”. In Ottoman Turkish “industry” was used to describe not only industrial works but also artistic works. However, in modern Turkish “industry” is used for mass production.

The aim of giving this source is to understand trainee teachers’ awareness of historical language and their ability to relate this to the visual source.

Researchers’ expectations of trainee teachers were:
• To read information given below the photograph
• To understand that the photograph was taken in the faculty of arts for girls
• To make inferences about girls’ education
• And to relate this photograph to another source, in order to get a sense of women’s struggle for their rights.

Data showed that 12 trainee teachers believed that the girls took anatomy lessons in the faculty of medicine. In this case the trainee teachers had little awareness of historical language; for them the word ‘anatomy’ and the photograph are associated with the medical school. Furthermore, it was found that the student teachers had a lack of historical knowledge about the education of girls. Girls first studied medical science in 1922–1923 and the first graduates graduated in Republic Era in 1927.

One of the skills that the trainee teachers were expected to use to analyse the source correctly was “corroborating the source” and according to this expectation, the written source that is supposed to be related with the photograph is below.

Here is the speech of Ms. Mihri to Mr. Sükrü who was Minister of War—

Your Reverence, Minister, in our country, liberty, equality and fraternity appeared with constitutional monarchy; but only men benefited from this circumstance; women could not make any progress. Today, equality and fraternity have been addressed. However, where is the School of Arts for Girls (İnas Sanayi-i Nefise Mektebi)? Everything is done only for men.

This source proves that women struggled to have the School of Arts for Girls opened and the photograph, which shows the girls in an anatomy lesson, also proves that this struggle had a positive outcome.

Trainee teachers ignored the information that the anatomy course was given not only in medicine but also in arts. In addition to this, some trainee teachers thought that the photograph was taken in a vocational school because they focused on “industry” because of the school’s name (arts industry school). Their inferences are incorrect in terms of unawareness of historical language, historical knowledge, different perspectives, and mistakes in associative thinking.

A great number of the trainee teachers interpreted this visual source in relation to the educational life of Ottoman women in general. They gave no specific information about women’s arts education. Only a few student teachers mentioned women’s struggle for the establishment of the arts school in the photograph using the written source given in the exam paper. One trainee teacher said that women having education in medical science as shown in the photograph was new information for him. He said that in Era of Constitutional Monarchy “I thought women had no education in medical science”. This suggests that he has little critical thinking and historical inquiry skills because the trainee teacher accepted a wrong interpretation of the sources as the historical truth without further questioning.

Was Belkıs Şevket first woman pilot in Turkish history?
One of the written sources is about Belkıs Şevket’s description of her experimental flight. She was the first Turkish woman to have a flight around Istanbul. In the text, Ms. Şevket talks about her decision to take a flight, her feelings and thoughts during the journey. While the text is given in the Latin alphabet, in accordance with the modern Turkish alphabet, the statements in the text were not simplified and they were left in their original style (trainee teachers have studied Ottoman Turkish intensively). However,
the language of the text was not as complicated as classical Ottoman Turkish. When answers about the text are compared, it is found that 12 trainee teachers think that Belkıs Şevket is the first female pilot in Turkish History.

The answers of the students show that:
• They do not understand the text enough
• They cannot link it to with their previous knowledge and experiences
• They can not think in parallel with the historical context
• They cannot use their historical inquiry skills.

The first female pilot in Turkish History is Sabiha Gökçen who is not only Atatürk’s stepdaughter but also a Republican woman. This knowledge is reinforced from primary school to higher education. Despite this, the students did not draw on this knowledge; they misinterpreted the source and, without developing supporting arguments, they claimed that Belkıs Şevket was the first female pilot.

It can be said that this situation partly derives from the fact that students approach formal history teaching with some scepticism. Furthermore, the attempt to attribute all primary and positive developments to the Republic Era and sometimes forcing or manipulating explanations to achieve this can be thought to lead the students to accept some events and facts belonging to the past in an unquestioning way, and lead them to misinterpret /overinterpret, or approach the past in a romantic way (see Egan 1978;1986).

After a trainee teacher concluded that, “in the Ottoman Era women knew how to read and write”, he/she commented that “we’re taught that women were not educated in the Ottoman Empire” is an example of why we should doubt the formal history course.

Similarly, feminist researchers argue that there was a women’s (feminist) action started by educated women in the late Ottoman Era; but an attempt was made to omit this from social memory by early-republicans (Kemalists), for the sake of legitimizing the new republic and claiming that all reforms, including women rights, were made by them (Tekeli, 1982, Çakır, 1996). Feminist researchers make clear that there was also a women’s struggle in the early Republican Era to get some social and especially political rights, but this struggle was constrained and kept quiet (Zihniolu, 2003). Feminist researchers further argue that republicans manipulated women’s rights issues in order to prove how contemporary and civilized they were. Feminist researchers who undertake important studies in Turkey deconstructed early Republican Era or Kemalist discourse, which is based on official history in relation to women.
Table 1:
These are some misinterpretations about this resource—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments/Conclusions</th>
<th>Explanations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. News Column</td>
<td>In a French magazine, information is given about Ottomans (especially about traditional Turkish music).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Car Bill</td>
<td>It is a bill for the coach that Sultan had brought from Paris.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Photograph Receipt</td>
<td>It is a bill in charge of the photographs taken.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Restaurant Bill</td>
<td>This may be the bill belonging to the restaurant in France.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Special Course Bill</td>
<td>This is a bill belonging to the special courses taken.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Portrait Bill</td>
<td>This is for the payment belonging to the portrait of Refia Sultan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. French Lesson Bill</td>
<td>She went to the house of Piano and Music in order to improve her French.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Opening Invitation</td>
<td>It is an opening invitation of a music and piano house in front of the Council of France in Beyolu.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Course Bill</td>
<td>It is a payment bill for the music course near the Council of France.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Night Club Bill</td>
<td>It is a bill for a nightclub in Pera.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Piano Course Bill</td>
<td>It is a bill including address of the Piano course.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be concluded from the Table1 students have made misinterpretations about the payment for the piano which was bought for the palace. Some of these comments are anachronistic and this may be because the trainees looked at the past from the perspectives of the present as well as a lack of historical knowledge. However, when the Ottoman custom is taken into account, it is not a matter of fact that women of the dynasty and palace could attend a course by going to any building outside the palace. These evaluations point to the lack of knowledge about palace life at the time because today going to a course is quite common. On the other hand, it is stated in the written sources that Refia Sultan took a special French course from a French teacher who came to the palace. Some of the misinterpretations derive from the inadequacy of analyzing (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8 and 10) sources. The main inadequacy is that the source could have been corroborated. (see Drake & Drake Brown 2003). The trainee teachers either could not relate one source to another or they related them wrongly. The most interesting reply is the evaluation of the promissory note arguing it was a news column; it is impossible to find any evidence to make us think this promissory note is a news column.

However, most of the trainee teachers who took the exam found out that this promissory note is related to the piano, which is a Western musical instrument and as a result of this, they concluded that the Ottoman Empire had been trying to become westernized. On the other hand, the fact that some of the trainee teachers identified this effort with a few concepts like “imitation, admiration of being a western” shows these student teachers supposed that becoming westernized is a negative development which led to the collapse of the Ottoman Empire. In this case, one can argue that most of the trainee teachers tended to make “romantic interpretations” (see Egan 1978;1986) without taking into account the historical context which is both national and international.

**Chronological Errors**

Two of the written sources given to the trainee teachers were letters written to or by Refia Sultan.

On one of the texts, the dates are given as both Hegira (1292) and Gregorian (1876). On the other text, only the Hegira date (1296) is given. The trainees were supposed to think about which sultan was ruling at that period and to comment in context. During Refia Sultan's life, 4 sultans ascended the throne. These are the time lines which show the dates of the sultans’ ascending the throne and the individual time line of Refia Sultan—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1839</th>
<th>1861</th>
<th>1876</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abdülmecit</td>
<td>Abdülaziz</td>
<td>Murad V (3 months)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1842</td>
<td>Refia Sultan</td>
<td>1880</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Birth | Death |

Refia Sultan was born during the reign of Sultan Abdülmecit and she spent her life in—

- Abdülmecit's reign for 19 years
- Abdülaziz's reign for 14 years (and Murad's reign for 3 months)
- Abdülhamit's reign for 4 years.

The trainees were supposed to make an evaluation of the historical context by taking the dates of the letters into account.

In evaluating this source ten of the trainee made teachers two obvious errors.

1. They thought that Refia Sultan wrote the letter dated 1292 (1876) to her father. Nevertheless, in 1876, Abdülmecit was not alive and Abdülhamit II ascended the throne. The trainee teachers made a serious mistake by ignoring the dates.
2. Refia Sultan’s life span is considered to be during Abdülmecit Period.

Such an assumption is a mistake since Refia Sultan lived during the reigns of 4 different sultans.

The trainee teachers ignored the chronology and could not construct the historical context. On the other hand, if all papers are examined, almost all the trainee teachers have mentioned...
the periods of Abdülmecid and Abdülhamit but few of them mentioned Abdülaziz, when Refia Sultan lived for 14 years during the Abdülaiz period.

These findings point to the fact that examining the historical period separately leads to the gaps and misconceptions in historical thinking, and the problem of “great men’s history” and “big events” history (l’histoire événementielle). Similarly, the trainee teachers had difficulty in constructing continuity and the change in historical thinking due to their perception of historical time, which is dominated by the sultans’ life spans and big events. As shown in our findings, when a historical narrative appeared that focused on individuals (especially more ordinary people), the trainees’ misconceptions about time becomes much more explicit. In addition they had difficulty in seeing the relationship between the micro and macro histories. Iggers (2000) argues that it is quite possible to integrate the history of large-scale social transformation and history which focuses on the lives of individuals (p.106).

There may be a populist approach related to the emphasis on Abdülmecid II and Abdülmeccet rather than Abdülaziz in a traditional view of history. It also points to a more “romantic historical understanding” (see Egan, 1978 and 1986) that is based on heroes.

Source Types
When classifying types of sources the trainee teachers made some obvious mistakes. Some did not recognise the original documents which were transcribed, and the documents printed in books or magazines were first or second order sources. Two trainee teachers classified the promissory note for the piano as an auditory source, some did not recognise that the original documents which were transcribed, and the documents printed in books or magazines were first or second order sources. Twelve trainee teachers implied that various other written sources were in this category. Trainee teachers considered these sources auditory, despite the fact that they are written, because they knew that their oral history records are auditory.

Conclusion and suggestions
This study shows that trainees have serious problems in analysing historical sources. In the constructivist approach even in the primary level, if we are to teach source-based approaches, using constructivist strategies we should educate teachers and trainee teachers themselves in this way. History students should be taught about historical methodology in History Departments, before entering the Teacher Training Department.

Within the context of this research, the obvious results that were obtained from the similarities and the repeated mistakes were taken into consideration. Along with these themes (Misunderstandings, Misinterpretations, Overinterpretations, Chronological Mistakes, Reference type mistakes) there are various other kinds of mistakes which were made by the trainee teachers but were not given in this research. These findings suggest that the trainees find some difficulty in dealing with historical sources. Given this situation, the fact that the education given in the science and the literature faculties and especially the history method lessons have to be re-evaluated. The source/ evidence based approach is about to be used in the new educational programs starting with the first grades of primary school. Given this situation it is expected that in the secondary school history courses the approaches using primary and secondary historical sources will increase.

In the light of these findings the trainee teachers who are supposed to teach the analysis of sources and work with sources with their pupils should have education at an appropriate level to enable them to do so.

Furthermore, this paper indicates that students have a lack of knowledge of women’s history. Given this situation, it is proposed that a women’s history course should be added to the curriculum as -at least- an elective course and history subjects should make women in the past visible. This is a first step towards women’s history, in order that it will provide a balanced gender perspective when studying and teaching history.
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Prospective teachers’ ideas about the methodology of Social Sciences/History and purpose of social studies teaching—Evaluation of “Us” through “Others”

Yücel Kabapınar

Abstract—Recently, there have been some important transformations in the area of education in Turkey. Social Studies education has also been affected by this change in many aspects such as learning and teaching approaches, curriculum, textbooks, assessment and evaluation techniques. In this respect, the constructivist view of learning and teaching the concepts and principles of social studies/history methodology have started to gain importance.

Another point that has gained importance is the opinions of social studies teachers/prospective teachers about this new approach. With this in mind, a survey was conducted with Turkish senior students of social studies education departments in two different universities. Three short history excerpts were selected from social studies/history textbooks already in use. The main feature of these texts is that they included an emotional point of view. They also involve some hidden negative statements/messages about others (i.e. other religions and nations). From primary to high school, social studies textbooks may have similar texts. Therefore, prospective teachers are likely to be familiar with such excerpts in textbooks and this familiarity is likely to affect their objectivity in evaluating the texts in terms of the methodology of social sciences/history. To help prospective teachers be more objective in their responses, the excerpts chosen were not presented in the form they were taken from the textbooks. Instead, words like Turk/Muslim/Islam Religion/Raiders (a mounted corps of the Ottoman army used as an advance guard and for raiding) were changed into English/Christian/Christianity/Knights suggesting that the texts were taken from English history textbooks.

These three texts were presented and open-ended questions asked the prospective teachers for their ideas and feelings about each text, this formed the first questionnaire. This questionnaire was distributed to the prospective social studies teachers (n= 140). After they read the texts and responded to the questions, questionnaires were collected. Immediately, a second questionnaire was distributed with an explanation that the texts which appeared in the first questionnaire were taken from Turkish textbooks rather than English ones. The aim of this second questionnaire was to reveal prospective teachers’ feelings and ideas about the texts for the second time, and the nature and methodology of social studies teaching. In analyzing prospective teachers’ written responses, content analysis, a qualitative data analysis method, was used. After the categorization of written responses was completed, ideas and perception of prospective teachers who were attending two different universities were compared both qualitatively and quantitatively via SPSS statistics program. Finally, potential reasons for the findings of the study were discussed.

Keywords—History curriculum, Identity, Indoctrination, Memorisation, Nationalism, Skills, Textbooks, Transmission model of teaching, Values and beliefs.

Introduction

In Turkey, the history courses are very famous among the subjects of the school curriculum. It has the knack of “memorisation” and as a result equivalent to “cheating”. In movies, talk shows, and standup shows, they are those that the comedians use most often and inspire them to make jokes about education. In such programs, comedians recall their history classes, along with their cheating adventures, in order to symbolize the absence of connection between education and real life and the amount of memorisation students need in school. This might stem from the way history and history education is interpreted. This perception may be because history has been reduced to sultan, king and general names, dates at which empires/states have founded, fought and collapsed, and the agreement articles signed at the end of wars. As an unavoidable result of this approach, history is seen as the transmission of facts. It does not include intellectual operations like analysis, synthesis, comparison, contrasting, commenting, or determining cause and effect. In addition, the history/social studies education aims to impose certain values, thoughts and facts in a non-critical one-dimensional and perfectionist attitude, characteristics of history education during the Republican Era. This situation is not unique to Turkey. No matter what the name and the style of the regime, history education has generally been seen, albeit in different degrees along with other courses, as a tool of continuing the existing system. The values, points of view and messages that the regime necessitates seem to be included in the prior aims of history education. The cognitive and emotional skills that are required to be developed in students, teaching the concepts of the field and presenting different points of views are pushed back to the second stage.

Opposed to the above, the new Primary Education Social Studies Program launched in 2004 possesses a different history and social studies teaching philosophy. This new program aims for students to “…realize that history can have different points of view”, “…acquire skills that the social scientists use while producing knowledge”, “…see the social studies education based on source usage and evidence evaluation”, “…learn the concepts of the disciplines”, “…construct their own knowledge and understanding by examining and evaluating the primary and secondary sources within the socio-cultural context”, “…distinguish historical events and ideas”, “…realize, mould ideas or recognize biases” (Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı, 2004). In line with this, some of the new methods like historical empathy, local history, oral history, historical stories, and visual sources have found a place in the Turkish Social Studies education program. It would not be wrong to suggest that this project has been the most radical and pioneering reformation encompassing not only alterations in the content of curricula, but also educational aims, teaching strategies, instructional materials, assessment and evaluation techniques of social studies and history education. In the new program, the sub-skills of the main skills that students need to acquire via social studies and history courses are presented below.
• Explaining different viewpoints, developing ideas and emotions
• Realizing mould ideas
• Questioning decisions
• Using evidence
• Being open-minded
• Looking from a different perspective
• Distinguishing historical facts and interpretations
• Learning problem solving
• Putting oneself in others’ shoes
• Defining events correctly and objectively
• Appreciating others’ thoughts
• Being respectful to differences
• Justifying personal opinions
• Distinguishing facts and ideas
• Being aware of propaganda
• Realizing the author’s idea
• Basing on reference
• Finding alternative solutions to historical issues.

Most of these sub-skills are abilities coinciding with the skills that social scientists use while producing scientific knowledge. For instance, a social scientist is expected to be aware of different viewpoints and to respect them, to use evidence and rely on references, to look at events from different perspectives, to distinguish events from facts, to question the validity of sources, to realize bias/propaganda and to be open minded while doing all of these (Stanford, 1987; Marwick, 1989). In helping students to acquire these skills, the role of the textbooks and teaching methods to be used will surely be very important. However the role of the teacher as a decision maker in using textbooks and designing instruction will be most critical of all (Dilek, 2001). With this regard, it is of great importance for the teacher to know the field and its methodology, to be able to practice the methodology and to help students apply it so as to acquire the skills targeted in the new social studies program. Thus, the aim of this study is to determine prospective social studies teachers’ perceptions about the methodology of social sciences/history and the purposes of social studies course. In this way, it is aimed to understand how ready they are for the described transformation in the educational system.

Research Methodology

The participants were fourth grade prospective teachers of two different universities. Due to the ethical issues, the names of the universities will be anonymous and will be called University A and B. The reason for choosing senior students was that they have already taken all the courses which will help them to develop a perspective about the methodology and teaching purposes in the field. Equal numbers (n=70) of prospective teachers were randomly selected from the two universities: a total of 140 prospective teachers participated. The research questions can be stated as “What are the interpretations of prospective teachers regarding the methodology of social sciences/history and the objectives of teaching social studies at school level?” and “How do these interpretations coincide with the theoretical frame that the new program presents?”

For this purpose three different texts were chosen from Turkish social studies and history textbooks currently used. These texts represent the old social studies/history teaching philosophy that the new program aims to change. The main characteristics of the old way of teaching philosophy are to make students believe in certain values and thinking styles without discussing or questioning them. The passages chosen from the textbooks were presented to the prospective teachers after having made some alterations. The alterations were as follows—

- Turkish replaced with English
- Muslim/Islam replaced with Christian/Christianity
- Raiders (a mounted corps of the Ottoman army used as an advance guard and for raiding) replaced with Knights
- Eastern authors replaced with Western authors

Imaginary English authors names were used to create the impression that the passages were taken from English textbooks. During their school life, Turkish students read and study the texts similar to the one exemplified below, not only in the Social Studies textbooks, but also in the Turkish, Literature, Religious Knowledge and Moral Education, Human Rights and Citizenship Education textbooks as well (Çömuşköken, Erzan & Silier; 2003; Ceylan & Irzik, 2004; Kabapınar, 2007). This may make students get used to the ideas presented in such texts as ‘normal perception’ and may hinder their objectivity towards social and historical issues. This is why texts were changed as mentioned above.

In this way, prospective teachers would have a chance of evaluating the Turkish social studies education as if it were English; it would be an evaluation of “us” by the use of “them” and they would possibly think in a relatively more objective way. Another advantage of such an approach is to give the prospective teachers an opportunity for empathy. They might get into the shoes of others against whom they may have bias developed due to the hidden messages transmitted via history and social studies textbooks. Thus, they might empathize with others’ feelings and perceptions which in turn may allow them to be more objective.

The three edited texts were used to prepare an open-ended questionnaire. In the questionnaire, each text was presented together with two following questions “Please evaluate the text in terms of history/social studies teaching” and “Please explain the feelings and ideas that the text created in you.” This questionnaire was distributed to the social studies prospective teachers (n=140). After they read the texts and responded to the questions, this first questionnaire was collected. Immediately after, a second questionnaire was distributed. This second questionnaire explained that the texts which appeared in the first questionnaire were taken from the Turkish textbooks rather than the English ones. Here again, there were questions that asked for the prospective teachers to evaluate the text in terms of the feelings and ideas about the nature of social studies/history education. The examination and evaluation of the prospective teachers’ open-ended responses to both questionnaires are likely to reveal their perceptions of the methodology of social sciences/history and the nature of social studies/history education. Although three passages were used in the questionnaires, due to the page limitations of the paper, only the analysis and results of the first text will be presented.
In the analysis, firstly the prospective teachers’ written responses were examined to see if they accepted or rejected the text/the approach in the text. As a result of this analysis, three categories were reached. These were; “Accepting the text”, “Rejecting the text”, and “Bias against the English”. Although they were asked to evaluate the texts in terms of the nature of history teaching ability, some mentioned their bias about the English in the evaluations. As a second step of analysis, the reasons offered for acceptances and/or rejections were examined and they were classified into some sub categories.

Subjectivity and occasionality exist among the assumptions on which qualitative studies are based. Thus, it is not possible to expect a qualitative study to obtain the same results from similar groups (i.e. reliability). In other words, the measurements might change depending on the individuals and situations. Also it is natural that the researcher might involve their own interpretations and perspectives while analyzing the data. Therefore it will not be possible for the researcher to test and define the reliability of the assessment tool in quantitative research. However, educators mention that there are some precautions that can be taken to assist the reliability of the research (LeCompte & Goetz, 1982; Patton, 1990; Silverman, 1993; Miles & Huberman, 1994; Huck & Cormier, 1996).

According to them, if the steps of the study are reported clearly in a detailed way the external reliability will increase, and the internal reliability will increase if it is shown that the results are not shaped according to the researcher’s opinions or preferences. For example, use of variety in the data analysis process, and presenting some of the findings in their original form (i.e. scanned responses) can be considered as important issues in the context of internal reliability (Huberman, 1994; Huck & Cormier, 1996).

In this regard, in order to maintain the external reliability, all the steps and the philosophies are presented in full detail. For maintaining the internal reliability, quotations from the prospective teachers’ written answers are presented. Additionally, a second researcher was involved in the study. The prospective teachers’ responses to the open-ended survey questions were first coded by the researcher, and later by a second researcher. The consistency between the two codings (number of answers coded the same in both steps/total coding number) was found to be 90%. This high percentage is a sign that the researcher does not involve personal perspective in analyzing the data. Therefore it will not be possible for the researcher to test and define the reliability of the assessment tool in quantitative research. However, educators mention that there are some precautions that can be taken to assist the reliability of the research (LeCompte & Goetz, 1982; Patton, 1990; Silverman, 1993; Miles & Huberman, 1994; Huck & Cormier, 1996).

Findings of the Study
Before moving onto the findings of the study, it is important to present the text used in the research. The text can be seen below. Note that the first terms did not appear in the first questionnaire.

Islam/Christian religion has added additional force to already existing bravery of the Turk/English. There wasn’t a main difference between surviving and dying. The main point was the war. Because war was the only way that was giving materialistic and soul comfort to people. The Turkish/English army was always ready for war. The army was never tired. It was walking three times faster than the Christian/Muslim army. Silent and fast movement was accepted as one of the most important points in war. Eastern/ Western authors reported that a hundred Muslims/Christians made more noise than ten thousand Ottoman/English. The bravery of the Turkish/English soldiers was higher than any kind of appreciation.

Table 1 shows the number and the percentages of the two groups of the prospective teachers’ responses to the question of their thoughts regarding the text.

TABLE 1. The results of Chi-Square analysis of the prospective teachers’ responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text 1</th>
<th>Accepting the view in the text</th>
<th>Rejecting the view in the text</th>
<th>Bias against the English Nation</th>
<th>Uncoded Empty</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prospectives' group</td>
<td>University A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University B</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>78.6</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X2=21.145 Sd=2 p=0.000

According to Table 1, 60% of the prospective teachers rejected the way history is presented in the text. They seem to think that such texts should not be used in history/social studies textbooks. The rest (27.2 %), on the other hand, showed their acceptance of the presence of such texts in textbooks. Table 1 also points out that 10% of the prospective teachers neither rejected nor accepted the text presented. Rather they rejected the ideas concerning the English and thus aired their bias against them in their responses. This was surprising because in the questionnaire it was underlined that the texts should be evaluated from the point of view of the methodology of social sciences/history and the objectives of teaching social studies at school level.

The distribution of the prospective teachers’ responses across the two universities can also be seen from Table 1. According to the findings, the prospective teachers at the University A are nearly equally divided into two categories; while 41.4% of them rejected the presence of such extracts in textbooks; 40% thought that the presence of the extracts is positive. On the other hand, a similar distribution was not seen in the
second group (University B). The majority of these prospective teachers (78.6%) rejected the text. They thought that the presence of such texts is negative for the methodology of social studies/history. The rest 14.4% of this group felt that such extracts can have a place in textbooks. It can be concluded that the two groups of the prospective teachers differ in terms of their perception of the text. This difference seems to be valid for the third response category (bias against the English) as well. According to Table 1, 15.8% of the prospective teachers at the University A indicated bias against English whereas only 4.2% of the University B prospective teachers showed bias against English. The results of the Chi-square analysis indicated that there is a significant difference (at the 1 percent level) between the two groups of the prospective teachers regarding their responses.

As previously stated, the prospective teachers' responses were analysed in terms of the reasons they offered to justify their responses. The frequency distribution of the reasons given for rejection or acceptance across the two groups is presented in Table 2.

TABLE 2. The frequency distribution of reasons across groups of the prospective teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rejection reasons</th>
<th>University A</th>
<th>University B</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subjective text</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslims are insulted in this text</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The text involves limitations for history education</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The text exaggerates national/religious emotions</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The text emphasizes that war is acceptable/necessary</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is similar to/taken from our history textbooks</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is a text which can create negative results for students</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acceptance reasons</th>
<th>University A</th>
<th>University B</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A positive/satisfactory text for presenting national/religious thoughts</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History is a pragmatic tool for teaching certain values</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nations do not present their history objectively to their students</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A useful text for the students</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen from Table 2, the prospective teachers offered a range of reasons for rejecting the text presented to them. Among those the most popular was “the subjectivity of the text”. This reason was stated by 69 prospective teachers of whom 49 were from the University B. These students found the text subjective in nature and explained that such text should not be included in social studies/history textbooks.

Another popular reason offered by 45 in total was related to the ideas about Muslims. This group of teachers felt that “Muslims are insulted in the text” presented. The reasons offered were varied. Some indicated the incorrectness of the information about Muslims in their justifications whereas some approached the issue more generally. They rejected the negative approach (insulting) towards any groups or nations. According to Table 2, 26 thought that the text involves different limitations for history education while another 26 felt that it exaggerates national/religious emotions. Both groups provided explanations concerning the methodology of social sciences/history.

As shown in Table 2, some of the prospective teachers (n=17) rejected the text due to its emphasis on the acceptability/necessity of war. They refused this view by giving examples to show the negative results of wars. A small group of students (n=7) thought that the text could create negative results for students. Some explained what the negative results could be by exemplifying, such as “forming bias against other nations” or “seeing themselves/their nations as superior over others”. The reasons mentioned so far seem to be in line with the concept and considerations of the social studies/history methodology. However, the reason concerning the similarity of the text to those presented in Turkish textbooks seems not to be related to the nature of social sciences/history. These prospective teachers (n=14) rejected the text and commented that the text was taken from Turkish textbooks. Some even stated that the features written for English are similar to Turkish. Two excerpts taken from prospective teachers’ written responses concerning their justifications for rejecting the text are presented below.

Prospective Teacher No. 15
In this style of history education, students are filled with nationalist thoughts and they start to form bias against other religions and societies. A student tries to see his nation as superior to other nations. As a result of the course taught with such language, a student is not critical, doesn’t see the need to question his own history, and objects to those who do.

Prospective Teacher No. 39
As I have mentioned previously, it has a completely one-sided approach. They raise their nations as well as insulting others. Also I noticed that there was a call to war, it emphasizes that the only way that people can make progress is through war. However, it doesn’t give attention to the fact that war is destructive and harmful. It does not underline the importance of peace at all. It makes the propaganda of English nationalism.

As can be seen from the two excerpts, these two prospective teachers offered a number of reasons to reject the text presented. The first of them made three criticisms regarding the text pointing out that the text exaggerates nationalist thoughts and values and hence forms bias against the others. This student also believed that the text can create negative results since it does not give an opportunity for students to make criticisms, to question their own history. Similarly, the second prospective teacher stressed the exaggeration of national of values in the text. However, two other criticisms were
raised concerning the text. One of them is the subjectivity of the text; the other is the appreciation of war and its positive results.

Turning now to the reasons for acceptance of the text, it becomes clear that there were four main reasons. The most popular reason offered by 26 was the suitability of the text for presenting national/religious thoughts. Students commented that the text was positive/satisfactory in transmitting national values. In the two excerpts given below, they explain how the text is positive in the sense of “presenting national/religious thoughts to the students.”

Prospective Teacher No. 24
The above text shows a characteristic for imposing national spirit. There exists a characteristic that needs to be present in every nation. It has mentioned that this character mostly exists in them and they were proud of the superiority of their race.

Prospective Teacher No. 12
By emphasizing the superiority of their nation among others, a national identity could be formed in the child. Also by showing religion along with these values it was aimed to own his religion and raise it. By insulting Islam against Christianity it was aimed to underline this aspect. Therefore it will be possible to make the child to see both his national and religious thoughts as superior to others. In the history classes we have seen there are certain items (One Turk is worth a world) similar to this raising the properties of the Turkish nation and Islam.

As seen in the excerpts, the prospective teachers underlined that in order to create national identity the superiority of a nation among other nations should be emphasized. In this regard, like history, religion was seen as one of the values that creates national identity by emphasizing superiority over other religions. Therefore, the prospective teacher (No.12) thought that Islam is being insulted by Christianity and perceived this as natural. It seems that this individual has seen similar approaches in history textbooks and thinks it is acceptable for others to do the same thing believing that if “we” do it, it is acceptable if “they” do it.

Another popular justification for accepting the text was related to the function of history. These students (n= 18) explained that history is a pragmatic tool for teaching certain values. Some of the prospective teachers (n= 11) added to this by stating that nations do not present their history objectively to their students. According to them, the English do not and that is understandable. Two excerpts taken from the prospective teachers’ written responses are given below showing why history can have a pragmatic function.

Prospective Teacher No. 103
History courses aim to motivate the generations for struggles that they can face in the future and maintain them to take action without hesitation. For the continuation and the existence of the nation.

Prospective Teacher No. 96
The students you educate are the future’s soldiers. Therefore it is natural for a nation to exagerate and to raise itself.

The prospective teacher (No.103) mentioned the pragmatic dimension of history education for teaching the ideology of the state. Interestingly, the second prospective teacher made an analogy between students and soldiers. He states, “history serves as a tool for creating the spirit of being a soldier who takes action without hesitation for the continuation and the existence of the nation.” Similar thoughts were verbalized by another prospective teacher (No.119) who stated “the text was written to show the importance of military power to students. In this way, it was aimed to enable students to love their army. By appreciating their soldiers, the English have tried to make their army and hence their history loveable.” It appears that this student identifies a relationship between the love of history and army. As seen in Table 2, the last category for accepting the text was related to the usefulness of it for pupils. Three prospective teachers aired this justification and they unfortunately did not provide further explanation by what they meant as “usefulness.”

Results and Discussion
The findings of the study highlighted that the prospective teachers who participated in the research can be classified under two main categories. One is Citizenship Transmitter as called by Barr et al. (1978). This group accepted the text presented to them since they intended students to emerge with certain beliefs, values, viewpoints and convictions as can be clearly seen from their written responses. Their responsibility seem to be to teach students to respect their country, and grow up to be good citizens by transmitting certain norms where “good citizenship” is possibly defined by “correct knowledge”, “proper behavior” and “respect for authority.” In this sense, the social studies/history teachers are defined as social agents responsible for “cultural transmission” in order to maintain cultural continuity and state existence.

The prospective teachers who form the second category can be termed “the supporters of methodological concepts and considerations”. This group of prospective teachers rejected the text presented to them. It is assumed that they will be much closer to the idea, at least at the theoretical level, that learning history/social studies is learning methodological concepts and considerations of the field. In this respect, they supported the idea that students learn to draw their own conclusions by examining and evaluating evidence. They possibly will be more willing to understand, appreciate and use the principles of the new social studies program launched in Turkey in 2004. In this sense, it would not be wrong to say that shifting the prospective teachers from the “Citizenship Transmitters” category towards the second category is vitally important for the success of the new program. The prospective teachers should come to an understanding and appreciation of the nature and methodology of social sciences/history and be able to practice them in their classrooms. To this end, there should be some renovations in the
teacher-training program. Some suggestions for renovations in teacher-training programs can be summarised as follows—

- Evidence-based teaching and introducing different viewpoints in the lectures (for example, “Contemporary World History”, “Ottoman History”, “Middle Ages History and Civilization”, “Current World Problems”) that prospective teachers attend should come to the fore. This is because teaching activities and the role of the lecturers at the universities are likely to shape prospective teachers’ perception of what social studies/history is about and how it needs to be taught.

- Much more emphasis on the methodological concepts and considerations of Social Sciences/History should be given in courses like “Introduction to Social Sciences”, “Introduction to Sociology”, “Research Methods in Social Sciences” and “Social Studies Teaching Methods” since these courses will both theoretically and practically determine what the methodology of social sciences/history is and how it may define and affect teaching at school level.

- The importance of developing pupils’ cognitive and emotional abilities should be strongly emphasized to prospective teachers so they will appreciate both intrinsic purposes (discipline-based aims) and extrinsic purposes (social aims) of teaching history and/or social studies as stated by Lee (1984; 1991).

- The way social studies/history is taught in some other countries and their textbook examples should be introduced to prospective teachers so as to enable them to widen their horizons learning different perspectives and practices are possible and in fact exist in social studies/history teaching.
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Well-Behaved Women Rarely Make History: Gendered Teaching and Learning In and About History
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I don’t remember anything about women or women’s rights coming up until like now. 8th grade boy

There were so many different kinds of women: but [until middle school] we didn’t really think about women much. 8th grade girl

Abstract—The role of gender in History Education is a relatively neglected area of research. The few extant research studies from the USA and other countries suggest that gender is only considered as relevant to the History curriculum where it feeds into a master narrative that reflects national identity as seen through the lens of stereotypical male oriented criteria. As such, where gender is included in master narratives it is in a reinforcing, supportive role but not treating gender as a subject of significance in its own right. The key role that History plays in providing the values, beliefs and overall orientation for informed citizenship suggests that there is need for a radical review of gender in the History curriculum. This affects both content and pedagogy. A possible way forward is to ground such revision in the corpus of findings from historical research on gender in history. Such findings relate both to the substantive content of the curriculum and an approach to learning grounded in the procedural knowledge of academic history—its skills, concepts, processes and protocols. Academic history has responded to the gender agenda of the 20th and 21st. centuries where the changed role and importance of women has become of paramount importance in societies’ evolving historical master narratives. Such revisionism is reflected in the popular, cultural representation of gender in history through films such as Pocahontas.

Keywords—Citizenship, Gender, Ghana, History Curriculum, History Education, Master narratives. Netherlands, USA.

Introduction

Several years ago a teacher colleague and I mounted an exhibit of student work representing the lives of women in antebellum America (1800-1861) (Levstik & Groth, 2002). Twenty-five eighth grade students in my colleague’s class developed the exhibit and helped install it in the College of Education. In the days that followed I watched as guests passed through the exhibit. One display included three pairs of hands—a mill worker, the wife of a mill owner, and an enslaved woman on a cotton plantation. Each pair of hands held symbols for the woman’s work and status, from coins representing the salary of the mill worker, and embroidery cotton for the “privileged” woman, to cotton bolls for the enslaved woman. The accompanying text described working conditions, social and legal limitations on the activities of each woman, the tools used for the work each did, and reform activities associated with that work. Captions explained that all women in each group did not have the same experiences and that “each display represents one part of textile work, including different pay based on age and race.”

Another display examined women’s clothing in the early nineteenth century, comparing dress for women pioneers, enslaved women, and “fashionable” women. After describing the health risks of “long skirts that usually brought in mud and dirt” and corsets that “cut off the supply of oxygen and rearranged their internal organs” the accompanying text distinguished between women who had some choices in what they wore and poor or enslaved women who “were just trying to stay alive and have food, to exist.” Moving past several other displays, guests found themselves facing life-size silhouettes of antebellum women from different regions and walks of life. Collages representing women’s individual and collective activity on the frontier, in agricultural and industrial work, and in social and political movements covered each silhouette.

In the study that led to the exhibit, students experienced their first sustained encounter with women’s history. In “normal history,” several explained, instruction “mainly focused on the men.” One student, Jake, suggested that they might have gotten some information on women in previous classes but “not that we remember. Somebody may have told us—they may have—but we don’t remember!” His classmate, Brooke, agreed, noting that “it was really amazing to know that women did all this stuff. I guess I thought the women were all alike. In my project I really enjoyed that: they were so different in so many ways, and that was really neat” (Levstik & Groth, 2002, p. 246).

Gender and History Education

After over two decades of research on teaching and learning history a rich body of literature offers insights into various aspects of historical thinking, of teachers’ and students’ conceptions of the purposes of history, of the impact of primary sources, digital formats, and various forms of testing (1). During this same period, too, researchers located much of their work in a socio-cultural framework, arguing that the meanings groups and individuals ascribe to the past develop in overlapping and often contradictory social, cultural, political, and historical contexts (Barton & Levstik, 2004; Crocco, 2004; Epstein, 2000; Marcus, 2006; Segall, 1999; Sexias, 1994; VanSledright, 2001; Wertsch, 1998). Interestingly, however, little research on history education focuses on gender, either as part of the content of history, as an analytical lens for studying history, or as a potential influence on students’ historical thinking.

The dearth of research on gender and historical thinking is surprising on several levels. There is evidence, for instance, that historical interests vary by gender, that boys tend to take more history courses than do girls, and that males and females perform differently on tests of historical knowledge (2) (NAEP, 2007; Niemi, 2005; Greenstein, 1961;
Gender differences in historical interests show up in studies in several different countries. Some researchers found, for instance, that female students ascribe more significance to issues of social justice or the history of everyday life than do male students, and female students perform better on test questions related to women's history (Barton, 2005; Barton & McCully, 2005; Kindervater & von Borries, 1997; Levesque, 2005; von Borries, Kindervater, & Körder, 1997). As Barton (in press) notes, however, few researchers have explored these differences in depth or attempted to explain them theoretically.

On the other hand, decades of commentary and critique analyze gender representation in standards and curricula, textbooks and tests, historical sites and markers, museums and media (AAUW, 1992, 1998; Behdad, 2005; Limerick 1987; Loewen, 2000; Marcus, 2006; Mazzarella & Pecora, 2001; Sewall, 1992; Schmurak & Ratliff, 1994; Scott, 1988, 1996; Thornton, 2002). Among the most influential of these analyses in the United States, the American Association of University Women’s (AAUW) report, Shortchanging Girls (1992), decried the lack of gender balance in history textbooks. More recent reports (AAUW, 1998, 2001) show increased visibility for women in history textbooks and curricula, but continue to express concern regarding a lack of equity in children's school experience. Clark., Allard, & Mahoney, (2004) caution, too, that textbook treatment of women remains superficial and after reviewing research on the effects of teaching women's history. Further, studies of classroom practice in the U.S. (Orenstein, 1994; Doyle, 1998; Walker, 2000) continue to report a lack of instructional time devoted to women's history, male-dominated discussion in history classrooms, and open hostility towards women's history from some students.

Meanwhile, a flourishing historical scholarship offers interesting and challenging analyses of the ways in which social, cultural, and political constructions of gender operate in private and public spaces over time (i.e. Cohen, 1999; Davidoff, et al., 2000; Hoganson, 1998; Ulrich, 1990, 2001) (2). Just as did the students in their exhibit on antebellum women, historian Patricia Limerick (1987) points out that “far from revealing weak creatures held captive to stronger wills, new studies show female[s] . . . as full and vigorous participants in history” (p. 53). In regard to Western women, Limerick (1987) described a “gritty, recognizably physical reality. . .[women] whose urges, needs, failings and conflicts we can recognize and even share” (pp. 50-53). In the years since Limerick published The Legacy of Conquest (1987) a number of scholars have offered similarly fine-grained cultural histories of various aspects of women's lives as well as studies of constructions of masculinity. Hoganson’s (1998) diplomatic history analyzes the impact of conceptions of manhood in the Spanish American War, for instance, while Ulrich’s (2001) recent work considers how women and men, Indians, colonists, and slaves left their mark on material culture in the years prior to the American Revolution and Karen Turner and Phan Thanh Hao’s (1999) work offers insights into Vietnamese women’s struggles during twentieth century wars in that country.

Given the amount of intellectual activity related to gender and history, the prevailing socio-cultural framework for much of history education research, and a largely unexplained achievement gap between males and females, it is worth considering the relationship between gender and conceptions of the past, including how that relationship might better inform scholarship on historical thinking and practice in history classrooms.

**Making Sense of Gender/ed History**

“And we’re kicking women to the side? Saying we’re not as important? ... When we eliminate women’s rights, are we saying it isn’t important? Are we lowering ourselves, what we are using to doing, we’re just kind of giving in, the usual role of women?”

Teacher candidate discussing the significance of women's history

When the students in the opening vignette began their study of antebellum U.S. history, they viewed men’s lives and experiences as normative (Levstik & Groth, 2002). That men’s history feels “normal” may not be surprising, but students’ failure to remember any instructional time devoted to women’s activity is certainly disturbing, especially given the space devoted to women’s activities in the U.S. history text series adopted by their school (eg Prentice-Hall, 1996). Of course, as Jake says, somebody may have told them, but they don’t remember. Why not? Social studies test scores routinely rank the school (including this class) among the top in the state. At test time, at least, they seem to remember quite a bit about other aspects of history. What makes women’s history different?

Thornton (2005)suggests one possibility: Gender relations were not fundamental to previous instruction and assessment. While “[a] thoughtful treatment of gender relations will quickly lead to considerations of religion, dress, diet, occupations, politics, and so on,” starting with political leaders may never lead students to gender at all (p. 51)...

Woyshner (2002) and Noddings (1992), too, suggest rethinking entry points in order to more thoroughly integrate women into the history curriculum. Noddings (1992) argues for “care” as an organizing principle; Woyshner (2002) draws on current historical scholarship to make the case for reconceptualizing political history to include women’s as well as men’s activities.

Perhaps, too, applying gender to women but not men in historical narratives leaves students unlikely to perceive gender relations as significant or to consider the gendered nature of the prevailing narrative. The slim body of research on gender in history education, for instance, focuses more often on women’s history or “women’s issues” rather than on gender relationships, on historical narratives as gendered or on gender as an analytical lens for studying history. As a result, students may continue to relegate women (and gender) to the margins of history, even when women are more visible in
texts and other classroom resources. In Singer's (1995) study, for instance, instruction centered on women's experiences, but students nonetheless ignored gender in favor of more traditional content in the final assessment activity.

In another study (Hill, 2003), secondary students received “enhanced” instruction about gender—after coursework related to women's history, student teachers were directed to include more women in their own instruction. Overall, the instructional intervention appeared to focus more on inclusion of women in the historical narrative rather than on gender as a cultural construct affecting men as well as women or as an analytical lens for interpreting the past. Further, the student teachers’ classroom performance was evaluated, not just on the basis of whether women were added to the historical mix, but on what kinds of women were added, with attention to “ordinary” women judged as a more sophisticated approach than focusing solely on famous (or infamous) women. As Hill (2003) notes, however, even this relatively gentle inclusion model challenged some student teachers (and some of the teachers in whose classes they worked). In evaluating the impact of this approach Hill also noted that even while student teachers attended to women's history in their instruction, they tended to ignore gender inequities in other classroom interactions.

Constructing gender in history as primarily a feature of woman's history extends beyond U.S. borders. In the 1970s, curriculum developers in the Netherlands looked to women's history as a way to address bias against women (ten Dam & Rijkaschraoeff, 1996). In 1978, women’s history became a required, tested subject with the intent not only of understanding the past, but of enabling female students “to better understand our present gendered society and their own position as women in that society.” In their description of the course, ten Dam & Rijkaschraoeff (1996) report no equivalent goal for the males required to take the course. By 1990, girls were performing slightly better than boys on tests of women's history, although boys continued to outperform girls on more “traditional” historical content (i.e. World War II). In light of these results, ten Dam and Rijkaschraoeff (1996) set out to examine one part of the equation—secondary girls’ thinking regarding women's history.

The ten girls in Dam and Rijkaschraoeff’s (1996) study found women's history interesting and worth studying because it was “not about all these wars,” but they also considered women's historic struggle for equal rights “over,” and not particularly relevant to their current experiences (p. 71). As the girls discussed women's history, they offered an optimistic account in which women in the past struggled for and gained the equality with men currently enjoyed by these young women. This finding mirrors both U.S. students’ descriptions of historical injustices discovered and overcome (Levstik & Barton, 1996), and Native American girls’ reading of Disney's Pocahontas as a form of cultural reconciliation (Aidman, 2001).

The researchers in the Netherlands study concluded that although studying women's history neither inclined or disinclined students towards feminist or antifeminist stances, girls cast the historical narrative as a story of progress in order to avoid being seen as part of a group “lagging behind” (p. 86). ten Dam & Rijkschraoeff (1996) argue that girls’ disinclination to identify with women in history arose from instructional approaches that present women as victims rather than as agents of history. As have others, they make the point that a narrative built solely on oppression misrepresents women's and men's lives, reinforcing misperceptions regarding men's and women's agency (see also Lerner, 1979; Woyshner, 2002).

Some scholarship in the United States offers a slightly different take on students’ and teachers’ disinclination to challenge narratives of progress. Jane White (1997) claims that “curriculum materials [in the United States] are chosen to elicit a sense of unquestioning pride as young people learn about their country's place in the world” (p.291). Events “that do not reflect the United States and its inhabitants at their finest hour, embodying the ideas for which we stand, tend to be ruthlessly edited out when ‘what is or was’ meets the filter of ‘what should be’” (p.291). From this perspective history curriculum developers intentionally obscure the ways in which constructions of gender constrain groups and individuals, but also perhaps more importantly, obscure the ways in which people resist those constraints. White (1997) along with others (Ladson-Billings, 1991; Martin, 1990) argues that offering students non-threatening images of exceptional women deflects attention from deeper discussion of social inequities and oppression.

Behdad (2005) describes a somewhat less intentional “contemporary denial” of past inequities that acts as a perceptual filter, shutting out unpleasant realities (p.177). As does Behdad, Limerick (1987) claims that Americans have always been reluctant to deal with their own complicity in oppression or victimization. She adds, however, that the result is not just that some things are shut out, but that roles are reversed: Americans imagine themselves as “injured innocents” triumphing over adversity rather than as complex historical agents who combine the roles of victim and victimizer. Limerick maintains that “the figure of the innocent victim is the dominant motif [in American history]”, (p.48), allowing white English colonists to decimate Indian populations, enslave Africans, and confiscate land and still imagine themselves as, variously, the victims of English tyranny, of marauding savages, or of greedy land speculators. Essentialist approaches to gender, she claims, fracture living women “into disconnected abstractions ... vulnerable victims or saintly civilizers ...” and leave only pale historical shadows rather than active agents of history (Limerick, 1987, p.53).

An increasingly rich historical literature investigating within group as well as between group differences offers a much more substantial approach to the complexities of shifting gender expectations playing out in interconnected social, cultural, and political spaces.
Two relatively recent books serve as examples here. In Patricia Cline Cohen’s (1999) The Murder of Helen Jewett, for instance, the murder of a prostitute forms the backdrop for a detailed account of shifting gender roles in urbanizing Jacksonian America. Similarly, Alfred Young’s (2005) Masquerade: The Life and Times of Deborah Sampson, Continental Soldier reconstructs Sampson’s acquiescence in and resistance to the complex gender expectations in the communities in which she lived and worked. It seems, however, that little of this research informs the treatment of gender in curriculum development (Crocco, et al., 2007; Crocco, 2004; Woyshner, 2002) and we know almost nothing of how it filters into classroom instruction. While some teachers appear better at helping students negotiate more complex histories than others, we have only a small body of research to help us think about how this might happen more consistently.

**Teachers and Teacher Candidates Negotiate Gender in History**

Although White (1997) contends that school histories smooth out the rough edges of the past in order to preserve a benign national story, teachers’ and teacher candidates’ thinking about gender belie an overly easy categorization. On the one hand, Levstik’s (2000) study of elementary and middle school teachers and teacher candidates seems to confirm White’s argument. Levstik notes that the teachers and teacher candidates she studied ascribed historical significance to aspects of the past perceived as promoting social unity and consensus. Although they were aware that injustices happened in the past, they worried that introducing “negative things like protests” might jeopardize students’ identification with the nation or generate hostile responses from parents or administrators (pp.294, 297). Reflecting Behdad’s (2005) notion of “contemporary denial”, teachers and teacher candidates argued about the extent to which inequities existed in the past, more often describing oppressions or inequities as separate and singular events rather than symptoms of larger, persistent patterns. They tended to understand gender-based restrictions on citizenship, for instance, as temporary aberrations, discovered and fixed. As a result they could, as did the students in the Netherlands, see the women’s rights movement as finished—a momentary disturbance of the historical landscape. Sometimes they based such assessments on their own historical misperceptions, as when one teacher argued that the Nineteenth Amendment was unimportant because women could already vote: “See, women voted in the 1700s! It just was who owned land,” she told her peers.

More frequently, however, they described women’s rights as an early problem (suffrage) recognized and rectified, and a later problem (discriminatory employment or feminism) also rectified well before their time.

As did the eighth graders in the opening vignette, participants in Levstik’s (2000) study expressed frustration with their inability to recall information about women’s rights from their previous history courses. While some argued for the importance of women’s history and the significance of women’s rights movements, others explicitly and forcefully rejected this as “feminist” and dismissed the historical significance of women’s rights (p.289). Regardless of their stand on women’s history or their foggy recollection of the specifics of that history, they nonetheless regarded the main point of the national narrative they were to teach as emancipation, progress, and exceptionality and rejected possible alternative narratives. And, as White (1997) predicted, when confronted with events “that do not reflect the United States and its inhabitants at their finest hour,” (p. 291) these teachers and teacher candidates understood their task as editing out unpleasant realities in order to ensure identification with the nation-state. Levstik (2000) argues that a vaguely recalled national story of progressive emancipation failed to provide them with a framework for making sense out of a more complex history. Alternately, the concept of contemporary denial suggests the difficulty of their recalling any other kind of history (Behdad, 2005; Smith, 2003; White, 1997).

The teachers’ and teacher candidates’ responses in Levstik’s (2000) study should be viewed with some caution, however. As other studies of teachers and teacher candidate’s make clear (Bennett & Spaulding, 1992; Evans, 1989, Hill, 2003, Grant, 2003, VanSledright, 2001; Wineburg and Wilson, 1991) different contexts or positions elicit quite different responses to the challenges of teaching history. S.G. Grant’s (2003) investigation of two high school history teachers (one female; one male) provides a rich analysis of teacher agency amidst an array of constraints and opportunities. One of the teachers, Linda Strait, offers an interesting contrast to the more cautious approach taken by some of the teachers in Levstik’s (2000) study. Grant explains that Strait wants “bigger more powerful understandings of the forces that move men and women during challenging times” (p.41). She engages her students at exactly the points that the teachers and teacher candidates’ in Levstik’s study express the most reservations. Strait identifies a primary purpose of teaching and learning history as helping students negotiate difference: the “other side of the diversity in America and we have got to see it, recognize it, and start working together” (p.41). Her (male) colleague teaching the same course in the same school makes quite different choices. Grant (2003) describes these teachers as practitioners of “ambitious” teaching (p. 187). Each teacher, acting as a curricular gatekeeper, exercises significant control over instruction (Thornton, 1991, 2005; Grant, 2003). Grant argues that “smart teachers, curious students, and powerful ideas” come together in their classrooms to produce very different but equally ambitious teaching and learning (Grant, 2003, p.187). Yaeger and Davis’s (1996) study of history teachers’ goals and related practices also suggests that the ways in which teachers exercise their role as curricular gatekeepers varies considerably. It would be interesting to know the extent to which it varies by gender.

While neither Grant nor Yaeger and Davis comment specifically on gender, their work and Levstik’s suggests that we need considerably more research on how teachers from different backgrounds, working in a variety of settings teach (and are taught) about gender in history. The picture may be considerably less bleak in some regions than in others and at some grade levels than at others (Barton & Levstik, 2004; Bickmore, 1993; Levstik & Barton, 2005; VanSledright, 2001; Grant, 2003, McNeil, 1998; Yaeger and Davis, 1996). Time constraints, testing, and student resistance may be more salient for
some teachers than others, for some topics more than others, and in some national contexts more than others. The small body of research on student engagement with gender in history does suggest, however, that teachers and students are far more capable of “ambitious teaching and learning” than some previous studies might suggest (Grant, 2003, p.187).

Children and Adolescents’ Conceptions of the Significance of Gender in History

While some researchers use quota sampling to ensure that data include males and females, the resulting aggregate portraits rarely shed much light on gender differences, either within or between groups, or on how students think about gender in history (Barton, in press). Amy Aidman’s (2001) investigation of media influences on a group of urban Native American and European American girls’ reading of Disney’s Pocahontas serves as one of the few studies to consider within group (female early adolescents) and between group (Native American and European American) differences. Although Aidman focuses primarily on identity construction rather than on historical conceptions or misconceptions, she provides an interesting glimpse into how a group of nine- to thirteen-year-old urban girls used media representations of Pocahontas to think about the intersection of gender and race/ethnicity. European American girls in the study worried about the historical inaccuracies in the Disney animated movie, Pocahontas, especially as younger children might accept the movie’s “happy ending” rather than the historical facts related to Pocahontas’ marriage to John Rolfe and her death in England. Some also worried about Pocahontas being “fake...the decorative frosting on a cake” and “a suicidal maniac” given her leap off a cliff (pp.144–145). They also concluded that Disney merely reversed historical stereotypes rather than eliminating them. In contrast, the Native American girls admired Pocahontas’ “wisdom, heroic nature, and adventurous spirit...” (p.148), and saw the movie as a positive portrayal of Native Americans. Although they noted the inversion of the old savage stereotype, they did not comment on the accuracy of the historical information presented. Aidman argues that some of the differences can be explained as reading against a traditional historical narrative or against a larger history of negative media representations of Native Americans. From the Native American girls’ perspective, the historical Pocahontas was considerably less significant than the availability of a positive (attractive, adventurous) representation of a Native American woman.

Other studies also describe American students’ tendency to ascribe significance to historical events related to personal affiliations (Levstik & Barton, 1996, Levstik, 2000). Levstik (2000), for instance, analyzes students’ shifting pronoun use: “we” and “our” in talking about “how we started our nation,” “we” [European Americans] and “them” [Native Americans] when discussion shifted to contact between Europeans and Native Americans, and, when gender was raised as an issue, to first-person pronoun use by gender (p.289). In the case of women’s suffrage, girls identified with women in the early twentieth century, explaining that “we [females] came along...and got the vote,” Boys, on the other hand, identified with men from the period, arguing that “we [males] already had the vote” (p.289). Because students also identify people, ideas, and events that explain “who we are” as historically significant, these distinctly gendered pronouns take on particular importance (p.294). If students perceive an aspect of national history as someone else’s they may well exercise contemporary denial with the result that “someone may have told us [about women’s history], but we don’t remember” (Levstik, 2000, p.246). Or, perhaps, students may respond as did the boys in Orenstein’s (1994) study, describing history as a male enterprise, and treating the introduction of women’s history with active hostility.

Studies in other countries suggest that this level of identification with groups and individuals in the past is not a universal phenomenon. In a study paralleling work in the U.S., Levstik (2001b) found that New Zealand students used pronouns more flexibly, switching from a present day “we” in discussions of current antinuclear policy—“we can do whatever we want in our backyard”—to more generic “New Zealand” or “they” in relation to people in the past (Levstik, 2001b). This pattern persisted even when the conversation focused on gender, as when a girl explained that men’s historical power meant that there was “discrimination against womankind” (p.81)—not against “us.” In addition, both boys and girls consistently identified women’s history as significant. One student, Stefan, argued that the women’s suffrage was historically significant because:

New Zealand was the first country to give women the vote, and that’s important because all people should be treated equally, and New Zealand’s the first country to kind of figure that out. They kind of break away from the tradition that women were weaker and should be allowed to do stuff ... (p.80).

In addition, the New Zealand students’ discussion of gender expanded beyond suffrage. From these students’ perspective, fairness and an ability to “help the country” established historical significance. Studying the history of women as well as men fell into both categories. It was, students said, “only fair” that women who represent more than half the population be part of New Zealand’s history. Boys and girls both argued that women were “just as important” as men, could do the same kind of work, and possessed skills necessary to the country. As one of the boys pointed out, historically the country relied on the labour of men and women, especially in times of war and economic depression. Boys as well as girls in the New Zealand study also argued that gender inequities continued—women did not have the same representation in Parliament as men, nor did they run as many businesses as men. They agreed, too, that studying women in different roles provided important “role models for other women”—evidence that women could “do the same jobs, and then other women learn that they can do that, too” (p.81).

Further, students described women’s suffrage not only as a women’s issue, but as something that affected both women and men. As Maori and Pacific Islander students, for instance, discussed how long it took for women to get the vote, one girl lifted up
suggests that this approach to history eludes children, adolescents, and a good number to think about historical narratives as negotiable. The research reviewed to this point presents in the way we tend to see the world” (p. 244) while encouraging students men and women are thrown into a world, but only by having been thrown into History construct pasts and upon which we create futures” (p. 66). Using the argument that should study . . .the legacy of the past in our present. For it is from a present that we In describing the purpose of studying history, Avner Segall (1999) argues that “we have to learn to adapt to and to live with and to adjust to and to respect” (p.242). Perhaps, one student argued, “differences are something that a culture could miss something important.

Similarly, students in Ghana (Levstik & Groth, 2005) paralleled New Zealand students’ language use, describing groups and individuals in the past as “the people,” “forefathers,” or “those who sacrificed for us,” but not identifying people in the past as “us” or “we.” The Ghanaian students also attributed significance to women (and men) who sacrificed for the people—Yaa Asantewaa, for instance, a woman who led the Asante army against the British, was captured and died in exile. On the other hand, they emphasised male leadership, explaining, in the words of one student, the role of “good men that passed through history the right way and are now big men, so that we follow their steps and become good people” (p.574). Students in Northern Ireland (Barton, 2001a, 2001b), also described the activity of “people in the past,” rather than identifying themselves as an extension of historic figures, male or female. In these studies, women’s history became a point of discussion in relation to suffrage (U.S. and New Zealand) or a specific woman in a non-traditional role (Yaa Asantewaa in Ghana). Although the historical images used in the studies included women in a number of roles (early settlement, use of technologies, inventions, political activity, and the like) students never commented on women’s presence in these images or described the images as gendered in any way. They only commented on gender when an image or caption specifically directed attention to women. And, even in the context of women’s suffrage, neither students in the U.S. nor in New Zealand commented on the racial or ethnic composition of the women pictured or the racially charged aspects of suffrage or women’s rights. American students did assume that the opposite gender would either select or reject women’s suffrage as historically significant purely on the basis of gender: boys would reject it; girls include it (Levstik, 1999). This turned out to be an inaccurate perception as almost as many girls as boys decided that women’s suffrage was less significant than other possible choices. No students in New Zealand or Ghana offered a similar prediction and all interview groups in both countries included women’s history (suffrage and Yaa Asantewaa) on their timelines of significant events.

In describing the purpose of studying history, Avner Segall (1999) argues that “we should study . . .the legacy of the past in our present. For it is from a present that we construct pasts and upon which we create futures” (p. 366). Using the argument that men and women are thrown into a world, but only by having been thrown into History do they have a world, Segall calls for a history that makes clear “how the past remains present in the way we tend to see the world” (p. 244) while encouraging students to think about historical narratives as negotiable. The research reviewed to this point suggests that this approach to history eludes children, adolescents, and a good number of their teachers. In particular, reviews of classroom practice suggest that few children encounter the kind of historical study that might help them better understand the interaction of gender and history. As a result, we have almost no studies of children’s and adolescents’ sense-making in this regard. We have suggestions about what might be done (Crocco, 2003, 2001, 1997a, 1997b; Woyshner, 2002; Levstik, 2001; Noddings, 1992), but only a few studies of what happens when students do engage gender in historical study.

Levstik & Groth’s (2005) eighth-grade study is unusual in focusing on a classroom experience most closely matching Lerner’s (1979) fifth phase of gender equitable history: a female-oriented consciousness in history with women’s experiences as the interpretive framework for the students’ study (Lerner, 1979; Woyshner, 2002). Student inquiry included women’s experiences in western settlement, industrialization and reform movements and included social, cultural, and political history. Primary and secondary sources documented a range of women’s and men’s perspectives across socioeconomic, racial, and cultural lines and sources were chosen specifically to offer contrasting perspectives on issues and events between and within these intersecting groups. Students also had sufficient time to develop historical questions, evaluate sources, and build evidence-based interpretations. Finally, they shared their work with public audiences through an exhibit that remained on display at the local university for over a month and was reviewed in the local newspaper. As a result, data collection took place in a setting reasonably well aligned with historical scholarship and pedagogical theories on the interaction of gender and history.

Using women’s experiences as the interpretive framework for national history offered challenges as well as opportunities for considering how gendered history might influence students’ historical thinking. Although students in the study identified women’s experiences as historically significant and recognized that women had been left out of previous historical study, they worried about “reverse sexism”—studying women at the expense of men. Despite the presence of men’s voices in the primary and secondary sources they used, students perceived the shift in emphasis as silencing men. Real historians, one student claimed, would “have gone from the male perspective” (p. 245). Others claimed that a gendered focus “shouldn’t go too far either way” (p.245). Limiting history to the experiences of one gender rather than both meant, they argued, that they could miss something important.

Students wondered, too, if a pattern of “disrespect for women” marked other countries (p.241). Perhaps, one student argued, “differences are something that a culture has to learn to adapt to and to live with and to adjust to and to respect” (p.242). Overall, students wanted to know more about women in other cultures because, as another explained, “you can step back and see a big picture” (p.246). This emphasis on perspective—including a multiplicity of women’s perspectives—marked much of students’ responses to their study. Nonetheless, within-group perspectives proved a
slippery concept, coexisting with a tendency to essentialise men and women: all women “were treated like slaves,” for instance, or all men treated women badly (p. 243). On the other hand, students also cautioned each other against these generalizations, proffering evidence to support their claims to differentiated experiences and opinions. They developed historical questions investigating if “there were places where reform wasn’t even discussed,” or if “women inside the reform movement . . . wanted the same rights,” and “what percent of women were involved in reform?” (p.243). As they investigated these questions, too, the “legacy of the past in our present” (Segall, 1999, p. 366) generated conversation regarding gender identification, feminism, sexual orientation, and the negotiations that marked students’ own experiences with gender.

In contrast with the young women in ten Dam & Rijkscharaoeff’s (1996) study, the eighth graders in Levstik & Groth’s study tended to describe women’s historical experiences as less victimization (although many “had all these responsibilities” and were “trained . . . to be submissive”) and more historical agency (“the strength and backbone” of antebellum America, who were “out in the open and did stuff”), varying by race and class, religion and region (Levstik & Groth, 2002, pp.240–247). It would be interesting to know if the student recipients of the “ambitious teaching” described in Grant’s (2003) study responded similarly to teacher Linda Strait’s emphasis on varying historical perspectives. Unfortunately, gender is so rarely the historical content in studies of historical thinking that we do not know how students at different ages, in different settings, or from different socioeconomic and cultural backgrounds might respond to a differently gendered history.

Conclusion

The obvious outcome of a discussion of children’s and adolescents’ understanding of gender relations in the past and of gendered historical narratives is to conclude that we know very little about either. We certainly need a more substantial research base. It would be useful to know more, for instance, about the kinds of contexts that support students’ sense-making about gender relationships in history. What differences, if any, do particular pedagogical approaches (inquiry, story-telling, simulations, mixed methods) make to students’ understanding in this area? What impact might drawing more heavily on contemporary scholarship in developing curriculum have? What concepts most challenge students? Under what circumstances do students develop an appreciation for within-group differences? And, how do race, class, ethnicity, and sexual orientation intersect with gender in learning history?

We would benefit, too, from studies of teacher development in this area. What pedagogical content knowledge might support Grant’s (2003) conception of ambitious teaching and learning? What “meta-narratives” as well as institutional constraints challenge teachers’ willingness and ability to enact a more gender equitable curriculum? (Crocco, 2003, 1997b).

On the other hand, we also need a stronger theoretical base. Not surprisingly, given the dearth of attention to gender in both history education and social studies, scholarship tends to focus on getting women into the curriculum rather than on theorizing a transformed curriculum (Crocco, 2007; Woyshner, 2002). In this regard, social studies’ theoretical emphasis on a pluralist perspective, grounded in a democratic learning community aimed at developing individual and communal agency is particularly useful—but limited (NCSS, 1994). Theorizing a transformed history curriculum might incorporate social studies’ theoretical framework, but it would also include attention to gender as one of an array of analytical lenses brought to bear in the study of history (Banks, 1995; Levstik, 2001; Shuster and Van Dyne, 1998). In such a curriculum students would have an opportunity to think about the past in ways that do not connote the significance of one gender over another, but consider the social construction of gender and the complex interaction of gender and history. Current scholarship in history suggests a number of interesting entry points for our own thinking about a more gender equitable curriculum, but historical scholarship is not enough. Educators need to understand how different points of entry and organizing questions employed in different classroom settings transform history teaching and learning. Do some phases of the past, for instance, direct students’ attention to gender interactions in history better than others? What kinds of questions support more careful historical sense-making in regard to those interactions? These and a myriad of other concerns await the serious attention of all of us searching for a historically sound approach to gendered history.
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Footnotes
1 The 2006 NAEP U.S. History scores indicate a slight increase in the performance gap between male and female students in eighth and twelfth grade, and boys outperformed girls in fourth and eighth grade on items in the “World Role” category.
2 Categorical identifications for different racial and ethnic groups vary in the literature that informs this paper. I have used terminology reflective of the studies being referenced. First nations people, for instance, are variously referred to as Native American, Indian, and American Indian. While this inserts some confusion into the text, I think it better reflects the perspectives of different authors (though not necessarily of the people being so identified).
3 For discussions of research on historical thinking and implications for teaching and learning, see Ashby, 2005; Barton, in press, Barton & Levstik, 2004; Brophy & VanSledright, 1997; Carretero & Voss, 1994; Cooper, 1995; Downey & Levstik, 1991; Levstik & Barton, 2005; Wineburg, 2001; Wineburg, Stearns, & Seixas, 2000. For technology and history see, for instance, Saye & Brush, 2002, and for work on the impact of assessment, see Grant, 2003.
2. An international literature on women’s lives also marks increasing interest in the intersections of gender and culture. Some notable examples include Rajaa Alsanea’s Girls of Riyadh (2005), Arundhati Roy’s The God of Small Things (1998), Jhumpa Lahiri’s The Namesake (2004), and Lisa See’s Snow Flower and the Secret Fan (2006) among many others.

3. I recognize that the term Native American is problematic on several levels. It is used here because that is the designation used by Aidman. Rather than create confusion for readers, I retain that designation for the remainder of the manuscript.
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Crossing Voices: History seen by Portuguese teachers
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Abstract—This paper discusses findings of two different studies, made within a five years interval, of Portuguese history teachers’ conceptions. Some similarities emerged: to the teachers in the first study, History is a science, open to renewal and based on evidence confrontation (new sources) and is mainly concerned with their students’ skills in the classroom. In the second study, different conceptions of historical accounts appeared: several teachers appealed to consensus, to truth in a logic of absolute neutrality; others think that is necessary to support divergence to achieve cohesion. Some teachers accept as legitimate and natural the existence of different perspectives in History, but impartiality is desirable as an ideal, in a perspective of absolute neutrality. However, looking into students’ historical competence, the hypothesis presented in this quantitative study - that history teachers had not adhered to work proposals with a traditional perspective because they considered them educationally undesirable—is confirmed. The second study was made under the aegis of the HiCon Project I and this paper aims to consider the results of these two Portuguese studies on history teachers’ conceptions.
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Introduction

Historical education seems to share the conception that learning History is an experience/process involving historical inquiry in a continuum. Historical literacy is developed taking into account the personal experiences of daily life that are confronted systematically with problematic historical situations that need solving in more complex ways. From this perspective historical education is thought as one of the motors that develop historical consciousness of people and societies. Different studies worldwide suggest the existence of different profiles of thought among students as well as history teachers.

The development of the complex process of historical competence must be supervised by reflexive History teachers, aware of their beliefs, values, and attitudes—taking seriously their responsibility as educators. Teacher education needs to promote articulate reflection on epistemological conceptions and the development of historical experience in classrooms so as to increase the teacher’s professionalism in applying the transformative logic of education as growth. Teachers’ education needs to change the focus from a purely pedagogical practice to the wider complexity of teaching as practice. Offering to teachers in training a wide range of learning opportunities as well as familiarizing them with different ways to reflect about their practice will promote the development of their own cultural and educational pedagogic practice that they will implement at classroom level. Zeichner (2005) pointed out that teacher education must “help them to learn about experience and help them to learn by experience.”

The perspective in this paper is that different levels of reflection are connected to a realistic approach to teacher education. Here both the theoretical dimension and how this can be articulated are emphasised and reconstructed in the pedagogic process by teachers or/and students. Teacher educators must help teachers and future teachers to think about their transpersonal concerns as well as accompanying and orientating them towards different stages of reflection. Educational research findings suggest that if our goal is to develop intellectual literacy then the teaching-learning process must be articulated within the specific theoretical framework chosen. Therefore historical literacy must be interfaced with meta-historical conceptions.

The Studies

Research questions

The first study was designed to contribute to our understanding of some aspects of the way (or ways) in which History teachers connect themselves with their subject, either practically or theoretically, how they conceive the subject and what intellectual challenges it brings.

The second study, made five years later, is globally focused on the different conceptual profiles history teachers present in using historical narrative as one of the facets of historical consciousness. In this study, some of the findings related to the articulation between the epistemological conceptions of History, historical accounts and teachers concerns about students’ historical competence are outlined.

Research methodology

For the first study, a pilot inquiry was used as the method to assemble the necessary data. The questionnaire was specially designed for this research following a series of semi-structured exploratory interviews with History teachers. The interviews were mainly about different conceptions of History and any perceived difference between History as a by-product of the academic discipline and the History that is taught. These interviews were also used to establish the importance that the interviewed teachers gave to aspects like chronology and narrative in the teaching of history, as well as the need or interest they felt for reflection on the nature of historical knowledge. The aim of these interviews was to find conceptions that could be explored in the future. From the results/analysis of the interviews a questionnaire was created and mailed to all teachers belonging to the target-group.

The questionnaire was divided in four parts—

1) personal and professional data
2) History
3) History teaching
4) a specific classroom situation.

Using the first part of the questionnaire we hoped to construct professional profiles from data such as professional back-ground, career situation, political positioning and also age and gender.
In the second part of the questionnaire, sixteen statements [quotations] about History were chosen by the subjects. These quotations were from authors belonging to different historical schools of thought, such as Ranke’s classical positivism, the Annales school and Popper’s anti-positivist scepticism. The third part of the questionnaire presented thirty statements about History teaching which aimed to reflect issues and problems of history education. The fourth part presented sources and materials for teaching the theme of the Renaissance and some statements on how the teachers would teach the topic in the classroom (15) including what could be demanded of the students (17). 96 teachers answered the questionnaire (33.1% of the target population). The questionnaire data was subjected to appropriate statistical analysis.

The second study, a qualitative one, was designed based on Grounded Theory: as such it involved a constant process of analysing data. The sample was drawn from History teachers from the North and South of Portugal, with different lengths and experiences of teaching—(between 3 and 10 years; more than 10 years of experience), teaching in elementary and secondary private and public schools, prospective history teachers from two different universities (Minho University and Évora University) who were graduation students: a total of 48 participants (proportionally subdivided). A sample of British history teachers was also interviewed: these findings will be discussed elsewhere. The data collection technique used was a semi-structured interview and audio-video taping of interviews in 2003 and 2004.

First two different accounts were presented inspired by Lee (1996, 2002) and Gago (2005). The questions were designed to provide data about the conceptions of historical accounts and the orientation of students’ historical understanding:

We have here two different accounts about the past. Do you think this kind of exercise benefits students’ historical understanding?

In History we want to know what happened in the past, but historians can provide different versions of the same event. How can the use of different versions of the past help pupils to understand the present and the future?

Then the interviewer presented three written answers pupils aged 10 to 14 produced when asked to explain why there are two different accounts of the same episode of history:

a) Historians can have different perspectives of the same past. Each historian investigates the sources available and tries to answer different questions. All the historians give an explanation, but they use different criteria in explaining the past.

b) Historians provide different accounts because they must have seen different sources. Some historians rely on more sources than others and have more or less details, because they know more or less. But only one of these accounts is true, as there is only one past, and historians have to tell the truth.

c) Historians may have different opinions about the same episode of history. They have their own ideas, therefore when they analyse the sources they look at them in a particular way, according to what they already know and their national and personal identity. They have to be honest and historians should together decide which historical account is the correct one.

The teachers were asked to rank the pupils’ answers with reference to the quality of their historical ideas and explain their rank order.

Findings
Quantitative study
The teachers who answered the questionnaire were mainly women (65.6%) History graduates (52.1%) and had been probationary teachers as the final part of their degrees (54.2%). They were mostly graduates of the University of Évora (50%). From a professional point of view, 46.9% were on the teaching staff of their schools. Many of them concluded their studies in the 1980’s (40.6%) and started to teach in the same decade (44.8%). They were mainly between 34 and 43 years old (58.5%). Politically they stood mostly between the left and the centre, the majority being centre-left (72.7%).

From the analysis of the second part of the questionnaire that dealt with notions of History, some of the quotations were clearly rejected and others were fully accepted. To study the association between the quotation responses and the questionnaire data principal components analysis was used. This analysis showed a simple factorial structure, constituting six factors, corresponding to six different conceptions:

1. History as a positivistic science; factor
2. History as a non-science; factor
3. History as relative knowledge; factor
4. History as comprehensive science; factor
5. History as a social science; factor
6. History as a temporal science.

The results showed a clear rejection of two notions: history as relative knowledge (average acceptance 25%) and history as a non-science (average acceptance 20.7%). The positivist conception of History was also rejected, although to a lesser extent (average acceptance 37.4%). The idea of History as a temporal science had the highest average acceptance (79.6%). Considering the teachers’ personal and professional backgrounds it was possible to make the following conclusions, concerning each of the six factors.

The acceptance of History as positivistic science seemed to be influenced by the political ideas of teachers; those who stood on the left did not comply with this notion, the ones who positioned themselves on the centre-right accepted it. The teachers who had concluded their probation before 1974 were likely to accept this notion, but there was no statistically meaningful difference. The same happened with the academic
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Here too, statistical analysis showed three groups of activities; furthermore, their
meaning was identical with those connected with teachers’ teaching preferences. A first
group preferred students' autonomous activities, like organizing debates or defending
opinions; a second group chose activities to be completed under the teacher's guidance,
but with students' engaged upon active work, like explaining documents or interpreting
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that consider familiarity with the tasks and previous experience to be important
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**Qualitative study**

Different ideas emerged from the answers of the participants to provide some profiles of
understanding History, historical accounts and students’ historical knowledge developed
in History classes. Some of the participants present a hostile attitude towards the use
of different historical accounts in History teaching as underestimating the conceptual
differences between the accounts presented. Their major concern is to “give” to
students all of the historical content in the History National Curriculum. These History
teachers and future History teachers defend ideas of the necessity of a consensual
narrative in a positivistic perspective of historical knowledge. Historical accounts must be
tallied with reality, the truth in a perspective of absolute neutrality. Students' historical
understanding is seen in a very homogeneous pattern. As Dalia with more than 0 years
as History teacher of a school on North Portugal commented,
When narratives are very similar we don’t have the need to explore them. It is a question of managing time and teaching the entire national curriculum.

Consensus is a difficult issue because each head has its own maxim, but we just have one truth.

The more reliable narrative is the one more close to reality. We have to look for the narrative that seems to be more consistant.

Other history teachers and future history teachers think that the use of different accounts is a difficult exercise for pupils in elementary school. Only students at the secondary levels have the skills to deal with so much information and to understand the difference of information by comparison. For these participants the relevance of this kind of exercise is focused on the historical content, the debate of divergence.

The variance of historical accounts is justified by the opinions of historians but consensus is desirable in the demand of the historical truth. This concern of historical truth appears connected to a pragmatic pedagogical perspective—simplify students’ learning. Students’ historical understanding is thought as heterogeneous justified by age. As Deolinda with more than 19 years as History teacher in a school in South Portugal stated,

If narratives are identical maybe they are not useful to the classroom. We need an accessible narrative. Two narratives only complicate matters with students of 5th and 7th year school [10 years, 12 years, respectively]. Perhaps it is best to do this kind of exercise with secondary students [15-17 years]. These two narratives allow students to understand the importance of Portugal in the European context and the relations between Portugal and England.

Historians have different perspectives but they could try to find some consensus.

Dalila, a prospective teacher of Évora University, reinforced this idea of consensus:

Consensus is impossible, each historian analyses the reality according to his point of view, although the existence of consensus would be something positive.

Several of the participants of this study think that the use of different historical accounts is desirable to develop critical thinking, question the received narrative, require cross referencing and promote the discussion of different points of view. The variation between historical accounts is justified by the author's point of view. Historical narrative is naturally a face with multiple perspectives. Students’ historical understanding is thought to be heterogeneous justified by age and the years students have spent in school. As Dario, a 4th year student in the teaching of History from Minho University suggested:

Narratives from different authors are beneficial because students can understand that there can be different opinions concerning the same topic, and that this is valid. I think that it is interesting for students to acknowledge and compare the differences in order to reflect about the impact those differences can have in our days.

Sharing some ideas of Dario, Diana with 12 years as History teacher of a school on South Portugal pointed out:

I give students the narratives with a group of questions. Then I promote a debate about the conclusions, as you repeat this strategy the discussion increases teaching quality. I think the most important thing is to focus on time and place, the historical production context, who wrote, what are their nationalities. The pupils point out that the best narrative is the one they easier understand. The youngest maybe understand the narrative as true.

Conclusions
Data for these studies were collected within a five year period and from different parts of Portugal. However, teachers with different orientations and pedagogic practices from both cohorts seem to share similar conceptions of History, reflected in their teaching practices.

The existence of multiple historical accounts is accepted as a product of diverse contexts that shape and influence their production. These factors must be analysed and discussed with students. However, this discussion is strongly based on positivist views of historical understanding. History teachers and future History teachers pointed to the need to look for the truth, the neutral impartiality and consensus.

This conceptual image is in convergence with other research findings on Portuguese pupils’ historical ideas about provisional historical explanation (Barca, 2005) and the variance in historical narrative (Gago, 2005). The majority of History teacher participants recognise different students’ profiles of historical thought justified by age and/or by school year. This can eventually explain the coexistence of more traditional and mechanical students’ activities (like taking notes or copying schemes from the blackboard to their note-books) and more dynamic tasks (like working with sources or organizing information). It seems that tasks leading to problem-solving to develop a “big picture” of the past are still at an early stage of teachers’ educational concerns.

So, there is an urgent need to debate and to implement the questions related to the epistemology of social knowledge. The promotion of teacher reflection must be seen as a bridge between History teachers and the educators of History teachers, i.e. between school and university to achieve continuous professional growth in a transformative manner. This dimension must be articulated within graduate teacher education as well as in lifelong learning [professional development] so as to discuss in the process curricular questions, theoretical conceptions and their educational implementation.
The prevalence of profiles of thought clued to ideas of impartiality, neutrality and the desire of consensus could be related to the Annales School's conceptions which until the 1990s had a strong influence on different Portuguese Universities history departments and the Portuguese History National Curriculum. This cultural and curricular context significantly affected the historical understanding of Portuguese History teachers as shown in the quantitative study of Magalhães, where the participant History teachers see History as a science grounded in ‘translation’ with rigour of sources and also in Gago’s qualitative study, where teachers stressed the importance of absolute neutrality in History.
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Constrastnig Identity through the Visual Image Memory, Identity, Belonging: History, Culture & Interpretive Frameworks

Jon Nichol, University of Plymouth, England

Abstract—This is a visual paper in which the readers have to create their own interpretations of the story, narrative[s], that the images present. As such the paper is genuinely constructivist; drawing upon the genre theory of Kress, Martin & Halliday, the findings of Roland Barthes in creating understanding and the interpretive paradigm of visual images that Gombrich presents (Barthes; Cope & Kalantzis; Gombrich; Martin, Halliday). Constructivism relates to ideas of functional literacy in which the positioning of the author, the authorial conception of the audience, the form/defining features of the mode of communication, the substantive content and the cultural ambience are crucial. And, of course, in a semiotic context, the role of signs and symbols. As such, the paper relates to over-arching ideas in History and Citizenship Education such as narratives, master narratives, sub-narratives, culture, folk memory, media, identity, myths, tradition, values and beliefs and nationalism.

Keywords—Belief, Ceremony, Iconic, Identity, Myth, Narrative, Story, Symbols, Values.

The origins of the paper were grounded in the events surrounding the tenth anniversary of the death of a major international figure. In presenting the images, all drawn from the Internet, to the international audience of the Istanbul conference of the History Educators International Research Network conference, the audience received the following guidance.

In pairs, discuss what you think and feel about the picture[s] in terms of—

ceremony
identity
beliefs
values
ritual
symbolism
the media.

What story do they tell?
We tried to ensure that pairs consisted of colleagues from different countries and cultures—

The ensuing lively discussion revealed a range of deep-seated values and assumptions, grounded in the individual’s orientation within their own complex and sophisticated cultural values, beliefs and attitudes, grounded in the story that they were able to construct from the images related to existing knowledge.
References
A decade later, the memory of her remains, but how much else has changed? After the death of Diana, Princess of Wales, in 1997, Princes William and Harry (then aged 15 and 12, respectively) marched through central London, their little heads bowed, toward their mother’s funeral. Today, with the sun shining bright on the day of a memorial service marking the 10th anniversary of her death, things couldn’t have felt more different.

Gail Weldon, Cape Town education department, South Africa

Abstract—The role and function of History Education is most vividly represented in societies in transition from a discredited and discarded political system to a new one. Such societies experience a period of curricular creation in which basic ideas and assumptions are reviewed, tested and as appropriate discarded or incorporated in a new educational framework that intends to educate for citizenship in the new polity. Nowhere is this process more vividly revealed than in post Apartheid South Africa. The period of transition saw the continuation of the previously Apartheid created and controlled curriculum. The attempt to create a new curriculum was grounded in an alliance between pressure groups and interests which felt that History Education had no role in the new South Africa. Dominant were the apartheid era bureaucrats who were happy to support a curriculum built around forgetting and not memory, the interest groups concerned with economic growth and development and politicians whose interests coincided in marginalising memories of the past that could be divisive and counter productive.

The abandonment of any commitment to a new ‘master narrative’ which all South Africans could share within the national curriculum saw forgetting triumph over memory. The outcome was a process of curriculum development that divided the curriculum into eight discrete areas with a set of Outcomes Based Educational [OBE] goals. This curriculum, Curriculum 2005, totally marginalised History as an element in the curriculum. Curriculum 2005 began to be implemented in 1998; the result proved to be almost totally unsatisfactory and led to a new ministerial initiative to replace the new curriculum with one organised more along traditional subject lines. Here a minister with strong support for History’s educational role played a major part, with memory being prioritised, but that is the subject of a subsequent paper.

Keywords—Apartheid, Curriculum development, Curriculum 2005, History Education, Identity, Master Narrative, Memory, Political influence and control, South Africa, Truth and Reconciliation committee.

Introduction

Retaining the apartheid history syllabus with minimal revision after the 1994 election, meant that round one of the ‘politics of memory’ had gone to the apartheid bureaucrats who were still in post and who de facto controlled the emergence of the new history curriculum. Although the history of apartheid and resistance was included in the interim syllabus, because of the lack of teaching material it inevitably meant it would be some time before this could be reflected in the classroom, particularly in former black schools who did not have the money to purchase textbooks that were not on the officially approved lists. However, there was still hope that a more thorough revision of the curriculum would include a revision of history teaching and texts used in schools. In a system of education with an overt political/citizenship education agenda which history education contributed to, this would be the rational action. 1996 did indeed bring a thorough revision of curriculum, but once again, the sensitive issue of history education was avoided, to the extent that the new curriculum turned out to be a denial of memory. At the most basic level, the memory choice for a country’s ruling elite in a society emerging from mass violence is between remembering and forgetting, i.e collective amnesia. This becomes more complicated when the new society is one in which ‘victims’ and ‘perpetrators’, however defined and identified, have to continue to live and work together, interacting daily in a functioning/functional society. Psychologists studying trauma resulting from mass violence point out that the traumatic memories of the past are seldom not forgotten. Research also suggests that unresolved trauma, in the form of memories, will be consciously and unconsciously transmitted from generation to generation—’transgenerational transmission of trauma’—with the potential for causing and inflaming future conflicts. Volkan calls this ‘chosen trauma’—the mental and physical representation of an event that has caused a large group to face drastic losses, feel helpless and victimized by another group and share a humiliating injury—as the key to understanding transgenerational trauma. Unless the victim group is able to enter a process of mourning, the cycle will not be broken. For Volkan, the TRC process in South Africa opened the way to entering the mourning process for the victims of apartheid.

Reconciliation: Memory or Forgetting?

Psychologists and political scientists researching trauma, agree that reconciliation between victims and perpetrators is a crucial element of the ability to move forward after internecine violence. A comparative study on transition from authoritarian rule emphasised that—

It is difficult to imagine how a society can return to some degree of functioning which would provide social and ideological support for political democracy without somehow coming to terms with the most painful elements of its own past. By refusing to confront and to purge itself of its worst fears and resentments, such a society would be burying not just its past but the very ethical values it needs to make its future liveable.

But what, as Mahmood Mamdani has asked, ‘if the truth should turn out to be morally unacceptable?’ Can there be reconciliation without justice? This also raises questions about an appropriate history curriculum in a post-conflict society. What would constitute too much remembering or too much forgetting? Should it include the morally unacceptable? And who has the right to decide these issues?

In South Africa, the country’s post apartheid ruling elite through the mechanism of the state chose memory over forgetting—of attempting to confront the truth that might turn out
to be ‘morally unacceptable’ to the country’s ‘victims’. The interim Constitution of 1993 and the Constitution of 1996 were the bases on which the new order was to be built. The postscript of the 1993 Constitution made a statement of transition from the violence and division of the apartheid past, bringing to a better, democratic future. It read—

This Constitution provides a historic bridge between the past of a deeply divided society characterised by strife, conflict, untold suffering and injustice, and a future founded on the recognition of human rights, democracy and peaceful co-existence... The pursuit of national unity, the well-being of all South African citizens and peace require reconciliation between the people of South Africa and the reconstruction of society... The adoption of this Constitution lays the secure foundation for the people of South Africa to transcend the divisions and strife of the past, which generated gross violations of human rights, the transgression of humanitarian principles in violent conflicts and a legacy of hatred, fear, guilt and revenge.

The Truth and Reconciliation Committee
The interim Constitution laid the foundation for the establishment of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) which was formed on 5 December 1995 under the leadership of Archbishop Desmond Tutu. On 27 May 1994 Dullah Omar, Minister of Justice, announced to Parliament that a commission of truth and reconciliation would be set up to enable South Africa to come to terms with its past. He emphasised that reconciliation was not just about indemnity through amnesty and forgetting the past:

We cannot forgive on behalf of the victims, nor do we have the moral right to do so. It is the victims themselves who must speak. Their voices need to be heard. The fundamental issue for all South Africans is therefore to come to terms with our past on the only moral basis possible, namely that the truth be told and that truth be acknowledged.

This was deliberately through the medium of a public space in which the stories of victims and confessions of perpetrators were to be told. It was not to be an Afrikaner witch hunt or a ploy to ‘haul violators of human rights before court to face charges’, rather a ‘necessary exercise to enable South Africans to come to terms with their past on a morally acceptable basis and to advance the cause of reconciliation’. The underlying concepts were that of reconciliation and restorative justice (in contrast to vengeance and retributive justice).

The hearings began on 16 April 1996 and for the next two years all South Africans were confronted with their violent past. Throughout apartheid there had been organisations such as Black Sash and the Institute of Race Relations that had tracked the deaths in detention and had made every effort under draconian media laws to bring apartheid brutality into the public eye. For those who had chosen to ‘know’, who had a Nelsonic eye, what was happening during the dark days of apartheid, the revelations of the TRC were not a complete surprise, though the extent of the brutality was far wider and deeper than expected. Witnessing the pain and trauma of the victims were key elements in the psychological reorientation of the perpetrators, indeed it tore at one's soul:

Week after week; voice after voice; account after account ... It is not so much the deaths, and the names of the dead, but the web of infinite sorrow woven around them. It keeps on coming and coming.

There were those white South Africans who remained defiantly unmoved about accepting joint responsibility for the past, i.e the recognition that they as an ethnic, social and culturally homogenous group were collectively agents of repression. But for many, and in particular for Afrikaners, there was the trauma and guilt of those ‘recognising evil in oneself’ through the support given to an evil regime. The Afrikaner poet and writer, Antjie Krog, has captured the impact the TRC revelations had upon them:

Wordless, lost. While Afrikaner surnames like Barnard, Nieuwoudt, van Zyl, van Wyk peel off victims’ lips...
And hundreds of Afrikaners are walking down this road—on their own with their own fears and shame and guilt. And some say it, most just live it. We are so utterly sorry. We are deeply ashamed and gripped with remorse. But hear us, we are from here. We will live it right—here—with you, for you.

The TRC process has been criticised as well as praised. It was a product of the negotiated political settlement. On the one hand, the representatives of the still ruling apartheid regime, the ‘perpetrators’ wanted a blanket amnesty; on the other, there were many among the ‘victims’ who wanted closure through a Nuremberg-style prosecution of perpetrators. The fragile political situation just before the 1994 elections needed the support of the apartheid security forces to ensure a peaceful transition. This was gained through the amnesty provisions of the TRC - amnesty in return for full disclosure of the truth about politically motivated human rights violations during apartheid. Without the amnesty provisions, there would also have been no incentive for perpetrators to reveal the policies, practices and specific crimes committed. For all its flaws, the TRC ‘served the purpose of sufficiently coming to terms with the evils of apartheid in order for a new state to be formed and a new community [and identity] to be imagined.’ In a real sense it had a catalytic social function, enabling transition to occur in a peaceful, non violent way.

The uncensored, post apartheid media played a crucial role in ensuring widespread national acceptance. The public hearings, broadcast daily on television and radio, included testimonies of both victims and perpetrators, ensuring that South Africans could not deny their violent past, nor, in fact their past. One of the effects the revelations had on white South Africans, was that they moved from saying ‘it could not have happened’ to ‘I did not know it was happening’, which although also a form of passive denial, did acknowledge the violence committed in the service of the apartheid regime, and ipso facto, in the ‘service’ of white South Africans. The TRC’s role was to impact
upon the collective memory of South African society, and by changing that memory, to pave the way for a liberal democracy. Though the TRC looked at apartheid through the experience of a tiny minority of political activists and state security forces, of perpetrators and a few thousand victims, the testimonies can be regarded as important knowledge which constitutes a new, though limited and contained by the mandate of the TRC, archive of previously silenced South African history; the cornerstone of what might be called a democratised history-making.

Psychologists suggest that the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) was an emotionally cathartic event, opening up a window for societal mourning and becoming what could be considered to be a public memorial of conscience. These were the stories, the histories, that Roger Simon suggests ‘insist remembrance be accountable to the demand for non-indifference’, that should be in the centre of ‘ethical practice and pedagogy of remembrance’ with the ‘responsibility of memory giving countenance to those who have provided testament’. It would seem reasonable, therefore, to assume that any new political education curriculum would support memory against forgetting and include the narratives of the apartheid past. As such, History Education would play the key role in mediating the emerging master and minor narratives that underpin identity.

The Truth and Reconciliation Committee, History Education as Political Education and Curricular Change

Within this context of the TRC hearings, the political elite chose amnesia over consciously using the TRC findings as the basis for citizenship education. In its education policy the post apartheid state consciously chose forgetting. This might seem remarkable, particularly as any new curriculum was be expected to aim to inculcate the ideals and identity of a new state through the construction of a new history. By 1996 the need for a curriculum that would signal a break with the past and be seen to be contributing to the education of the citizens of a liberal democracy and the creation of a new society had become a matter of some urgency. Education had always had an overtly political role in the Apartheid era. It has been deeply encultured with Apartheid ideology. The Afrikaner elite used it for political control ‘so deeply were vast numbers of educational institutions scarred, both by policies and practices of that era’ that a curriculum was needed that would bring about the realisation of a new society and promote the ‘unity and the common citizenship and destiny of all South Africans irrespective of race, class, gender or ethnic background’.

Jansen has suggested that the mid-1990s saw a ‘race for policy frameworks’ all needing to be understood within the context of a political system founded on reconciliation, and that the period was limited to the symbolism of policy production. Several key new education policies drawing upon the values embedded in the South African Constitution and signalling a decisive break with the apartheid past were in place by mid-1996. The White Paper on Education and Training of 1995 for example, states the goal of post-apartheid education as the promotion of a democratic, free, equal, just and peaceful society with well-informed and critical citizens. The White Paper had a stormy passage through Parliament with the National Party contesting the provisions and language of the proposed policy. Its significance politically lay in that the White Paper symbolised the consolidation of political power of the ANC through the education policy process. On 16 April 1996 (the day of the first TRC hearings) the National Education Policy Act was ‘assented to’ in Parliament. The preamble states the necessity of facilitating the ‘democratic transformation of the national system of education’ to serve the needs and interests of all South Africans and uphold fundamental human rights.

Further, the policy states that education will be ‘directed toward the advancement and protection of the fundamental rights of every person guaranteed in terms of Chapter 2 of the Constitution...’ and ‘...the advancement of democracy, human rights and the peaceful resolution of disputes’ as well as the ‘...redress of past inequality in education provision...’ However, while none of these policies specifically engaged in issues of memory or identity, according to Ihron Rensburg, Deputy Director General in the Department of Education and a political appointee, these were the ‘policy options’ selected based on the best available information’ which they ‘elaborated’ into ‘change programs’.

It was becoming increasingly imperative to have a new curriculum in place before the next general election in 1999 as the government had to be seen to be delivering on its promises in education. In July 1996, a draft Curriculum Framework for General and Further Education and Training, a guiding framework for the development of a new curriculum, was published. Significantly, as a framework for developing a curriculum that was to be the antithesis of apartheid education, unlike the Constitution and other new education policy documents, it did not take the past as a point of departure. In other words, it prioritised forgetting over memory.

The main focus was on the economic present and future—on the skills needed for citizens in successful modern economies and societies—for commerce and industry—but included the need to promote the development of a national identity and an awareness of South Africa’s role and responsibility with regard to Africa and the rest of the world. National identity was not located in an understanding of our past, but in the recognition of our diverse society, multilingualism, co-operation, civic responsibility and the ability to participate in all aspects of society and an understanding of the national, provincial, local and regional development needs. The new curriculum was to be outcomes-based with integration of knowledge within eight proposed learning areas that would take the place of subjects.

Over three hundred people assembled in Johannesburg on the 16th September 1996 to begin the process of constructing the first new post-apartheid curriculum in line with the framework document. The interim syllabus process of 1995 had set a precedent for the location of curriculum development within the national Department of Education: two of the three in overall charge of the process were bureaucrats who had served the apartheid regime and the majority of those who gathered in Johannesburg were from the nine provincial education departments, the bureaucratic educational face
of Apartheid. These also included a significant proportion of administrators and bureaucrats, while the concept of them enshrining the beliefs and practices of the previous regime, perhaps the post 2003 history of Iraq serves as a terrible warning about destroying the infrastructure of a modern state. The precedent of ‘democratising’ curriculum processes had also been set with the stakeholder representation on the subject sub-committees that undertook the ‘cleansing’ of the apartheid stable’s syllabi in 1995. Eight Areas of Learning Committees (later known as the Learning Area Committees or LACs) were given the task of drafting a rationale, Learning Area Outcomes and Specific Outcomes for each of the Learning Areas. These writing groups were large and relatively unwieldy, with the Human and Social Sciences (HSS) in which History was located, being the largest with 52 members listed, 30 of whom were from the national and provincial education departments, or other government departments.

In the interests of ‘neutrality’ a national Department of Education (DoE) official was elected Chairperson of the Humanities and Social Studies Learning Area Committee and the scribe was the same national DoE official who had been the secretariat for the post Aparteid interim History syllabus process. Although the roles of the chairperson and scribe were defined, both were from the apartheid regime’s bureaucracy. As such, culturally, socially and politically they represented deep seated vested interests that would almost axiomatically, automatically exert influence over the curriculum processes. Not only did they have an apartheid oriented knowledge base that they brought to bear, they also controlled the mechanisms of curriculum development, i.e. the drafting and development of protocols, procedures and orders to implement change.

Timeframes were tight, which in turn heightened the influence and even control of the apartheid bureaucrats. The first immediate deadline after the September launch was the 21 October 1996. By the end of November 1996 it was hoped to have a discussion document on all of the outcomes for all learning areas and by the end of February it was hoped that the process of informing teachers and the public and receiving feedback would be completed. The Minister planned to announce the policy at the end of April 1997—some seven months from the beginning of the writing process. In the event, the curriculum was launched six months after the first writing week.

A highly complicated ‘transformational’ OBE (Outcomes Based Education) became policy in March 1997 when Curriculum 2005 was introduced to the people of South Africa with appropriate publicity, in itself a rite of passage to signal the change from the old to the new era—

…the introduction of OBE as curriculum policy was consummated in a dramatic public relations display in March 1997 when the Minister of Education officially launched Curriculum 2005 (read: ‘outcomes-based education’) in Cape Town with the equivalent number of balloons in the colours of the recently adopted national flag. curriculum and patriotism were firmly linked.

Linking the new curriculum and an emergent ‘rainbow nation’ South African patriotism overrode any attempt at critical, reflective and constructive engagement with Curriculum 2005 within the provincial education departments. The continuation of the modus operandi and mentality of the apartheid bureaucracy resulted in an autocratic and authoritarian approach to teachers by education officials during the provincial advocacy programs. As such, it was deeply insidious, undermining the very democratisation of South Africa by casting implementation in the mould of apartheid totalitarianism.

In popular conception, transformational OBE would transform both school knowledge and the country. Subjects were combined/integrated into the eight Learning Areas, transforming the way knowledge had previously been organised in the curriculum. The Department of Education produced a policy for transition, its ‘advocacy campaigns’. In these, the apartheid bureaucrats told teachers that they would have to make a ‘paradigm shift’ throwing out everything they had hitherto done and taking on board the new. This meant ‘radical integration’ of knowledge and skills both within and across the Learning Areas, working with 66 Specific Outcomes across the Learning Areas, all with Range Statements and Performance Indicators which were meant to bring depth and breadth to the Specific Outcomes.

Transformational OBE was content free, focusing on the outcomes (competencies) necessary for the world of work for young adults exiting the education system. It was intended that teachers would create their own content and resources. The Specific Outcomes of Curriculum 2005 were predominantly about the creation of an infrastructure based upon a revised educational system for a modern economy. In concrete terms it was about employability and the creation of a work force to meet the needs of a 21st century economy. This was a curriculum that implicitly, through simply operating in an amnesiac vacuum, aimed to leave behind all vestiges of the apartheid education system and support and build democracy and prepare young people to contribute to the economy.

The new curriculum was explicitly symbolic of the transition of a state’s break with its apartheid past. The introduction to the curriculum policy documents contained a vision of the ‘new’ South African citizens who would be able to build social cohesion. It set this ideal, ‘model’ citizen against a view of citizenship cast in the mould of apartheid racist ideology—

In the past the curriculum has perpetuated race, class, gender and ethnic divisions and has emphasised separateness, rather than common citizenship and nationhood. It is therefore imperative that the curriculum be restructured to reflect the values and principles of our new democratic society…[supporting the] following vision for South Africa: ‘A prosperous, truly united, democratic and internationally competitive country with literate, creative and critical citizens leading productive, self-fulfilled lives in a country free of violence, discrimination and prejudice’.
However, given the behaviourist principles underlying outcomes-based education which assumes a ‘unanimity of behaviour’ under the same circumstances, it is not easy to see how Curriculum 2005 would have been able to make good its aim of delivering ‘creative and critical citizens.’

**Curriculum 2005, Memory and Identity**

As a curriculum for coming to terms with the past in order to construct a new, alternative collective memory and identity for the emergent democratic South Africa, evaluation of Curriculum 2005 indicates that it comprehensively failed to achieve its goals. History had been subsumed into the Learning Area, Human and Social Sciences (HSS) and was virtually unrecognisable both as a substantive body of evidentially academic based knowledge, and as a syntactically based area of teaching and learning. The Human and Social Sciences Learning Area had three broad focus areas: Social Processes and Organisation, Environment Resources Development and Citizenship Civics. There was one brief reference to history, included in brackets, in the rationale for the focus ‘Human and Social Processes and Organisation’ in a draft document: “…this focus equips learners with knowledge of different forms of society (contemporary and historical)...’ The rationales for the focus areas did not appear in the final policy document. Apart from contributing to ‘developing responsible citizens in a culturally diverse, democratic society’ the rationale for the HSS Learning Area in the final document placed more emphasis on environmental issues. As such, the temporal dimension essential for any meaningful identity as citizens was missing.

Specific Outcome 1 was the single outcome that addressed the possibility of History Education: Demonstrate a critical understanding of how South African society has changed and developed. The related Assessment Criteria were broad with only one referring to the past: The impact of Apartheid on development is analysed.... Key concepts such as ‘processes of change’, ‘colonialism’ and ‘liberation’ are mentioned in the Range Statements, but no historical content is given beyond this. History is interspersed with sociology, development and environmental issues. By the end of the intermediate phase (Grade 6) it was claimed that—

...the learner should be familiar with major change processes in, and periods of South African history. Given the lack of specified content and a related pedagogy it is not clear how this was to be achieved.

Curriculum 2005 had its roots both in curricular models from around the world, drawing on Australian, New Zealand, Scottish, Canadian and some United States models, and in South African trade and industry debates. The origin of the move towards Outcomes-Based Education within South Africa appears to have been in the National Training Board (NTB) and the labour union, COSATU. The NTB and COSATU produced a policy document, the National Training Strategy Initiative (NTSI) which laid the basis for a future national training strategy. The aim of the Strategy was to provide for the recognition of the skills or competencies workers gained in the workplace. The debates about competencies were, thus, largely situated within the labour movement and business with little integration with educational ideas even though schools were incorporated into the framework. Once taken up into the school system, the competencies became ‘outcomes’ still with an emphasis on the world of work. Critics have pointed to the conceptual confusion of Curriculum 2005, drawing as it did on both the competency debates and the popular rhetoric of People’s Education. It has been suggested that the radical rhetoric of People’s Education provided an essential legitimacy to a curriculum that is otherwise highly technicist and conservative. Rensburg indeed claimed that the ‘development, design and implementation of the new curriculum has its theoretical and epistemological roots...not in the new and emerging state—although it is now legitimated by it—but within the anti-apartheid and national liberation struggle’.

There is an extensive body of evidence grounded in research on Curriculum 2005 in general and the extent, or otherwise, to which it achieved its goals. As this paper’s focus is on the history curriculum with its possibilities for coming to terms with the past, I will not spend much time reviewing that research. What is relevant, however, is the extent to which Curriculum 2005 could be said to have been symbolic rather than a policy that was intended to be implemented. Jansen maintains that policy making during this period demonstrates ‘the preoccupation of the state with settling policy struggles in the political domain rather than in the realm of practice’. Ichon Rensburg characterised the period between 1994 and 1999 as a period marked by ‘symbolic change statements and announcements to signal the transition to a new order while managing the fears of national minorities’. However, the symbolic nature of Curriculum 2005 does not sufficiently explain why a curriculum with such major inconsistencies incoherence and theoretical [as opposed to empirical] dimensions emerged from the curriculum writing process. It also does not explain the disappearance of History Education as a strand in the curriculum, and by implication, the omitting of any consensual ‘master narrative’ within the education of the nation’s new citizens.

Such a master narrative would have been evidently, academically based and reflected a genuine attempt to reconcile emergent South Africa with the legacy of the past. The literature surveyed demonstrates the preoccupation in most societies emerging from conflict with History Education, mediated through schooling, and changing hegemonic national narratives. There had been a legitimate expectation that History Education would receive such attention in a post-apartheid South Africa. As such, there would be a transformation in content and approach in support of an emerging national memory and linked to the constructivist development of personal identities drawing up a wide range of cultural, social and familial minor-narratives. Certainly no one in the history community, both academic and History Education, expected history to be removed so completely from the National Curriculum. Indeed, this reflected a political stance in which there was a conscious denial of memory—the creation of a dangerous vacuum into which would be sucked Folk History, perhaps of the most dangerous and pernicious kind. As noted earlier: this was forgetting with a vengeance.
What had happened? There were certainly those who felt such a ‘deep aversion’ to the manipulation of history and history textbooks during apartheid that ‘History teaching was symbolic of apartheid; removing history was removing apartheid.’ There had been, in fact, a precedent for the idea of removing history from the curriculum. The NEPI Curriculum report released in 1992 posed three options for the place of history in a future curriculum, the third of which was to:

exclude history altogether from the future curriculum, since it is so contentious, has been so abused in the past, and has little vocational relevance.

Although the report did not suggest this as a serious option, it gave expression to important concerns about history, which could have influenced the post-1994 curriculum developers to drop history from the school curriculum. Two issues are raised here: the manipulation of history during apartheid and the perception that history had little economic relevance.

Perhaps for those members of the ‘political nation’ involved in shaping the curriculum the past was still too painful and too present to deal with in an educational context; this was the role of the TRC. So it was easier to ignore the past and to dissolve it into something new. An academic, interviewed in 2001 felt that both the misuse of history under apartheid and a fear of confronting the past—

was a strong guiding force for several of the people designing Curriculum 2005 in de-emphasising history.

This could have well have been so. If so, such opinions were so deeply ingrained and based, i.e. tacit, that there were no debates about the importance of memory and of confronting the past in the meetings of the HSS Learning Area Committee.

Chisholm maintains that critical to the analysis of curriculum revision is the ‘competition and negotiation among social actors who vie to influence the determination of norms and values that the state will uphold over others.’

In national political processes such as curriculum-making, authorship and voice are refracted through both the positioning of the voice and the authority of who speaks...In addressing the authority and positionality of voice, the question of power is critical: who exercises power, how and through which voice?

I would suggest that authority and positionality of voice (therefore legitimacy) were key factors at work within the HSS working group and those to whom they felt answerable. Who manages to exercise power, how and through which voice is the result of powerful, though often not overt, struggles that were shaped by the particular context of the apartheid legacy and the negotiated transition after conflict. The production of memory, individual and collective, takes place within this complex set of relationships. At times it may be perceived to be in a group’s best interest to alter or suppress certain memories with implications for History Education’s role in the curriculum. What is interesting in this instance is that the group in whose interests it would have been to suppress apartheid memory (inherited Afrikaner bureaucracy) was not the group that overtly had the voice of power in the creation of HSS in Curriculum 2005. As it turned out, by remaining silent and being covert and insidious was in their best interests as those who were positioned for power were opposed to History Education for very different reasons: its association with apartheid and its perceived lack of economic value in the new nation.

Further positioning occurred within the writing groups in the context of the apartheid legacy. Ariel Dorfmann, in a foreword to My Neighbor My Enemy: Justice and community in the Aftermath of Mass Atrocity, wrote of the possibilities of dealing with the unspeakable. Although he was referring to the genocides in Rwanda and Serbia, I believe that the notion of ‘unspeakable’ can be interpreted more broadly to include the legacy of mass societal violence in the transition period. Curriculum 2005 was constructed in the political context not only of the revelations of the TRC, but the Mandela period of national reconciliation. The TRC process was about the victims of torture and security force brutality; apartheid as a system that divided South Africans and impacted in a mainly destructive way upon the life of millions both economically and psychologically, was not ‘on trial’. Mamdani called this the ‘truth that the TRC is obscuring’. For him it was crucial that the country recognised—

...the experience of apartheid as a banal reality for sixteen million people arrested for pass law violations, for four million victims of forced removals, and for the millions who went through Bantu education.

These experiences were among the ‘unspeakables’ of the reconciliation period immediately after 1994, as was the ongoing deeply ingrained racism of the majority of white South Africans. The legacy of a racially divided society is the continuing deep feelings of mistrust, inferiority and superiority. Possibly 1996, as HSS was being created, was too soon for these emotions to be openly articulated in a working group context which included potential perpetrators and victims of the apartheid era. However, these powerful tensions undoubtedly influenced the way in which members of the curriculum writing groups, and particularly Humanities and Social Sciences (HSS), interacted in establishing, but again not openly articulating, legitimacy within the process. What I am suggesting is that the dynamics of the HSS Learning Area Committee were deeply rooted in apartheid and that this strongly influenced the direction the Learning Area took, including the exclusion of History Education.

Constructing Curriculum 2005

In an attempt to break with the secrecy and lack of transparency of the curriculum development processes under apartheid, the construction of Curriculum 2005 was ‘democratised’ with stakeholder representation. This resulted not only in large and
unwieldy working groups, but in representatives of the stakeholders with an educational agenda that was culturally and politically driven and who were not necessarily experts in the subject or area they represented. This, I believe, contributed to the tensions and incoherence of the emerging curriculum. In addition, a large proportion of the HSS Learning Area Committee was comprised of provincial and national bureaucrats, both inherited and new. While the old bureaucracy were generally appointed for their unquestioning acceptance of the apartheid system rather than their expertise, the new bureaucracy tended to be political appointees who supported the policies of the new government just as uncritically as their apartheid counterparts had done with the policies of the apartheid state. Very early in the process, the emerging curriculum was linked to a sense of patriotism which was used effectively to close down debate.

None of the provincial officials would have had any curriculum development experience. As such, there was a community of interest between the previous Afrikaner bureaucrats and the new, ANC officials. The provincial representatives who were part of the inherited bureaucracy were associated with a discredited education system which would have made them reluctant to take any stance that could be interpreted as opposing the emerging curriculum whatever they thought about it. The Afrikaners amongst them, given the daily revelations of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission, no doubt felt easier without History Education in the curriculum and would certainly not have fought for its inclusion in HSS. The new bureaucracy was even more inexperienced, though ideologically in line with the development of the curriculum. For them it needed to be so far removed from apartheid education that it could be seen to be eradicating apartheid. The representatives of the largest teacher union, the South African Democratic Teacher Union [SADTU], which had its genesis in the struggle against apartheid, fully supported the new curriculum and carried with them the legitimacy of being ANC-aligned and active during the anti-apartheid struggles. SADTU representatives therefore had a legitimacy that the other teacher union representatives did not have. Conversely, the voice for History Education and Geography Education was extremely weak. The representatives from the South African Society for History Teaching and the Society of South African Geographers were not only male, but also ethnically debarred, i.e. white, for legitimacy. When the Geography Education representative presented a submission the Geography Education representative presented a submission from the Society of South African Geographers requesting that Geography be given the status of a ninth Learning Area, he was seen to be making an attempt to derail the integrity of the new learning areas and the submission was rejected out of hand. A later attempt made by the History Education representatives to have a stronger history focus within the Learning Area led to a major confrontation, again revealing the legitimate/ illegitimate fault line.

The location of the curriculum processes within the Department of Education [DoE] brought further challenges and tensions to the process. Cross et.al. (2002) have noted in relation to the national DoE, there was ‘a politically motivated visionary but inexperienced [senior] bureaucracy of the new regime’ which lacked policy knowledge, skills and understanding to implement change. The new senior education officials who were appointed carried with them the stamp of political legitimacy but often lacked the necessary knowledge base and skills to manage the system and because of this, they very quickly adapted to the authoritarian institutional memory of the national DoE disallowing discussions that deviated from the Curriculum Framework. The Curriculum Framework advocated an integrationist approach, therefore, in spite of the claim to be democratising the education processes, the question of ‘subjects’ was always forbidden in discussion in the Learning Area working groups during the construction of Curriculum 2005. Thus the increasingly authoritarian nature of the process ensured that any attempt by historians or geographers to engage in debate would not be successful.

And finally, the lack of History Education within the HSS Learning Area may have had much to do with the unrealistic writing timeframes, therefore the unfinished process of writing by the Learning Area Committees and the subsequent rushed finalisation of Curriculum 2005 by an appointed, and paid, 15-member Technical Committee. At this point power was centralised in the Technical Committee, assisted by Canadian advisers, which was answerable only to the Minister. It was the work of this committee that signalled the failure of the stakeholder process in the construction of education policy. It also had the effect that the Technical Committee was given far more influence over the eventual outcomes than it would (or should) have had, as it reduced the hundreds of outcomes that had been written by the LACs by the end of November 1996, to the eventual sixty-six of March 1997. The Technical Committee interacted with the Phase committees and with a small group of nominated people from the LACs (the Reference group), took significant decisions without seeking endorsement from others.

The last work of the HSS Learning Area had created (rather unrealistically for implementation) 17 Learning Area Outcomes and 186 Specific Outcomes, a veritable curricular Frankenstein. When it reconvened after the Technical Committee had drafted its first discussion document, the HSS Learning Area Outcomes had been reduced to 4 and Specific Outcomes to 13. When the final Curriculum 2005 document appeared the design features had become Specific Outcomes, Assessment Criteria, Range Statements and Performance Indicators and only 3 out of 9 of the HSS Specific Outcomes from the original working group remained unchanged. None of the working documents had included a History Education outcome though there had been specific outcomes among the original 186 which had had a historical bias, such as the analysis of past and contemporary issues; empathy for people; and continuity and change. These did not appear in the Technical Committee draft. In March 1997, responding to criticism from outside of the process that the HSS outcomes excluded South African history, the Technical Committee requested the members of the Human and Social Sciences reference group to draft a new History Education content-based outcome that dealt with the South African past. However, as previously noted, this outcome was heavy on concepts with very little real content and no guidance in the range of statements to provide depth and breadth to the outcome.
Teachers and Curriculum 2005

The response of the teachers to the introduction of Curriculum 2005 was also located within the legacy of apartheid. It was welcomed by black teachers particularly in under-resourced and rural schools who had suffered the most under the apartheid and who saw Curriculum 2005 not only as symbolising the death of the hated apartheid system, but also a curriculum that would bring real transformation to the country and assist with job creation. However, because of the confusion of interactive classroom methods with OBE and Curriculum 2005, many white teachers felt that they had been ‘doing OBE all along’ and that they would not need to change their practice. This caused a great deal of resentment in provincial teacher workshops during the first implementation phase of Curriculum 2005. Black teachers regarded this as an attempt to undermine the transformation process and the new South Africa, as well as an expression of white, i.e.
apartheid, superiority. A very vocal but small white religious right group regarded the curriculum as undermining traditional values and began a campaign that was to surface even more strongly during the next round of curricular change.

Teachers and students were ambivalent about the disappearance of History Education from the new curriculum. There was anger and concern from specialist history teachers, particularly in senior schools. Not only did they feel cheated by the lack of value placed on History Education, but they also feared job losses or being forced to teach unknown subjects when the implementation reached their grades. In fact, it never did, so for them these fears proved to be unfounded. A Grade 6 teacher with 61 pupils in his class was relieved that he would no longer have to teach history and geography as they were ‘too monotonous’ and History Education, he felt, posed a danger in taking his pupils back rather than forward. Two of his colleagues felt that History Education even after the end of apartheid was still propagating ideas of European superiority and old ethnic stereotypes. However, at the same school, a teacher made a call for History Education to be retained in order to teach about the apartheid past so as to help inform and shape pupil attitudes, values and beliefs.

By 1998, the year of the implementation of Curriculum 2005 in the Foundation Phase (Grade 1–3), the interim curriculum which resulted from the ‘cleansing process’, had been in place in Grade 12 for two years. Evidence gathered from two research projects during 1988 and 1999 and my own interaction with teachers and principals, indicated that many teachers were avoiding teaching the apartheid period, some because of the lack of appropriate resources, some because they were worried about the divisive effect on the students, and others mainly Afrikaners, because they did not want to confront issues of guilt themselves or transfer the burden of guilt for apartheid to their students. Some principals of white Afrikaans schools began phasing out history as a subject choice in Grades 10–12. However, there was also some optimism and a growing sense that the country needed to come to terms with the past through teaching history.

A research project carried out in Western Cape classrooms by Sarah Dryden in 1998 highlighted the ambivalent attitudes held by teachers and pupils and the sensitive nature of History Education in a post-conflict state in which perpetrators and victims need to co-exit. This clearly raises questions of what history can or should be taught [substantive] and in what way [syntactic]. Three extracts from her interviews with teachers demonstrate the tension between memory and forgetting:

In this situation, teaching about inequalities and racism can be dangerous. We have to be careful not to make people hate with the history that we teach them.

[They] need to know the history of the oppression of the past fifty years to understand why things are like today. Some of them live in shacks, but don’t know why. It will help them to live in South Africa...we try to make sure that students can speak well and make an argument and analyse situations and documents. That’s what history needs to be all about these days.

But we must help them [students]. History can help them to have the discussions they need to have, to understand each other. They must learn to live in the kind of South Africa that is made of diverse people, who are equal. That is hard for some of them. But as history teachers we’re trying.

Pupils were unsure about engaging with the apartheid part: as such it was part of their current consciousness, understanding and beliefs. It was the living past – and as such specifically an element in citizenship and political education. One told Dryden that the history they were exposed to made them think of revenge on white people, but they didn’t want to think that way. ‘I think history is a wrong subject, just because I’ve told myself that we must make peace in our land’. A fellow student agreed: ‘I think we must forget history and think of the future.’ At another school she was told: ‘I don’t think we can talk about things because it makes pain for other people and their families. And then the pain comes again. They must put it in the past and plan for the future.’

A report compiled by the Centre for the Study of Violence and Reconciliation (CSVR) a year later (1999) included interviews with teachers and pupils from around the country. Many noted that learning about and remembering the past was important for various reasons that were central to citizenship, political education identity and social cohesion:

If we didn’t learn about the past it would be much harder to understand why things are the way they are. (Student)

It is important for the younger generation to learn about the past. Otherwise they wouldn’t understand and know where they are coming from. They need to know how things have changed, how it used to be in the old time and how people struggled for them. (Teacher)
It's important to know about the past, but [one] can’t cling to the past and be trapped. We should not develop an attitude based on the past. We need to look at the past and see how change has come and that there are now opportunities. (Student)

While in 1998 it seemed that there would be no place for History Education in the curriculum, the situation was to change after 1999. In that year, South Africa had her second democratic elections, and a new Minister of Education who was passionate about History, Prof. Kader Asmal, was appointed. Professor Kader's appointment confirmed the idea that political influence and power is the major driver, agency in shaping the curriculum.

Conclusion
Chisholm maintains that in the social construction of curriculum, there is a dynamic interaction between context and agency that results in profound tensions, contradictions, and paradoxes. These constructions are also always deeply historical in that they are the products of such interactions at different and particular times and places. The dynamics of the HSS Learning Area Committee and the creation of HSS were not only deeply rooted in apartheid, but also demonstrated the complex nature of the 'layers and multiplicity of interests' in policy development playing out in the context of a post-conflict state.
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majority of teachers who attended the consultative workshops were enthusiastic about the proposed changes. Ensuring that the Grade 12 examination was also changed in the Western Cape took a little more strategic manoeuvring as examiners (all males and mostly Afrikaner) had been using one textbook to set exams and memoranda and could not see any point in changing. As Siebörger (1999) points out in distinguishing between the rhetoric and the reality: the Case of History in Curriculum 2005: ‘It is a source of considerable irony that at present Senior Certificate history is making considerable progress towards this end [fostering the particular skills of the discipline] (currently in the Western Cape. I have no knowledge of other provinces).


Jansen, J. D. (1999) Setting the Scene): 12 This was something I also experienced in the workshops conducted for teachers in the Western Cape.


The psychologists, Mitscherlich, A. & Mitscherlich, M. (1975) The Inability to Mourn (Grove Press Inc, New York) wrote of the German people who had overwhelmingly supported the Nazi regime, having to come to terms with that evil, and by doing so, recognising the evil in oneself. This, they suggest, led to the inability to mourn in immediate post-war Germany and thus silence about the Nazi past.

Ibid: 44.


Kros (2000) Interviews conducted in the Northern Province.

Kros, C. (2000) Effacing History: an examination of curriculum development and History textbooks after 1994, a paper presented at Memory and History: Remembering, Forgetting and Forgiving in the life of the Nation and the Community, Cape Town 9–11 August. She quotes a teacher from the then Northern Province as welcoming a ‘more advanced outcomes based education’ believing it would assist in job creation. ‘by the end of Grade 9 the pupil can do something for himself—maybe make a business—run a shop.

Lewin, T. (2001) History education and social justice: debates about the History Curriculum in South Africa, PhD Thesis, Institute of Education, University of London. The Assessment Criteria as they appeared in the final policy document were: AC1 The sources from which a knowledge of South African society is constructed are identified; AC2 Key features of change over time and space are critically examined; AC3 The interrelationships between South Africa, Africa and the rest of the world are explored; AC4 The impact of Apartheid on development is analysed; ACS Patterns of continuity and change in post-Apartheid South Africa are analysed; AC6 Relations within and between communities are critically understood.


Naidu, E. & Adonis, C. (2007) History On Their Own Terms: The Relevance of the Past for a New Generation, CSVR Report. The first quotation was from a Herza Student, a private Jewish school in Cape Town, the last two from Kulani High students, a government school in Cape Town.
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Abstract—History and History Education need to be placed in the context of national and international developments that frame the political discourse of the societies in which schooling occurs. History is a way of thinking about the world, and as such can play a key role in education for citizenship, however defined. History’s role as an academic discipline is grounded in its historiography: an historiography that should frame and determine the form which History Education takes in schools. In a modern, industrialised society which is global in scope and international and interdependent History Education needs to reflect these changed national priorities. History can provide both the temporal frame of reference, the substantive knowledge that plays a major part in informed judgment about current issues and concerns as well as a set of thinking skills and tools that are attributes of citizens in plural democracies. Turkish historiography, and the subsequent impact it has upon History Education, has long followed patterns and trends developed in the West. Prior to the 1980s the dominant discourse was historicist in nature with a clear focus upon national identity within a nationalistic carapace. Since the 1980s there has been a major shift in the direction of historiography which represents history as a constructivist discipline in which there are competing, evidentially grounded, interpretations. This accords with a major shift in emphasis towards multi-nationalism, multi-culturalism and the ‘histories’ of a wide range of social groups. Here Turkey is following a major reorientation that has particularly affected societies like Japan. The result has been an attempt to reorient History Education in Turkey to give it a skills, concepts and thinking tools dimension and a substantive framework that reflects Turkey’s position in the modern world with particular reference to the European Community.
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Introduction

History education and instruction are very closely tied to scientific history and historiography. Approaches to history instruction in schools followed the academic findings and tendencies in the field of history. In this respect, History and Historiography are the fundamentals and essentials of the matter.

History is not a religion. A historian accepts no dogma, respects no law, recognises no taboo, which may be disturbing, but history is not ethics. Historians have no role in condemning or exalting, they explain. History is not the slave of the present. Historians do not impose modern ideological schemata on the past nor do they place past events in today’s sensitivities. History is a lawful thing, it includes memory in the reckoning, but is
not memory itself. A historian gathers people’s memories by means of scientific research and compares them with those of others. In a free state, neither parliament nor legal authorities can define history.

History has always been one of the most effective determiners in the centre of social life. Over time, the expectations of history as one of the humanities have become more varied and rich. This has led to the increase in the number of history’s intervention-effect areas.

While the expectations of history education up until the 16th century were limited to preparing candidate administrators in the art of administration, after this period, the interpretation of religious texts and the provision of material for the teaching of the classic languages were also added. However, simultaneous with the rise of political nationalism, history began to be placed in school curricula as a scientific discipline and a program of instruction. After this period, it was given the duties of building a national identity and educating good citizens.

When preparing History programs, it is natural that place should be given to the duties given to History and their related variables. The duty of educating good citizens is becoming more complex, because continually changing social dynamics have made it necessity to continually review history programs.

The expansion of the roles of historians and history teachers

In the 1970s, as a necessity of industrial society, the economic structure of society necessarily placed an emphasis on mathematical and science education. This led to the discussion on the place of the disciplines of the social sciences in the curriculum. The removal of history lessons in particular from the curriculum began to be discussed. As a result, an attempt was made to restructure history programs so that they would meet the economic expectations of society. The attempt was made to show that history lessons did not just explain past events in a chronological order, but that they could shape individuals in order that they may cope with the pressures of a complex society and economic necessities. In this way, History programs were restructured to include the development of cognitive skills such as decision making and problem solving.

These examples show that the history programs in the world do not only deal with single aims such as ‘faithfulness to the nation and state’, but can also be effective in meeting different social needs and tendencies within the frame of this main aim.

History programs in the world are being investigated in view of basic social and economic indicators

No other lesson content has the potential to include ‘all human experiences’. This is both an advantage and a disadvantage for history programs. It is expected that they hold a light to the whole of human life.

It is necessary in preparing History programs to take into account many different variables such as the basic social problems of violence, inequalities of income distribution, gender-based discrimination and environmental problems. For example, in Britain in the 1980s it was observed that female students were unsuccessful in history lessons. The reasons for this were researched and it was found that historical subjects had a “patriarchal” structure and that there was a dominant male-centred viewpoint. Female students were not interested in the “important” stories of men and they showed tendencies not to empathise with the historical characters. This result is related to the problems of female-male relations in society and is reflected in history lessons.

This social indicator led to the discussion of the content of history and resulted in the addition of the “woman” factor. Basic social trends and economic indicators need to be taken into consideration when preparing history programs, which makes it necessary for the structure of history lessons to be richer and more realistic.

Nationalist History Writing in Europe

With the background of the French Revolution, the nation states that emerged as a result of the provocation by nationalism invented in Europe and the themes that these states needed brought with them a new way of writing history. In place of the heroes and kings that had appeared in history up until the 18th century, the stories of nations appeared with the expansion of nationalist approaches. One of the pioneers of the restructuring of history writing in Europe was Ranke. The historians after Ranke reviewed the search for the national roots of their countries and put forward new approaches. These new approaches meant it was necessary to review the writing of history.

The acceptance of history as a discipline, as a branch of science, is synchronous with the appearance and establishment of the nation states, because historicism was necessary in order for these states to be universally accepted and take on an institutional nature. In the establishment of nation states, the ruling powers’ support of the discourse of new history which can explain nationalism in the shortest way is one of the most important factors in the spread of such discourse. In this period, the greatest support in the spread of nationalism came from historians. Historians formed the majority of those who view nationalism with sympathy. It is accepted by many researchers that historians and nationalists adopting partisan approaches played an important role in the development of nationalism. (Özkırımlı, 1999 pp. 4–38)

History writing in Turkey

Looking at the development process of history writing in Turkey, it can be said that the changes and developments taking place in history writing in Europe directly affected Turkish history writing. The political developments occurring during this period and the activity in the nations of the Balkans found within the Ottoman structure determined the nationalist discourse.
The chaotic environment brought about by the wars and opposing treaties of the 19th century had as much affect as the historians and the discourse in Europe on the history writing in Turkey that took on a nationalistic dimension.

At the end of the Balkan Wars, when the Turks were almost completely thrown out of Europe, the validity of their existence in Anatolia was a matter for discussion and it was suggested that they be exiled to Central Asia, where they had come from. During this time, at the end of the 19th century the Greeks’ emphasis on the continuity of their antique culture and appearance of the Armenians with other claims were to force the Turks to struggle in the context of historical discourse, which, together with the difficult years of the War of Independence, caused a new understanding of history to appear which would give the Turks a new source of confidence and strength, better their appearance, prove the greatness and continuity of their culture, and demonstrate the ancientness and legitimacy of their existence in Anatolia as well as their ability of forming states over thousands of years. This understanding was a nationalist one of “defence historicism” and was exactly reflected in education.

The history books used in the first years of the Republican period

The textbooks prepared as from the establishment of the Republic are formed of the discourse aimed at forming a nation state consciousness, whose outline was beginning to be determined. There are a lot of noticeable common characteristics of the content of the books written at this time. Ottoman history and the history of Islam were left in the background and the roots were traced back to Central Asia; anthropological and linguistic approaches, widespread resources in Europe, were taken as principles; Turkishness was frequently emphasised; French sources were no longer used when preparing books, history was explained from the perspective of Turkish sources; history took on a structure which had nationalism at the centre; maps with texts were drawn; efforts were made to relate the heroes and events of the Republican period to those of pre-Ottoman Turkish history, etc.

New trends and new histories on a world-wide basis

The changes in history education that took place in many countries, the USA in particular, in the 1980s and 1990s were not by coincidence. The changes that took place in the fields of communications and trade on a global basis, the change in economic and military balances and the end of the Cold War made the arousal of a national consciousness necessary once again in many countries of the world. A result of this change on a global level was the emergence of reform movements in educational systems on a world-wide basis (Nash, 1999 p.199).

In other regions of the world, reform movements occurred because of the restructuring of geopolitical situations. With the collapse of the Soviet Union and the communist regimes in Eastern Europe in particular, 15 new sovereign states appeared, and educational reforms were carried out by these new governments. As a result, attempts were made to shape the new education systems in these regions according to new ideological approaches. Since official approaches to history had been dictated by the authoritarian regimes in this region, the new regimes tried to adapt opinions of history to modern approaches.

In Europe, as a result of the economic and political changes that took place in the 1980s in particular, significant discussions between politicians and intellectuals about the rewriting of the past arose. For example, in 1989 in France during the celebrations of the revolution, the right wing in particular claimed that the celebrations and remembrance of the revolution needed to be forgotten because the bloody and radical events of the revolution were no longer appropriate to the modern understanding of democracy. The discussions caused such a great effect that the French Ministry of National Education had to remove the questions related to the French revolution from the lycée examinations (Appleby et al, 1994 p.291).

In Japan, which has a very centralised education system and resembles Turkey in that respect, the discussions centred on the content of the history books. The book “A New History of Japan” written by Ienega Saburo in 1965 was one of the first publications to be in opposition to the official stance of the Japanese Ministry of National Education. This work was an open criticism of the appropriateness of the books in Japan presenting the official ideology. The author accused the Japanese government of collaborating with war criminals and censoring writers. Even though Saburo lost his battle with the Japanese ministry of education, he had sparked an international debate. Finally, in 1982 the ministry had to publish a new book list. At this time, Korea and China in particular complained that Japan was bringing its children up with a militarist history against them. In the end, Japan realised that if it did not come face to face with its past it would not be able to form normal relations with the Asian countries when it emerged as an economic power in the international arena. As a result, in 1994 the curriculum for history accepted Japan as an aggressor in the Second World War (Marshall, 1994 p. 187).

The situation in Turkey

As from the 1980s, Turkey entered a new era in parallel to world developments. A process of serious change began first in foreign politics then in every area after the coup of 1980. Discussions began on the revision of history education in Turkey which was trying to establish complex communications and economic ties with other countries. In order to adapt to the economic developments of the international arena, it was necessary to form good relationships with other countries. For this reason, it was essential that elements of enmity and blaming others be removed from the curriculum for history, as seen in the Japanese example. As from the 1980s, discussions on this matter increased considerably in relation to the following profile of History Education in Turkey—
History instruction is carried out from the perspective of passing on a culture legacy; New findings of historiography are reflected in the program; The history program does not include topics drawn from recent history; The findings of research on History Teaching are not reflected in the program; Of the acquisition of knowledge, values and skills, History instruction only aims at knowledge; The content of history lessons have no relation to daily life; The content of the curriculum is very intense due to the concern of presenting the whole of Turkish history.

After the 1980s, the first attempt at a holistic change in method, content and approach was started by the Council for Instruction and Education in 1992. The problems created by enmity towards ‘the other’ in the historical curriculum’s content were noticed and the first steps were taken to write textbooks with a more ‘pacifist’ neutral language. There was also a move toward social and cultural history rather than political history. Attempts were made to include material that would be interesting for the students. The process of Turkey’s entrance into the European Union caused fundamental changes in the field of education as it had in others. The European Committee’s Decision of Recommendation dated 31 October 2001 was the beginning of the fundamental changes in History instruction in Turkey.

The programs of the curriculum were subject to serious changes for History from the primary level social sciences lessons up to the last years of secondary education. In the studies still being carried out, efforts are being made to form a curriculum that takes into account such priorities as national identity, tolerance, mutual understanding, the ability to analyze human rights and democratic knowledge within the framework of criticism and responsibility, prevention of abuse by learning from history.

Conclusion
20th century history has brought us to the place where “us” and “them” are defined. The 20th century has finished, even though it might be difficult to say so. So, what mission should be given to history in the 21st century? Or, what is history going to deal with whether we like it or not? It seems that the basic problems posed by the trends of the new century to human beings are different from those of the previous one. The basic problem is not proving oneself superior to others, but ‘succeeding in being oneself’. Maybe this century we will take advantage of history to ‘be ourselves’ and to ‘stay ourselves.’

It is natural that History instruction should follow a national path. Yet this path should not wander off to deny the truth of history or to follow subversive ways. The truth should be put forward with its characteristics and its evaluation from the aspect of national history should be developed on this truth. Love of country and nation should go in parallel with humane emotions and thoughts. The following words of Atatürk should be adopted with sincerity and passed on to our children.

“Selfishness, whether personal or natural, should always be seen as bad”...
“Our patriotism should not be a selfish or conceited one”...
“The citizens of the world should be educated to be kept away from envy, greed and grudge.”

It is in these ways that History instruction will take on the role of educating a generation ready for cooperation by emphasising the positive interaction which removes prejudice between different countries, religions and opinions in the international arena. It is now more necessary than before that the education in our country as well as that of other continents move in this direction.

On this matter, it would be beneficial to adopt as a principle the following sentence found on a humble monument in London, to which I have added a few more words: “Patriotism is not enough. Let us not feel grudge and hate toward anyone” (Neither anyone toward me).

Correspondence
Gazi Faculty of Education, http://www.osae.gazi.edu.tr Department of Secondary Education Social Sciences Teaching, University of Gazi, Ankara, Turkey safran@gazi.edu.tr

References
History Education in its Turkish Perspective

Salih Özbaran

Dear Colleagues,

It is an immense responsibility as much as a great pleasure for me to make some concluding remarks to add to the proceedings of this HEIRNET (History Educators International Research Network) Conference.

It is a great pleasure, because the organizers of this conference have been kind and generous enough to ask me to make the final speech in order to assess what has come out within the last three days' discussion on “History Education, Identity and Citizenship in the 21st Century” held at the Atatürk Faculty of Education of the University of Marmara, Turkey.

It is, at the same time, an enormous responsibility that I should appear here before the audience who, as I appreciate, are distinguished scholars of history education. I should try to indicate the outcomes to be drawn out from the seminar sessions of the conference: a task that is almost impossible to realize for a subject such as this which requires experience, knowledge, educational skills as much as familiarity with historical research.

I am aware how difficult it is to summarize the details of every single paper and every moment of discussion concerning history education and its connections with identity and citizenship. I shall, nevertheless, attempt to say very briefly something based on my ‘as an historian of the 6th century Ottoman Empire and a tutor of methodical problems of history’ personal experience as much as my feelings and reactions that I have had during the last two to three decades. What makes me feel at home here is my interest in history education as much as my academic career in working on the 16th century history. Let me say a few words about the recent developments in which I have found myself deeply involved.

It was in 1977 that I saw a book published by the Felsefe Kurumu (Philosophical Society) in Turkey. In this book there appeared the papers which were read in a seminar, organized on 13-15 November 1975 by the Felsefe Kurumu under the leadership of Ioanna Kuçuradi. Although lacking the métier of history teaching and omitting most of the problems which were being discussed in those years around the globe, this seminar nevertheless indicated, at least to me, that Turkish historiography severely needed to bring examine closely the problems of history education.

There were then occasional publications, official or private, touching on the lack of organizations and some meetings emphasizing reforms which should have then been done. I was myself one of the very few academicians, who perhaps felt that historiography, among its professionals, in Turkey did not include the problems of history teaching within its aims. In those days I put forward the following defective factors:

- Historiography very rarely identified itself with the problems of history education and history teaching
- Dimensions (at least from the curriculum point of view) in history teaching were limited
- Textbooks were not up to date
- Nationalist and religious views were dominant
- Contemporary history was not included
- Teaching methods were not up to date.

In the years of 1980, a change took place: the faculties of education replaced the teacher training colleges (eğitim enstitüleri), but with no proper background in learning and teaching expertise. There were in Turkey a classical department system in which students on one side were taught how to become an historian and on the other side faculties of education in which candidates were taught how to be a teacher of history for primary and secondary schools. There was not much difference between the new and the old systems: I should put emphasis here on the latter case.

Education faculties undertook then the job of training the candidates of history teaching with no specific background, with no experience, with no scholarly preparatory effort. While this deficiency continued to affect the universities the Ministry of Education and schools, outside these circles grew increasingly dissatisfied. Some intellectuals, parents, even some of teachers and students expressed from time to time their dissatisfaction concerning history education, particularly with history textbooks.

There came, then, the last decade of the 20th century, i.e., the 1990s, in which involves in the matters of history education became more apparent. The number of secondary book writers increased (no matter how amateur and insufficient these book writers were), and seminars and meetings were held in the circles of universities, the History Foundation in Istanbul and the Ministry of Education. Even the TÜS AD (Turkish Industrialists’ and Businessmen’s Association) ordered and sponsored a history book for secondary schools even though the contents of the book were not included in the official program, i.e. the contemporary history. They all tried to develop, occasionally with the coordination of Georg Eckert Institute in Germany or EUROCLIO (European Standing Conference of History Teachers Associations), the level of history learning, education and practice. I shall not calculate or repeat here what has been done, written and said about the aims of developments in history education; but it is now a happy moment for me to say that ever since the days of 1970s, history education has been questioned whether on the teaching of national history, the ‘others’ in history, or human rights in textbooks as much as on the technicalities of learning and teaching. It is a very hopeful moment to see that The Atatürk Faculty of Education, The University os Marmara, has established a close association with the HEIRNET (History Educators International Research Network) as proved by this conference.
Where are we now in history education in Turkey with particular reference to the identity and citizenship? How advanced the academicians and practising teachers all over the globe on these matters? It is impossible for me to come to certain concrete conclusions here; I do not think that any final definitions exist to answer these questions. However, it is possible to develop a general model, as Falk Pingel, one of the contributors to the writing of history textbooks, said in 1996:

*a set of general principles, which should help us to pave the way for a stable, but not exclusive, identification, which groups with which we seem to have a special relationship because we share a common past, may be developed.*

In this conference, it has been shown that these developments are continuing. We shall never come to concrete principles as history education is scientific, artistic and educative. The past we share - common or specific, global or local- is always subject to change. When it changes according to principles suggested in international mutual meetings as that we have just experienced, we shall feel that we are on the right way. I should finally add here that the historiography in Turkey has recently undergone a great change, not without the influence of those who have made so useful warnings in this very important field called the education of history.

“Tell me Daddy. What is the use of history?”

This question from a child with a thirst for knowledge was asked of an historian father, Marc Bloch, in 1940s. This well-known French historian's answer is still valid:

*At any rate this question, from a child whose thirst for knowledge I was not, perhaps, too well able to satisfy at the time, now serves me well as a point of departure. Doubtless there are some who will consider this a naive approach, but to me it seems entirely to the point.*

To add a few words to the above-mentioned short introduction, I shall say the following:

Firstly, The University of Marmara has hosted competent history educators from various countries such as United Kingdom, U.S.A., Portugal, South Africa and Finland.

To see these very eminent scholars and teachers visiting Turkey with their experiences accumulated over the years together with their newly undertaken researches, has personally made me so happy that the Atatürk Faculty of Education of the Marmara University has become one of the centres of international exchange as far as history education is concerned. By bringing and sharing their knowledge with us on global perspectives as much as local applications relating to history education, identity and citizenship, they have contributed something, which Turkish counterparts, I am sure, have profited from greatly.

Secondly, to see Turkish history educators, now specialists in this very new field of study, participating with quite a large number in such a conference has made me even happier. Almost everyone of them has reminded me how insufficient we were when the problems of history education began to be taken seriously a couple of decades ago in Turkey. I am sure that the guest history educators in this conference have learned quite a lot from them concerning the debatable situation of history education system in Turkey with particular reference to identity and citizenship.

What the Turkish participants have done in this conference, and that has struck me the most, is to point out that the years of effort expended in pursuing the developments in history education have fruited sufficiently enough to catch up with international debates. I am happy to have noticed that they have brought to this conference what they had been observing in their various localities and educational centres all over Turkey together with what they had gained and learned from internationally discussed subjects. With the increase of their participation in such a conference as this one, they will feel more authoritative, and their contribution to this field will be internationally sound.

We have once more put forward in this conference that we are entirely to the point. History Education, Identity and Citizenship in the 21st Century Conference at the University of Marmara has contributed to what historical knowledge means and what methods we should follow in order to obtain it.

I hope as much as I believe that you have enjoyed this HEIRNET Conference.

Thank you.

Salih Özbaran
CLIOHnet: The European History Network

Elif Hatun Kilicbeyli

Introduction

CLIOHnet is a Socrates-Erasmus Thematic Network formed to address the task of bringing the study of history and a critically founded historical perspective to bear on the challenges facing European society and education today. Both as a research area and as a subject widely taught and studied in universities and schools at all levels, history is undergoing a rapid transformation, often perceived as a crisis. The Network utilises the remarkable opportunities created by the swift expansion of contact between diverse European cultural and educational traditions to bring a supranational, diachronic and comparative approach to the study and teaching of history. The target groups are, first of all, students and young people, including school children, and those who are responsible for their education: teachers and teachers’ associations, universities and university professors, including scientists and engineers; second, those who cultivate an historical outlook such as local, national and international historical bodies, associations and journals; finally, on a larger scale, the media, the general public and public opinion. CLIOHnet works on a variety of levels. In each country - about ten in each of the three planned years of activities - a national workshop for teachers, students, researchers and other interested citizens is to be held. Five Task Forces have been created to address priority areas: gender and equal opportunities issues; racism and ethnicity; the use of ODL and ICT in achieving a new historical perspective; history and humanities in scientific and technological curricula; the broadening of the historiographical space to include Eastern Europe and the Mediterranean countries. Other Task Forces may form in response to the needs perceived during operation.

A. Refounding Europe. Creating Links, Insights, Overviews for a new History Agenda (CLIOH)

The ECTS History Network’s project for an innovative core curriculum and preparatory modules for SOCRATES students.

1.1 The rationale and background to the project (current situation, need for improvements, other reasons)

History is society's memory. No one can live in the present or plan for the future without memory. The ECTS History Network has become acutely aware that the way history is taught and studied in universities and schools is one of the most important, though least recognised, ways in which men and women form an idea of their collective past and present identities and relationships. History is a powerful tool, too much so to be left to chance and to the development of academic discourse of professional historians. Much of what is commonly taught and learned in European Universities is based on historiographical viewpoints developed in a context far from that of the Europe which is emerging today. Each national historiography, as is well known, has its own agenda, largely incomprehensible for students and researchers from other countries; furthermore the idea that Eastern, Western, Northern and Southern Europe are essentially different is almost universally accepted in one form or another. In the judgement of the group it is essential that the vision of the past, (and hence of the present day relationships between the peoples of Europe), be taught and studied according to a supranational approach. In particular, the group recognises the urgent need to collaborate in this effort with the Eastern European countries which are now entering the European educational and political space. As integration extends it is imperative that educational programs at all levels be built on a perception of both the common interconnected past and the rich diversities between the various parts of Europe. Professional historians have a duty to ensure that ordinary citizens, politicians, policy makers and media base their actions on an adequate factual and conceptual idea of the past and of the nature of change rather than on superficial commonplaces and deep-lying prejudices. We posit that historians are experts in the nature of change and that they have therefore a primary role to play in giving guidance in the developments of the present day.

1.2 The general aims and objectives of the project

The group intends to pursue its general objective of influencing and up-dating the way European history is perceived and taught in a variety of ways. To achieve maximum impact the new outlook is to be introduced first within the existing courses in each institution. This will be accomplished through creating, testing and perfecting a “CORE” module to be used in general history courses of the first cycle in all participating universities. Such courses are the prime target of the project because:

1) They are normally part of the required curriculum both for future historians and for students who will pursue careers in other key fields, including policy-making, journalism and teaching.

2) They form the basic factual and conceptual framework in which more specialised information will be understood and they will serve as a basis for development of more advanced courses. Implementing the CORE module requires creating syllabi, reading lists
and teaching materials to be used and tested by all. Secondly, the group intend to create carefully designed “COMPASS” modules to introduce students to the variety of historical experiences, languages and cultures of the new Europe. These modules will be aimed both at students preparing for a mobility experience and at those students who will not be able to study abroad. Lastly it will devote great effort to disseminating the knowledge and experience gained in other Institutions, schools, teachers’ associations and in the public forum generally. On the basis of 10 years of experience and performance we are convinced that these are significant and realistic objectives that can be reached within a three year period.

1.3 The courses to be developed including a brief description of content

a) “CORE” modules in general history courses of the first cycle. The CORE modules are planned to include five main topics:

1. The concept of Europe and its history; the geographical definitions of the continent; other measures, other criteria; linguistic and cultural definitions
2. National historiographical views in Europe; institutions and historians; politics and history; examples of national readings of different periods (e.g. the relationship to the ancient world, absolutism, the French revolution, national unification, the Balkans, the post-second world war period and European Integration); national languages and state formation
3. Non-national readings of Europe: regionalism, empires, colonisation within and outside of Europe
4. History of concepts used to group Europeans in larger categories such as ‘Western civilisation’, Atlantic democracies, Mediterranean countries, Mitteleuropa, Eastern Europe, Scandinavia and so forth
5. History of the European Union [see details in Annex A].

b) “COMPASS” modules preparing students for study abroad and/or introducing them to the variations in the common European experience. They are intended for students from all Faculties, including, but not limited to those who have taken the “CORE” module. They are to be articulated in five sub-modules:

1. Europe today: an overview of component national, regional and linguistic groups; basic information on demography, economy, political organisation
2. Different readings of moments of unity, conflict and state formation (examples)
3. European universities, their history, their role in the formation of cultural and linguistic identity
4. Study in Europe today: diversity and convergence
5. Comparison of cultural models and linguistic structures in two out of four macro-area sub-modules (for prospective SOCRATES students, their own macro-area and that of their intended host university; for others their own and one other) [see details in Annex B].

1.4 The intended outcomes within the IC funding period in quantitative terms (type of diploma certificate, number of course(s)/course units, credits, number and type of teaching materials)

a) “CORE” modules will be made available as a relevant part of first cycle general history courses. According to the course structure in the different university systems they will normally give 5 to 10 ECTS credits.

b) “COMPASS” modules also will normally give 5 to 10 ECTS credits. They will be made available to all Faculties and will be appropriate for use at any course level, but are suggested for the second year.

To generate the necessary innovative teaching materials to use in the modules the Network intends to involve linguists, geographers, political scientists and other specialists, to co-ordinate TS mobility within the participating Institutions, and to organise each year Intensive Programs on carefully chosen themes, so as to continue the formation of a bank of digital interactive materials (websites, CDs, video and texts) documenting teaching methods and contents in a comparative international perspective. The number of teaching materials is: one reader for the “CORE” module; one main reader for the “COMPASS” module, four sub-readers for the fifth part of the “COMPASS” module; CDs, website reference and resource material.

The first year will be devoted to designing the modules, defining their specific content, and creating interest and interaction around them; the second to development of the modules using IP and other materials; the third to testing and inserting into the regular course structure so that the modules can appear on catalogues and course lists for 2003-2004. The perfected modules and support material will be used in regular teaching from September 2003 [see details in table under 7.2.4].

c) For the third action, dissemination, of the Project see point 7.1.6; for time schedule the table under 7.2.4.

1.5 The target audience of the project (students, teaching staff, etc.) and an estimate of the number of participants directly involved in the activities proposed

The primary target audience of the “CORE” modules are the students taking general history courses in the 38 participating Universities, an estimated 20,000 to 30,000 students. Also the staff involved directly or indirectly in each department are expected to modify to some relevant degree their understanding of European history and historiography (700 staff). The “COMPASS” modules target all OMS students [estimated 3800] and other humanities and social sciences who are not able to go abroad (more than 10,000). The preparation and utilisation of the “COMPASS” modules will broaden interactive contact with non-History departments, increasing the information and changing the outlook of staff from an ample range of disciplines, for an estimated average of 20 to 30 per Institution, for a total of 900–1000.
1.6 Other beneficiaries of the project and measures taken to disseminate results

The third action in the project, dissemination, is specifically aimed at reaching the largest and most influential public possible, through extension to other universities and contact with rector’s conferences, ministries, teachers’ associations, schools, the media and scientific associations and journals. The teaching materials, the syllabi and module formats will be made publicly available on the central website or on other digital support. Specific campaigns will be made to explain the purpose and the importance of the program. The final outcome is impossible to quantify but reasonably must be calculated, as a minimum, in the hundreds of thousands. The proposing universities wish to point out that in the last 10 years the ECTS Pilot Project, from which the present Network was born, has influenced literally millions of people, and laid the foundations for convergence of the entire European higher education system, as the Bologna agreement demonstrates.

1.7 Our co-operation programs are in place with public and or private sector organisations (other than those directly involved in the partnership identified in section? E.6) All partner Institutions have stated that support and some financing is available from local bodies and foundations.

2 Project approach and project organisation

2.1 The project relates to and complements the existing teaching programs of the participating institutions

All participating institutions offer general first cycle history courses and have outgoing OMS students. All universities listed in section E.6 have entered into a formal agreement with the proposing university to implement the project, designating an appropriate coordinator and a local committee to assist. Normally the local committee will be interdepartmental, including sectors of Ancient, Medieval, Modern and Contemporary History, the Auxiliary Sciences of History, Archaeology, Literary studies or Linguistics, Art History, Geography and Political Sciences. The modules will be developed, tested and perfected during the project; the ECTS credits they give will be recognised as an entire course or a part of a larger course as appropriate to the structure of studies. The responsibility for ensuring that the modules are available in the official course structure lies with the deans of the faculties involved, or where the structure requires it, of the directors of the participating departments.

2.2 The methodology, pedagogical and didactic approaches

The activities involved are of several kinds as explained above. All are based on the utilisation of the pan-European characteristics of the group itself to gather information and generate insight into the way historical studies and concepts have developed in the various national and regional contexts. Subsequently the information is to be elaborated and presented to students in two ways:

1) In a vertical comparative perspective, using differences in approach to highlight the way each nation has codified its historiography and elicit the need for a new overview; and

2) In a horizontal perspective, showing through the use of single themes how the histories of each area are interconnected notwithstanding or even because of their diversity.

The pedagogical or didactic approach is based on active and interactive learning in a carefully prepared scenario designed to maximise psychological impact and learning energy gained from deconstructuring and explaining unquestioned convictions. “CORE” modules aim at showing students how apparently the deep-seated and unquestioned ideas of each national history (which they well may have studied in their upper schools) were actually formulated in a specific historical and intellectual context in the past; how the various country’s visions of their past and images of their neighbours are not compatible with each other; at stimulating reading and providing materials for individual and group exploration of the formation of students’ own national ideologies and those of others. “COMPASS” modules are explicitly aimed at exemplifying the diversities in national experience, the differences in university structure and didactic systems, periods and phenomena which have affected all of Europe, in analogous or contrasting ways, and giving specific linguistic and cultural preparation for work and study in the various parts of Europe. All modules include interactive sessions based on video materials showing students and professors from different participating countries in an actual teaching situation; when possible, thanks to TSM, staff shown can be present to answer questions and join in discussion; otherwise interactive feedback can be achieved by scheduled internet discussion sessions.

2.3 The nature of the ODL involvement and the benefits it intends to achieve

As explained above, various aspects of the project require ODL procedures of different types. Participants have different degrees of familiarity and different technical capacities and equipment. All must have access to e-mail and internet, to be able to access, download and print the documents and materials placed on the central web site. Hence all will be able to organise interactive e-mail discussion sessions with staff of partner institutions as described above. Most institutions are able to project videos and to use CD materials in their modules; some can actually organise video conferences. Maximum use will be made of existing capabilities; equipment will be improved as budgets permit.
2.4 An overall work plan with dates, activities and provisional outcomes.

**Preparatory Phase**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Bologna</td>
<td>European Conference on role of credits in the European Educational System</td>
<td>Coordinators of ECTS History Network (Averkorn, Gonzalez, Hafldanarson, Isaacs, Sadourny, Salavaterra, Wagenaar); other experts</td>
<td>Discussion of perspectives for convergence in view of the June Bologna meeting and declaration; preparation for May conference in Pisa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Pisa</td>
<td>European Conference on History in European Universities, “The Present of the Past”</td>
<td>All Coordinators from ECTS History Network; representatives and observers from other Italian and European Universities</td>
<td>Discussion and planning of present proposal on the basis of a comparative overview of history teaching in European Universities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun-Jul</td>
<td></td>
<td>Contacts and visits with partners in countries recently admitted to SOCRATES</td>
<td>Central Coordinator of this CDI proposal and appropriate Departments and Faculties in the Universities listed under E.6</td>
<td>Explanation and discussion of CDI proposal, preliminary TSM and OMS agreements to enhance interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td></td>
<td>Distribution of CDI Proposal to all participants for discussion and suggestions</td>
<td>All Coordinators, Departmental and Institutional, of the ECTS History Network; all prospective Coordinators and Partner Departments in the recently included countries</td>
<td>Feedback on CDI Proposal; designation of Local Coordinators and Committee in all partner institutions; existing teaching and discussion materials and videos produced by the group are sent to new partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sussex Fall meeting of ECTS History Network</td>
<td>All Coordinators of ECTS History Network. Coordinators of new partner institutions invited if funding is available.</td>
<td>Final discussion and approval of present proposal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Leipzig</td>
<td>First plenary fall meeting of CLIOH, key project of the newly extended ECTS History Network</td>
<td>All CDI Project Coordinators</td>
<td>General discussion and planning decisions, smaller group and steering committee meetings according to the format as under point 7.3.1., on contents and issues of modules and dissemination of knowledge about the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Pisa</td>
<td>IP on Welfare State; IP on Definition of Gender Roles</td>
<td>Coordinators directly involved in IPs</td>
<td>Creation and testing of teaching materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Roskilde</td>
<td>To be decided</td>
<td>Project Coordinator, CDI group leaders</td>
<td>Guidance and monitoring of activities; preparation of spring plenary meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Pisa</td>
<td>First plenary spring meeting possibly to be held in conjunction with IP to cut costs and to guarantee testing of real teaching situation</td>
<td>All CDI Coordinators</td>
<td>Discussion and final decisions on design of modules; planning for development in 2001-2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2000 May

Reykjavik IP organised by Universities of Iceland and Pisa on “Nations and nationalities’ and ECTS History Network: Spring plenary meeting. All present coordinators of present ECTS History Network. All new coordinators are invited to participate if able to find financing.

Production of digital video, CD and web material on “Nations and Nationalities” to be used with digital video material produced in Pisa IP, May 1998, on “Empires, states and regions in a European Perspective” in modules.

Year 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Leipzig</td>
<td>First plenary fall meeting of CLIOH, key project of the newly extended ECTS History Network</td>
<td>All CDI Project Coordinators</td>
<td>General discussion and planning decisions, smaller group and steering committee meetings according to the format as under point 7.3.1., on contents and issues of modules and dissemination of knowledge about the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Roskilde</td>
<td>IP on Welfare State; IP on Definition of Gender Roles</td>
<td>Coordinators directly involved in IPs</td>
<td>Creation and testing of teaching materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>To be decided</td>
<td>Project Coordinator, CDI group leaders</td>
<td>Guidance and monitoring of activities; preparation of spring plenary meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Pisa</td>
<td>First plenary spring meeting possibly to be held in conjunction with IP to cut costs and to guarantee testing of real teaching situation</td>
<td>All CDI Coordinators</td>
<td>Discussion and final decisions on design of modules; planning for development in 2001-2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Year II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001 Oct</td>
<td>Alcalá</td>
<td>Second plenary fall meeting; beginning of second year of project, development</td>
<td>All CDI Coordinators</td>
<td>Discussion and finalising modules for development phase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002 Feb</td>
<td>To be decided</td>
<td>Steering Committee meeting; IP Coordinator and CDI group leaders</td>
<td>Project Coordinators and CDI group leaders</td>
<td>Guidance, monitoring and preparation of spring meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002 Spring</td>
<td>To be decided</td>
<td>IP’s</td>
<td>Coordinators directly involved in IP’s</td>
<td>Creation and testing of teaching materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002 May</td>
<td>To be decided</td>
<td>Second plenary meeting; to be held if possible with IP to cut costs</td>
<td>All CDI Coordinators</td>
<td>Finalising contents of modules; organisation of testing programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Year III

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002 Oct</td>
<td>To be decided</td>
<td>Third plenary fall meeting; beginning of third year of project, testing phase</td>
<td>All CDI coordinators</td>
<td>Finalising testing program; development of information material for insertion in university packages in early spring 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003 Feb</td>
<td>To be decided</td>
<td>Steering Committee meeting; IP Coordinator and CDI group leaders</td>
<td>Project Coordinators and CDI group leaders</td>
<td>Guidance, monitoring and preparation of spring meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003 Spring</td>
<td>To be decided</td>
<td>IP’s</td>
<td>Coordinators directly involved in IP’s</td>
<td>Creation and testing of teaching materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003 May</td>
<td>To be decided</td>
<td>Third plenary spring meeting to be held possibly with IP to cut costs</td>
<td>All CDI Coordinators</td>
<td>Evaluation of testing phase; decisions on in modules and teaching materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003 Sep</td>
<td>To be decided</td>
<td>Conclusion of project: final plenary meeting</td>
<td>All CDI Coordinators</td>
<td>Implementation; use of modules in regular study programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.5 The main responsibilities/activities of the coordinator and each of the partners in the project

The organisational plan is based on the experiences, both negative and positive, of the Network. For simplicity we describe it beginning with the partner institutions. Each participating university designates an appropriate local coordinator, whose status and ability to work with others is such that he/she is able to organise the work, the support and the diffusion of results which the project requires. The local coordinator must be deeply interested in the project and have a good working knowledge of English to enable them to interact effectively with the Network in all phases of its activity. The local coordinator acts as an interface between the Network as a whole and their Institution; they attend the plenary meetings and translates the materials centrally produced by the group into the local language if required. The local coordinator is assisted by a local committee formed as explained under point 2.1. It has two responsibilities: on one hand it assists the local coordinator in elaborating and testing those materials or projects for which the institution is responsible, on the other it will ensure the spread of knowledge about the project within the institution and within the local milieu. The project coordinator is responsible for directing the project, for ensuring that the objectives are well known to all and that the appropriate actions are taken according to the schedule set up for the project. The project coordinator will be the prime spokesperson for the Network and will be responsible for arranging internal and external monitoring as explained in point 2.8. At the central level they will be assisted by a Steering Committee, formed by the present central coordinator of the Network, and by the leaders of the four working groups. The Steering Committee with the project coordinator directs and proposes actions to the Network, prepares proposals for collateral financing where possible, promotes dissemination of results and publicity for the Network's activities. At the local level the project coordinator will be assisted by a local committee formed in the coordinating university. The meetings of the Network will be organised according to the format explained under point 3.1.

### 2.6 The coordinator and each of the partners have sufficient competence and experience to fulfil their respective roles within the project

The Network has indicated Prof. Ann Katherine Isaacs of the University of Pisa as project coordinator on the basis of her linguistic and organisational abilities. She has worked in the ECTS Pilot Project since its beginning in 1989. With Professor Halfdanarson of the University of Iceland, she has coordinated the largest theme group in the CDI Project centrally coordinated by Robert Wagenaar of the University of Groningen.

Isaacs designed and organised a successful IP held in Pisa in 1998, producing didactic digital video material now available for use in the Network. She designed a second IP which will be held in Reykjavik in May 2000. She held a European Conference History in European Universities in Pisa in May 1999. The materials are available in print and on web; they form an important document on the status of history in higher education today. All partners have been chosen for their experience and because they are representative...
of all different types of European Universities. The ECTS History Network is formed of Universities originally chosen by the European Commission to experiment and implement the European Credit Transfer System. All coordinators have many years of experience in the ECTS group and have gained though their work and dedication an uncommon grasp of the problems and prospects of convergence of the European higher education systems. The members now joining the Network have been chosen on the basis of geographic distribution, academic excellence and motivation to collaborate in this project. The result is an exceptional group which adds to the unique experience the new members which make it truly representative of the Europe of the 21st Century.

2.7 The project’s working language(s)

The Network has taken as one of its primary objectives experimenting with multilinguism and making students aware that historical documents and historical research must be based on adequate knowledge of the languages of the people involved. The Network has held a bi-lingual Conference in May 1999 and an IP in May 1998 in which all materials were presented in two languages, the local one (including Icelandic, Gaelic and Basque), and a more widely known one. On the basis of its experience the Network has decided, for practical reasons, to use English as the language for working meetings, but to continue its efforts to produce teaching materials which include in some form (subtitles, translations, hypertexts) all European languages. Also the COMPASS modules will be specifically geared to prepare for study in less frequently known languages.

2.8 The project will be monitored (internally) and evaluated (externally), in particular as regards its impact

The realisation of the time table will be monitored by the Project Coordinator on the basis of proof from each institution that the intermediate and final goals have been achieved. As to impact, internal monitoring will be organised and carried out by the Project Coordinator and the Steering Committee through questionnaires and logging utilisation of the website. The materials produced in the Project will be on the web and will be in the public domain. Hence they may be evaluated by external observers. The Network itself will ask a board of three respected independent academics from three different areas of Europe to act as assessors.

This project is submitted only here. It is coordinated with the OMS and TSM proposals of all the 38 institutions listed under E.6, and its effectiveness will be enhanced by the experience, reciprocal knowledge and synergies developed by actual studying and teaching in the partner institutions. Furthermore, as mentioned, the proponents intend to propose each year at least two IPs to facilitate developing and testing the necessary innovative teaching materials. This method has already been successfully employed with the two IPs held in 1998 (see material in annexed dossier), and will again be used in spring 2000 in IPs in Gent and Reykjavik. For the 2000-2001 period the Network is presenting 2 IP proposals: “The Welfare State: Before, During and After” [University of Roskilde]; “Political Systems and Definitions of Gender Role” [University of Pisa].

3.1 How and to what extent the needs of disadvantaged people have been taken into account

The participating universities guarantee to do their utmost to give optimal assistance to any personally disabled students or staff that may participate in the project. Furthermore, the project itself has as one of its main objectives that of making less known languages, cultures and university systems more accessible to all and of creating opportunities for productive collaboration between European universities.

3.2 How and to what extent the project will actively promote equality of opportunity between men and women

The modules and materials produced in the Project promote a view of history and culture in which the gender issues and roles are kept constantly present. Many of the local coordinators in the Network are women, as is the project coordinator: an important step towards empowerment of women as protagonists of culture on a pan-European scale.

Conclusion

Developing a European Education Program is a “ccc” process: collaboration, co-operation, co-ordination. Although the Bologna process is not meant to be primarily a unification process, there are some simplification, consolidation, generalisation processes that will be necessary to develop a truly European education program. CLIOHnet disseminates the insights developed in a variety of ways. Each Task force is responsible for publicising the results of its work.

The Network as a whole is carrying out a project entitled “Cloih’s Workshop II” under the Culture 2000 program of the Education and Culture Directorate. General of the European Commission. It collaborates in the Tuning Educational Structures in Europe Project (Phases 1 and 2), and in TEEP 2002 (Transnational Evaluation Project). It will create an association (HEKLA) for enhancing the historical perspective in European culture, it operates a web-site and a mailing list. It is now creating a pan-European directory of historical associations and bodies; it encourages publications relating to its objectives in the specialised press and in the media. It promotes the study of teaching and learning history in Europe today and will publish the results in book form, containing both an overview of the present situation and recommendations for action.

CLIOHnet is currently extending its links outward toward institutions in countries not yet admitted to Socrates programs, particularly in South East Europe, the Mediterranean area, Russia and Central Asia. It promotes reciprocal knowledge and collaboration in the areas of research and innovation in higher education throughout its network. It has successfully proposed CLIOHRES.net, a Sixth Framework Network of Excellence, for History, and has generated other projects, such as e-HLEE for e-learning and EMMHS, a Masters in Mediterranean studies. It promotes collaboration across and beyond the humanities through the Archipelago of Humanistic Thematic Networks. It develops history materials for small children (CLIOHnet-Kids) and promotes the formation of a CLIOHnet student Network (CLIOHnet-Youth).
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