Global Perspectives on the Role of Dialogue in History Education

Socio-cultural, Psychological, and Digital Dimensions

Edited by Mario Carretero and Everardo Perez-Manjarrez

First published 2025

ISBN: 978-1-032-85440-3 (hbk)
ISBN: 978-1-003-53589-8 (ebk)

Introduction

Dialogue as a necessary challenge for history education

Mario Carretero and Everardo Perez-Manjarrez

DOI: 10.4324/9781003535898-1

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group
LONDON AND NEW YORK

Introduction*

Dialogue as a necessary challenge for history education

Mario Carretero and Everardo Perez-Manjarrez

We live in a polyphonic world, yet we are far from being dialogic communities. Contested and seemingly irreconcilable narratives dominate the public conversation over present controversies and easily find themselves projected onto unresolved past conflicts and historical disputes, triggering prejudices over the past that in turn permeate view of these present-day issues. The public and educational communication of history has the potential to either promote or defuse this process of reinforced antagonism. Traditionally, history education, in the broadest sense, has served one or the other of two parallel objectives, which we might term 'enlightened' and 'romantic' (Carretero, 2011); the former related to the emergence of a critical understanding of the past and the latter to fostering in citizens an emotional identification with and attachment to their own national or cultural community. The beginnings of history as a curricular subject in schools were very much in the service of this second objective. As analyzed elsewhere (Carretero & Bermúdez, 2012), the 'romantic' goals held exclusive predominance in national education systems from their inception at the end of the nineteenth century until approximately the 1970s. Historiographical studies (Berger, 2012) have identified, as the central motivation behind this emphasis on patriotism and national identification, a need for the construction of national identities as a narrative support to nation states (Anderson, 1991; Hobsbawm, 2012). Since the 1970s, numerous countries have effected marked changes to their school history curricula,

* This chapter has been possible because of the support of the project www.makinghistories.eu from the EU (Marie Curie Staff Exchanges Project 10108606), coordinated by the first author. The views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

DOI: 10.4324/9781003535898-1

incorporating current approaches from the social sciences and particularly from contemporary historiography; in numerous societies, however, the content of school history remains fundamentally 'romantic' in the sense of being strongly nationalistic or indeed blindly patriotic. The last two decades have seen a degree of renaissance in nationalistically oriented history curricula. One striking example might be formerly Communist countries, in which, after the caesura of 1989/90, history education and historiography swung from dogmatic Marxism to extreme nationalism. The content of history curricula of some US states as Texas is also notably nationalist in character (Perrillo, 2018). In other nations, this trend is less pronounced and sometimes manifests much more implicitly. Current tensions between nationalism and globalization are likely to be influential in these developments (Carretero, 2017a).

We note the *conundrum* inherent in what we have defined as 'romantic' representations of history. There is little basis or support in historiography for these romantic representations, which instead are effectively founded on national myths of origin; yet they play a powerful role in maintaining social cohesion among citizens and therefore national self-definition and self-perception. In other words, this 'romantic' content, implicitly or explicitly, continues to undergird the construction and maintenance of national and societal identities. Their impact is particularly evident when we have regard to informal devices of history education (as opposed to 'formal', school-based learning), such as commemorative events, historical re-enactments, TV series, and similar cultural productions (Carretero, Wagoner, & Perez-Manjarrez, 2022).

The master narratives typically at the center of 'romantic' history education objectives largely lack polyphonic character and stand in the way of a complex understanding of the past. Students and citizens exposed to an education focusing on 'romantic' objectives generally acquire not multi-perspective representations of the past but instead a view centered on the official national master narrative. In many instances, this type of narrative has obscured and omitted the role of specific groups of historical actors, such as slaves, indigenous peoples, minorities, and women, upholding and perpetuating discrimination. In response to this, recent research in history education has frequently proceeded from the question of 'whose history?'

The intent of this book is to contribute to the establishment of a new theoretical basis for research into history education in both formal and informal contexts paying particular attention to

a the need to promote meaningful interaction between the romantic and enlightened objectives as defined above; this implies considering the role of social, cultural, and national identities in the process of learning history.
b the relationship between history and collective memories, whose analysis will progress us to a fuller understanding of the process by which people internalize historical narratives, in its continuous movement back and forth between individual and collective memory, engaging and linking both.

c the analysis of the underlying cognitive and social psychological mechanisms that provide the preconditions for the emergence of dialogical and polyphonic views of the past, which represents the principal and most useful way of promoting a reflective view of representations of history and preparing the ground for potential change in how citizens perceive historical events and actors.
d the workings of implicit conflicts and processes of silencing and how we might identify and uncover them and work toward change.

Models of historical thinking and historical consciousness: achievements to date and gaps still to fill

History education research has come of age as a vibrant field bringing together experts from across disciplines and professions, including historians, psychologists, sociologists, educators, politicians, and policymakers. During its four decades of research to date (Dickinson, Lee & Rogers, 1984; Carretero & Voss, 1994; Seixas, 2004; Carretero, 2017a), it has generated a robust body of knowledge on historical literacy, didactics, and students' learning (Berg & Christou, 2020; Köster, Thunemann & Zülsdorf-Kersting, 2019; Elmersjö, Clark & Vinterek, 2017; Metzger & Harris, 2018).

Various initiatives in relation to informal education have also given rise to important debates around the significance of historical knowledge to societies (De Groot, 2016). The increasing sophistication of media and public spaces, enabling the consumption of and debate on history, ranging from museums, memorial sites, and TV series to historical re-enactments and new forms of history-related tourism, has cast light on the historical origins of and backgrounds to current social issues. This discursive prominence of the past in the present has also exerted an influence on public policy and the agendas of societal actors; political discourses and campaigns, for instance, are often deeply rooted in representations of the past.

The most significant developments in formal education during the lifespan thus far of the history education discipline are probably the models of historical thinking and historical consciousness (Rüsen, 2005; Seixas, 2017a; Nokes, 2017; Wineburg, 2001). As yet, these seminal theoretical proposals have had limited impact on the sphere of informal history education. In general terms, these two related approaches assert that an appropriately complex representation of historical events and issues requires the individual to proceed decisively beyond the assimilation of historical facts, names, and dates by, above all, employing historical concepts in their thinking and referencing the cultural frameworks in which the individual is embedded. Achieving a historical consciousness, or doing historical thinking, implies establishing a meaningful relationship between past, present, and future in terms of problems requiring solutions in diverse societies across chronological periods.

A notably influential approach in this regard has been that of Wineburg and colleagues (Nokes, 2017; Reisman & Wineburg, 2012; Wineburg, 2001). They propose that the use of three heuristics – corroboration, sourcing, and contextualization – would significantly improve the evaluation of evidence among students in advanced stages of schooling (Wineburg, Martin & Monte-Sano, 2011). These heuristics revolve around the way students check the plausibility of various different types of historical documents through complex reasoning processes (Luís & Rapanta, 2020). In recent years, Wineburg and colleagues have extrapolated this model to digital environments, with success in the analysis of curricular content from history and social/civic studies (Wineburg, 2018a; McGrew, Breakstone, Ortega, Smith & Wineburg 2018); their work represents a contribution to the urgently required development of students' skills in examining the authenticity, veracity, and potential bias of materials in an age in which a range of media communicate unprecedented volumes of content. Related studies have made tentative attempts to trace the processes of argumentation followed by students when they examine historical documents and explore the importance of argumentation to civic education (Monte-Sano, 2016).

Critics of this particular model of historical thinking have argued that the development of the three heuristics as outlined by Wineburg et al. falls short of fully grasping the processes by which students make sense of historical content in digital environments, as it fails to take other factors into account, such as peer-to-peer interaction and validation, ideology, and the negotiation of meaning (Gardner & Davis, 2013, erratum: (Perez-Manjarrez, 2022; Santiago, 2017). In this vein, Seixas (2017a) has noted that Wineburg's approach focuses primarily on the issue of historical evidence, while relatively neglecting other important questions such as causality and multiplicities of interpretation. A further factor requiring consideration, in our view, is that the very idea of historical thinking, as set out in studies of this type, is based on a conception of teaching the academic discipline of history as a cultural production considered completely separately from possible social and political influences (see also, for example, critiques by Dessingué, 2020; Nordgren, 2016, Thorp & Persson, 2020). Historical knowledge ('history') is not only an academic discipline but also a cultural activity subject to powerful influences from activities relating to memory at societal level. Similarly, historians, alongside being experts in their academic discipline, are social actors, exposed likewise to political, social, and cultural influences, some of which are drawn from the 'romantic' objectives of history education that were the erstwhile romantic objectives of the historiographical profession.

A further influential model of historical thinking, proposed by Seixas, has found broad-based use in school history curricula. Based on the pioneering distinction between first- and second-order historical concepts as set out in the seminal work by Dickinson, Lee and Rogers (1984, see Carretero & Perez-Manjarrez, 2022 for an updated view), this model is built around the six second-order historical concepts of historical significance, evidence, continuity

and change, cause and consequence, historical perspectives, and the ethical dimension (Seixas & Morton, 2013). These types of concept are meta-concepts in the sense of representing procedural knowledge in history education. Seixas (2017a) acknowledges the limitations of this model, conceding that it omits to take account of the interpretative nature of history and its transformation over time and does not adequately explore the interconnections among its constituent concepts. In this context, our team has noted the great importance of paying attention to historical concepts and to the relationship between master narratives and conceptual change as essential questions in historical thinking (Carretero & Lee, 2014; Carretero, Castorina & Levinas, 2013). Further, and most importantly, we have acknowledged that it is crucial to avoid overlooking cultural variability, that is, the existence of multiple understandings of historical concepts.

In recent responses to the critique of his work, Seixas explored the interconnections between two traditions of history teaching: historical thinking, a model driven largely by the discipline of history, and the German sociocultural tradition of historical consciousness in education (Seixas, 2017b), drawing on the ideas of Rüsen (2005) and advocating the importance in school history curricula both of procedural historical knowledge and its associated methods and of historical consciousness as a fundamental orientation promoting the comprehension of the relationship between past, present, and future experiences. This is without doubt a seminal idea (Carretero, 2018a; Epstein & Peck, 2017) which requires a great deal of further empirical work.

A number of voices have recently called for these two concepts of historical thinking and historical consciousness to take into account the cultural specificity of representations of the past. The finding, for example, that African–American students do not consider the traditional historical narratives communicated in the US to hold meaning for them (Epstein, 2009) and their call for school history to discuss historical processes such as slavery imply that history education faces a need to reconsider its role in that society and the importance of dialogical views on national or regional pasts. Analogous cases occur in various regions of the world (Carretero, 2011). Crucially, any dialogical view of these issues will of necessity require culturally comparative studies from a transnational point of view. In other words, the consideration of the perspective held by 'the other' is vital to a dialogical view of the past (Bakhtin 1986; Todorov, 1999) because of its enrichment of the complexity and completeness characterizing both our view of the past in general and our sense of **our identity as historical subjects**. While enlightened advances in historical tradition, such as those drawing on the notions of historical thinking and historical consciousness, have had significant impact in theoretical developments and pedagogical practices, they have failed to appreciate that the underlying romantic dimensions of identity, emotions/sentiments, and socially situated negotiations of meaning are always present and active when a subject learns about the past. Instead of approaching, however critically, these romantic components of historical learning, the enlightened

tradition has turned its back on them, pushing it out of the processes of historical enquiry, research, and pedagogical innovation. From our point of view of this project, it will be vital to recover and reclaim the role of cultural and national identities and related issues in the future development of new models for history education. It is inescapable and inevitable that the 'romantic' roots of national and cultural identity will rear their heads, be it implicitly or explicitly, in citizens' representations of history; findings from the discipline of social psychology provide ample evidence of this (Reicher & Hopkins, 2001), indicating that our self-definitions as citizens are thoroughly linked to our conceptions of our – real or invented – pasts. This is still more the case where the history at stake revolves around recent, troubled pasts related to conflict (Psaltis, Carretero & Čehajić-Clancy, 2017). One of the reasons put forward by the enlightened tradition for disregarding the influence of identity on the learning of history was the risk that it, alongside the influence of collective memory, might distort people's ideas of history and block a critical view of the past. This has indeed been the case over many decades of history education. We propose to resolve the dilemma by addressing, rather than avoiding, the influence of deep-rooted identities, and specifically the type of identities involved. As defined in our previous work (Carretero, 2018b; Carretero & van Alphen, 2018), if we look to develop an 'ironic', rather than an essentialist, social identity within history education, we can make room for romantic objectives without their gaining absolute validity and authority. Attaining, or even progressing toward, this state of affairs will require substantial additional research on both an empirical and a theoretical basis.

'Whose history?' Bridging the gaps between multiple sources of history in education: Collective memories, processes of silencing, and historical controversies

The significant upsurge in history education research which we have seen in recent years has taken its cue from an awareness that the learning of history does not occur in a vacuum, but rather in social and societal contexts, many of which are subject to contestation or conflict, both in divided, post-conflict, and transitional societies and in well-established societies such as the US (Epstein, 2009: Wineburg, 2018b) and various countries in the EU (Perikleous, 2011). In this context, we might perceive a degree of tautology in the relatively newly coined term 'difficult histories' (Bermudez & Epstein, 2020; Gross & Terra, 2020; Rose, 2016) due to the fact that difficult and violent periods are virtually ubiquitous in nations' pasts. Much history education research concerns itself with the values of citizenship, social justice, and reconciliation (Carretero, 2017b Carretero, Haste & Bermudez, 2015; Perez-Manjarrez & Carretero, 2021; Psaltis, Carretero & Čehajić-Clancy, 2017), seeking to identify ways forward for rethinking the definition and use of historical concepts and the structure and validation of official historical narratives and critiquing the preoccupation with reproducing traditional canons that remain at the heart of much conventional history teaching and learning

(Carretero, Berger & Grever, 2017; Elmersjö, Clark, & Vinterek, 2017). The present proposal falls into this broad group, with its emphasis on engaging with historical controversies and, on the basis of active reconciliatory, dialogical, and prosocial practices, incorporating into the school history curriculum issues around traumatic pasts, post-conflict problems, postcolonial heritages, and historic burdens for racialized communities (Ahonen, 2014; Cooper & Nichol, 2015; Epstein & Peck, 2017; Perikleous & Shemilt, 2011).

An important breakthrough in this respect, precipitated by and amid the profound societal changes of recent decades, has been the tearing down of the frontier between 'history with a capital H', as elaborated by historians, and the 'other stories', the products of oral history and collective memory. These new studies have challenged the idea of a one-sided history and advocated a multiperspective approach to the past. Their agenda is a response to the struggle of emergent political actors from diverse ethnic, religious, and cultural backgrounds for recognition as part of their nations, for the restoration of their historical rights, and for the rightful place of their stories within official national histories. The communities engaged in these struggles include African Americans in the US (Epstein, 2009), North Africans in France (Tutiaux-Guillon, 2017), and Muslim populations across Europe. Concomitant to these minorities' claims, we have heard increasing calls for historical reparation and justice, conflict resolution, reconciliation, and, ultimately, for a coming to terms with troubled pasts which still drive reciprocal negative perceptions and conflictual relationships between particular communities and countries (Cajani, Lässig & Repoussi, 2019; Epstein & Shiller, 2015; Sant, 2019).

Research on social psychology and collective memory has stressed the importance of perceptions of history to the emergence of national identity (Reicher & Hopkins, 2001). The content of collective memory (Halbwachs, 1925/1992; Psaltis, Carretero & Čehajić-Clancy, 2017), transmitted from one generation to another, is a set of collective constructs that, acting within a given society, define rights and obligations, legitimize political consensus, and determine 'right' and 'wrong' individual and collective actions in accordance with past historical experience (Sibley et al., 2008; Paez et al., 2017). These findings are consistent with theories of social identity and cognition which postulate that people who define themselves in terms of their membership of a specific group are motivated to evaluate that group positively. This national identification serves as a link between individual self-esteem and collective in-group esteem and establishes a cultural continuity between past and present (Carretero, 2011; Carretero, 2017b). The result is generally a simplified understanding of history that is skewed favorably toward one's national group and tends toward exclusion of the 'other' (Barreiro, Wainryb & Carretero, 2016, 2017). Parallel empirical cognitive studies in Spain and Argentina (Carretero & van Alphen, 2014; Lopez, Carretero & Rodriguez-Moneo, 2014a) have found identification of individuals with their own national group to be a firmly rooted dimension of the historical master narratives around the attainment of national independence espoused by high school and university

students. Research has likewise found the exclusion of an antagonist group – the indigenous people in the case of Argentina (Carretero & Kriger, 2011) and the Arabs in the case of Spain (Lopez, Carretero & Rodriguez-Moneo, 2014b) – as a feature of this conception of history. These 'romantic' and essentialist narratives, then, appear to remain active and virulent despite the influence of the 'enlightened' paradigm in formal learning. A number of studies explore the genesis of group-based emotions, such as collective guilt and shame, in response to histories of colonialism, slavery, and genocide, and the impact of such historical events on attitudes toward intergroup relations. Other work has instead examined the group-based emotions expressed by victims/survivors of abuses and atrocities and the attitudes toward intergroup relations among these groups (cf., for example, Psaltis, Carretero & Čehajić-Clancy, 2017).

This brief overview of history education research in its current state, as a discipline foundationally engaged with the current state of the world, demonstrates its responsiveness to historical flows and social change and its fundamentally dialogical approach to the various conceptions of history learning it espouses, of which the most crucial for our case are historical thinking, historical consciousness, and historical culture. We note and welcome the rising currency in history education studies of the influence of collective memories on the process of learning history. We must, however, raise some caveats and criticisms. First, we should be aware that most studies to date are descriptive in nature, focusing on processes of cultural production without considering the ways in which students and citizens consume and assimilate these products. Their principal objects of research are artifacts – textbooks and related cultural products, such as curricula and museums. Some include analysis of citizens' views, largely applying a methodology based on questionnaires about attitudes toward specific historical events and their protagonists. This type of work has the advantage of providing data based on large samples from different parts of the world. Their limitation consists in their lack of detailed consideration of people's engagement with complex historical processes. In other words, we need research on the process to go alongside the existing work on the product. A key point of focus in this regard should be the central, unresolved question of how collective memories could change. Such change might be a daunting prospect, seeming as it does to require an intervention in the processes of internalization and assimilation which mediate between individual and collective memories. It is a plausible prospect that dialogical processes might play an essential role here.

It is of interest to note in this context the two shared features of all the 'difficult histories' behind historical controversies: as one of us has explicated elsewhere (Carretero, 2017b), they are recent, and they are national in character and scale. As a matter of fact, on the basis of research our team has undertaken over the last decade (Carretero, 2018a, 2018b; Carretero & Perez-Manjarrez, 2019), we have set out a specific theoretical proposal drawing on the idea of an approach to learning whose focal moment is the

deconstruction of master narratives. Our work has identified six fundamental dimensions of master narratives as follows: a) an essentialist definition of the national historical subject; b) identification with this 'invented' subject; c) the presence of mythical characters; d) a simplified causal plot, in terms of a search for either freedom or territory; e) the influence of a moral vector; and f) an essentialist concept of the nation and its nationals. One of the most frequently arising challenges with the de-construction of master narratives is the difficulties citizens face in identifying and reflecting upon, to the end of 'neutralizing' the effect of, the cultural and historical conflicts which underlie processes of silencing and exclusion in the narratives' formation (Barreiro, Wainryb & Carretero, 2016, 2017). With this in mind, we would wish to direct our theoretical and empirical attention to cultural productions which might support this problematic process.

Polyphonic history education and dialogic practices

Since the advent of seminal initiatives in the area of history didactics in the UK and Germany during the 1970s and 1980s, multi-perspectivity has held the status of a key concept in the development of historical thinking in young people (Ahonen, 2014; Stradling, 2003). Having fallen somewhat out of the limelight for some years, it regained notice in the field when, in 2003, the Council of Europe (CE) released a comprehensive guidebook, compiled by Robert Stradling, which delineated the broad characteristics of multi-perspectivity as a disposition toward viewing historical events and figures, and the development of history, societies, and cultures from the various, divergent perspectives of those involved.

The CE (2001) has emphasized that multi-perspectivity is incomplete if it does not grow through dialogue and open debate, especially with regard to sensitive historical issues. While it is difficult to understand why people thought and acted the way they did in the circumstances of a time in the past, the principle of multi-perspectivity requires that students go beyond simply identifying different perspectives and the individuals or groups holding these views, and that they likewise progress past binary representations of an issue, which are as deleterious as are single perspectives to the development of nuanced or contradictory moral assessments; a switch in the depiction of a particular historical figure from being 'guilty' to being a 'victim' does not necessarily imply the consideration of several perspectives (Perez-Manjarrez, 2017). In contexts where historical events have unfolded under the influence of two opposing positions, the consideration of 'the other view' does not necessarily occasion a significant shift in historical understanding (cf. McCaffery & Hansson, 2011, on the case of Northern Ireland). Various studies examining recent troubled pasts have highlighted that multi-perspectivity needs dialogue and debate, alongside cognitive ability and learning, if those engaging with the approach are to attain significant understanding of others' views, stories, and sensitivities (Perez-Manjarrez, 2023).

Small numbers of recent studies in history education have the underlying aim of promoting historical multi-perspectivity and societal understanding by broadening the scope of narratives and interpretations around a given historical event and finding 'the truth' through the examination of contrasting evidence, to the ultimate end of discovering paths to intercultural dialogue and possible reconciliation in divided societies (Marko-Stöckl, 2010; Minkina-Milko, 2012). These studies seek to make visible socio-political topics and discussions typically silenced or excluded in history lessons, increasing students' exposure to and understanding of situations of inequality, to promote in this way their awareness of injustice, structural discrimination, and alternatives to these social relations both within and outside the school environment (Barton & McCully, 2007; Epstein & Shiller, 2015; McCully & Reilly, 2017). Some have suggested that teaching controversial issues creates opportunities for re-imagining identities and the ways people relate to the past (Hess, 2009; Hess & McAvoy, 2014, Kello, 2016) or for raising questions about the definition of historical concepts and the legitimation of historical master narratives (Perez-Manjarrez & Carretero, 2021).

This approach takes as its point of departure that analyzing conflictual events, such as the colonial legacy and present-day disputes around identity whose roots lie in past conflicts, may help young learners develop critical scrutiny (Perez-Manjarrez, 2019). The teaching of these issues and, crucially, of their critical analysis may help students to understand that disciplinary historical problems have no closed answers, pre-established and set within a definitive narrative, but rather that these problems are available to investigation and interrogation for different interpretations. The skills and values at their heart are critical thinking and intellectual autonomy. These ideas are in line with recent research (Freeman, 2015) that calls for increased opportunities for students to develop critical thinking through the introduction of a broader variety of sources and to locate the historical evidence they find in the context of general interpretations or 'frames'. In this context, recent and comprehensive reviews (Luís & Rapanta, 2020) have redefined historical reasoning as a target competency of history teaching, critiquing a simplistic view of it as pertaining only to the disciplinary assessment of primary sources, and defending the important role of argumentation and dialogical activity in the classroom. Van Boxtel & van Drie (2017) have progressed down this line of research.

This research suggests that dialogical activities aiming toward the establishment of a multi-perspective view on the past represent a worthwhile component of present and future research on history education and that the concept of dialogue should play a central role in theoretical developments around historical thinking and historical consciousness. This might prove a material didactic realization of the substance of historiography – controversies, resolved through dialogical exchange. Dialogical activities are of potential significant use in the consideration of contextual diversity (Smith, 2006), a crucial influential factor in the workings of any new model of historical thinking and consciousness *(Van Boxtel, Grever & Klein, 2016; Clark & Peck; Seixas, 2017b)*

as a potential theoretical tool for change in formal and informal history education. The marked differences in history education content on the same topics (Carretero, Jacott & López-Manjón, 2002; Lindaman & Ward, 2006) and in the historiographical approaches taken in different world regions – differences also in evidence in relation to heritage studies (Lowenthal, 2015) – remind us that the theoretical consideration of how citizens make sense of the past acquires greater validity when challenged by a diversity of contexts.

Notwithstanding the initial progress in this direction outlined above, we need, in our view, an emphatically greater degree of systematic development in terms of empirical studies alongside, crucially, further theoretical elaboration within an interdisciplinary context. This is one of this book's leitmotifs. In addition to this, we should also consider that most extant studies have been conducted in the enlightened tradition, which implies a strictly rational and analytical manner of proceeding, involving the identification of relevant perspectives, the reconstruction of their context of meaning, and the coordination of diverse perspectives in coherent accounts. They fail to engage with the personal-relational process of recognizing, acknowledging, and making sense of divergent perspectives and incorporating them into one's understanding of a historical event.

The need of interdiscipline and structure of this book

This book is divided into three parts: theoretical debates on the challenges and opportunities of dialogue in history education; practical applications of dialogue in the classroom; and the impact of technological advances on teaching and learning dialogue and history. These sections present three main discussions, allowing us to consider the role of dialogue in history education from global perspectives and from three key dimensions: socio-cultural, psychological, and digital. All of them have an enormous importance on educational issues in general, and more specifically in the case of history education, because education is a complex phenomenon which is affected by individual, social, and political issues. This is the reason to include contributions from several disciplines in this book.

In the first part, titled Dialogue on rival and silenced stories, Bar-Tal, Adwan, Psaltis, and their colleagues, as well as Dozono, introduce the audience to essential theoretical discussions about dialogue, history, and education. Their work also makes it possible to approach dialogue from different disciplines and fields, including historiography, memory studies, social psychology, education, didactics, and critical race theory. These authors allow exploration of the theoretical debates and proposals around the difficulties and possibilities of fostering dialogue at different levels in society: from the analysis of the structural conditions of power, the difficulties of intractable conflicts within societies, the overlooking of students with disadvantaged backgrounds, to the contradictions between the production and implementation of pedagogical materials in the history classroom. The work of these

authors also helps to understand the implications of these debates on students' learning and on the advancement of history education based on dialogue.

In Chapter 1, Bar-Tal provides a critical analysis of the historical representations found in school history textbooks. While these materials are created through a careful examination of sources and the application of research methods, the way they are used and understood is influenced by structural conditions. Bar-Tal demonstrates how in totalitarian states, societies in deep sociopolitical conflict, and even in some democracies like Hungary or Turkey, academic freedom is limited, and certain historical findings are censored. In these contexts, history textbooks often present selective, biased, and hegemonic narratives that aim to instill the regime's ideology in the younger generation. These narratives, conclude the author, serve to justify the regime's structures and values, becoming ingrained in the societal belief system and shaping collective identity.

Adwan presents an in-depth analysis of the above-mentioned issue in Chapter 2, embedded himself in a moment of extreme turmoil in Palestine. Using the case of the Israeli occupation of Palestinian territories, he shows how macro- and micro-conditions of individuals – from biased historical narratives to beliefs, perceptions, and myths – contribute to the distrust and hostility among societies. The author goes beyond discussing the conflict and introduces the innovative dialogic initiative of the Peace Research Institute in the Middle East (PRIME). Established in 1998, PRIME follows a bottom-up peacebuilding approach by facilitating dialogue and mutual understanding. Adwan demonstrates how PRIME, starting with 12 school teachers working in mixed groups, provided recommendations for revising and using schoolbooks to promote peace and understanding. He describes the collaborative process of developing this dialogic initiative as challenging, yet worth exploring for its theoretical and practical implications.

Psaltis, Onurkan-Samani, Kyprianou, and Samani drive on the same lane and discuss the historical conflict between Greek-Cypriots and Turkish-Cypriots in Chapter 3. They explore the possibilities for dialogue in societies experiencing conflict, drawing from social psychology and political science. Their chapter focuses on the Cyprus Peace and Dialogue Centre (CPDC) initiated in 2021. The CPDC, leveraging expertise in political peace processes, history education, and grassroots peacebuilding, emphasizes policy, grassroots dialogue, cultural reconciliation, cross-community civil society networking, and economy and commerce. Their strategy includes promoting historical dialogue in a bicommunal manner and providing platforms for exchanging diverse accounts of conflict experiences. Despite initial resistance, the authors discuss how the CPDC's efforts have helped deconstruct ethno-nationalist identities, address biases, and promote healing and reconciliation.

Finally, in Chapter 4, Dozono delves into a deeper and more critical examination of dialogue from decolonial, queer, feminist, and critical race theory perspectives. The author reflects on the challenges of historical dialogue and

its education, focusing on the production of history. The chapter discusses the difficulties posed by archival silence, shifting the focus from the failure of marginalized groups to document their voices to the methodological shortcomings of the discipline. Dozono explores how scholars address archival silences and how these approaches can be used in classrooms. Dozono also offers ideas on how teachers can encourage historical inquiry despite such silences, drawing from their experience as a queer Japanese American educator in New York City. The chapter concludes by emphasizing that historical silences prompt different forms of inquiry, fostering dialogue about historical production, marginalization, and new interdisciplinary collaborations.

The second part of the book, titled *Dialogical Activities in the Classroom*, presents recent pedagogical initiatives for promoting dialogue during history lessons. van Boxtel and van Drie, Freedman, and colleagues, and Wagner and colleagues explore various dialogue-into-practice initiatives, along with serious state-of-the art research reviews that allow finding learning keys to successfully incorporating dialogue into history education. These initiatives aim to help students learn history by debating, arguing, and considering contrasting views on specific historical events. The chapters also address the role of teachers in facilitating dialogue and promoting historical understanding among students. Overall, this second part of the book pieces together the possibilities of fostering historical learning through dialogic practices in the classroom.

In Chapter 5, van Boxtel and van Drie provide a comprehensive overview of the latest studies and research on dialogue in history education. The authors use the term 'educational dialogue' to describe dialogue organized to support learning, emphasizing its specific features relevant to education. The authors point out that there has been an increase in studies analyzing dialogue aimed at learning history over the past decade. This research examines the theories and frameworks used, the focus of the analyses, and the resulting insights. The review explores how these conceptualizations appear in studies on dialogue in history classrooms, analyzing shared historical inquiry where students and teachers engage in historical thinking, reasoning, and argumentation. While this approach emphasizes collective historical inquiry, it often underrepresents the sociocultural dimensions. The chapter aims to discuss research on dialogue as shared historical inquiry, its underlying theories, and productive dialogue assumptions, offering examples of dialogue analysis and highlighting its benefits and limitations. The authors suggest enriching the dialogue-as-historical-inquiry approach by considering broader sociocultural contexts, multiple perspectives, and integrating analysis of complex historical sources.

On a same note, in Chapter 6, Rapanta, Pereira, and Macagno discuss how students engage in argumentation during history discussions. The authors believe that argument-based teaching helps students develop cognitive, metacognitive, and epistemological skills through dialogue. They aim to highlight the important theoretical and practical aspects of teaching argumentation to history teachers, emphasizing the creation and evaluation of arguments as well as the process of argumentation. According to the authors, involving

students in historical practices means helping them choose, analyze, and evaluate sources to form evidence-based arguments. While argument-based teaching improves historical reasoning and is recommended for classroom discussions, it must be carefully implemented to handle conflicting narratives and ensure that arguments are based on evidence. They also note that understanding the pedagogical content knowledge of argumentation in history is still a developing area despite its benefits.

In Chapter 7, Freedman addresses a highly relevant question: *How can educators promote more student–student dialogue in their classrooms?* To answer this question, he looks at changes in classroom discussion, focusing on the teacher's role, and examines how the type of issue being discussed (empirical or moral/political) and students' personal involvement (low or high) impact the conversation. He suggests that educators should be attentive to opportunities when dialogue naturally arises. His research indicates that moral and political topics and issues related to students' identities are more likely to prompt dialogue. Despite the current trend to avoid controversial topics, these discussions have the potential to stimulate lively debate and critical thinking, which are essential for understanding complex historical and social matters. Visually mapping discussions can help extend and enhance dialogic discourse in classrooms.

Finally, in Chapter 8, Wagner, Wagner, and Dessingué present a design-based research study focused on exploring new dialogic perspectives for teaching history with teachers. The study critiques the dominance of monologic talk by teachers in classroom interactions and the low quality of dialogic practices. The authors argue for the importance of teacher professional development (TPD) programs in promoting more effective dialogic teaching. They examined changes in two social studies classes after a one-year TPD program aimed at encouraging dialogic practices. The findings show an increase in dialogic practices and students' awareness of their metacognitive benefits. Teachers reported positive effects on their teaching, transitioning from a teacher-centered to a student-centered approach. At the end, new questions arose from this study based on its inherent limitations.

The third and final part of the book, *Digital Media and Historical Dialogue*, is dedicated to analyzing dialogic strategies for teaching and learning history using digital means. Van Nieuwenhuyse, Perez-Manjarrez and Dawes Duraisingh, and Carretero, Cantabrana, and Barreiro explore the potential of integrating digital media into dialogic strategies to help students make sense of the past. The authors argue that the growing role of digital media in students' lives makes it essential to incorporate it into the learning process. Their work demonstrates the significant role of digital platforms, apps, and media in facilitating dialogue scenarios for students that align with their needs and experiences as young learners. However, these advantages do not come without challenges. The integration of digital media faces obstacles such as biased historical narratives in digital environments, teachers' reluctance, and students' disengagement with 'formal,' educational digital media. The civic implications of using digital media for historical dialogue are also discussed.

In Chapter 9, Van Nieuwenhuyse addresses the problematics of teaching religious diversity in Belgium and explores young Belgian students' perceptions of it. He suggests an innovative learning strategy using 'docutubes'. The author believes that digital storytelling can effectively engage young people by combining connectedness, autonomy, and digital competence. The proposed methodology involves young people creating short documentary-style videos, called 'docutubes', to critically engage with religious diversity in both historical and contemporary contexts. Van Nieuwenhuyse presents the results of this methodology, which has been tested in eight European countries, and concludes that the docutube approach has effectively motivated participants, but there is still work to be done in fostering a deeper historical understanding.

From another perspective, in Chapter 10, Carretero, Cantabrana, and Barreiro explore the impact of debating documentaries on students' learning of controversial history in Argentina. The authors highlight the need for a method of approaching the past that promotes critical perspectives while also recognizing the importance of social identities in understanding history. They focus on the teaching of the 'Malvinas War' (or South Atlantic conflict) and discuss dialogical teaching based on the examination of documentaries showing different perspectives of this event. They argue that this approach can facilitate meaningful exchanges of ideas in the classroom, identify various perspectives, and construct reflective knowledge about the past. By analyzing the impact of Lola Arias' documentary theater and dialogic controversies on 66 students from Buenos Aires, Argentina, the authors found that students were able to engage in the analysis of the war's complexities. However, they also observed challenges in the limitations of dialogue and debating controversies.

Finally, in Chapter 11, Perez-Manjarrez and Dawes Duraisingh explore the potential of intercultural historical dialogue to enhance young learners' understanding of history. Through an innovative, student-centered study, dialogue is examined based on the analysis of students' interactions during an online learning experience called 'Remembering the Past?'. Students from five countries used dialogue to make connections, explore differences, and discuss historical and memory issues. The findings show that asynchronous intercultural dialogue can improve historical understanding by helping students recognize links between the past and present, broaden their understanding of history, and consider diverse perspectives. The authors also acknowledge challenges such as the unpredictability of online dialogue and the spread of inaccurate information. However, using this format proved effective in engaging students and enabling informed discussions about civic debates related to memorialization and monuments.

References

Ahonen, S. (2014). Education in post-conflict societies. *Historical Encounters: A Journal of Historical Consciousness, Historical Cultures, and History Education*, 1(1), 75–87.

Anderson, B. (1991). *Imagined communities*, revised edition. London and New.

Bakhtin, M. (1986). *Speech genres and other late essays.* Austin: University of Texas.
Barreiro, A., Wainryb, C., & Carretero, M. (2016) Narratives about the past and cognitive polyphasia remembering the Argentine "Conquest of the Desert". *Peace & Conflict*, 22(1), 44–51.
Barreiro, A., Wainryb, C., & Carretero, M. (2017). Power struggles in the remembering of historical intergroup conflict: hegemonic and counter-narratives about the Argentine 'Conquest of the Desert'. In C. Psaltis, M. Carretero, & S. Čehajić-Clancy (Eds.). *History teaching and conflict transformation. Social psychological theories, history teaching and reconciliation*. (pp. 125–145) Palgrave.
Barton, K.C., & McCully, A. (2007). Teaching controversial issues… where controversial issues really matter. *Teaching History*, 127, 13–19.
Berg, C., & Christou, T. (Eds.). (2020). *The Palgrave Handbook of History and Social Studies Education*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
Berger, S. (2012). De-nationalizing history teaching and nationalizing it differently. History education and the construction of national identities. In M. Carretero, M. Asensio, & M. Rodriguez-Moneo (Eds.), *History education and the construction of national identities* (pp. 33–48). Information Age Processing.
Bermudez, A., & Epstein, T. (2020). Learning about the violent past in memorial museums – Ethical reflection and history education. *Journal for the Study of Education and Development* 43(3): 503–543.
Cajani, L., Lässig, S., & Repoussi, M. (2019). *The Palgrave handbook of conflict and history education in the post-cold war era*. Palgrave, Cham: MacMillan.
Carretero, M. (2011). *Constructing patriotism: Teaching history and memories in global worlds.* Information Age Publishing.
Carretero, M. (2017a). Teaching history master narratives: Fostering imagi-nations. In M. Carretero, S. Berger, & M. Grever (Eds.), *Palgrave handbook of research in historical culture and education* (pp. 511–528). Palgrave.
Carretero, M. (2017b). The teaching of recent and violent conflicts as challenges for history education. In C. Psaltis, M. Carretero & S. Čehajić-Clancy (Eds.), *History education and conflict transformation. Social psychological theories, history teaching and reconciliation* (pp. 341–377). London: Palgrave Macmillan.
Carretero, M. (2018a). History education and the (im)possibility of imagining the future. In C. de Saint Laurent, S. Obradovic & R. Carriere (Eds.), *Imagining collective futures* (pp. 255–271). Palgrave Macmillan.
Carretero, M. (2018b). Historical consciousness and representations of national territories. What Trump's and Berlin-walls have in common? In A. Clark & C. Peck (Eds.) *Contemplating historical consciousness: Notes from the field* (pp. 76–90). Berghan Books.
Carretero, M., & Bermúdez, A. (2012). Constructing histories. In J. Valsiner (Ed.), *Oxford handbook of culture and psychology* (pp. 625–646). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Carretero, M., Castorina, J. A. & Levinas, M. L. (2013). Conceptual change and historical narratives about the nation: A theoretical and empirical approach. In S. Vosniadou (Ed.), *International handbook of research on conceptual change* (2nd ed., pp. 269–287). Routledge.
Carretero, M., Haste, H., & Bermudez, A. (2015). Civic Education. In L. Corno, & E. M. Anderman (Eds.), *Handbook of educational psychology* (3rd ed., pp. 295–308). Routledge.
Carretero, M., Jacott, L., López-Manjón, A. (2002). Learning history through textbooks: Are Mexican and Spanish students taught the same story? *Learning and Instruction*, *12*(6), 651–665.
Carretero, M., & Kriger, M. (2011). Historical representations and conflicts about indigenous people as national identities. *Culture & Psychology*, 17(2), 177–195.

Carretero, M., & Lee, P. (2014). Learning historical concepts. In K. Sawyer (Ed.), *Handbook of learning sciences* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University.
Carretero, M., & Perez-Manjarrez, E. (2019) Historical narratives and the tensions among national identities, colonialism, and citizenship, In H. Thünemann, M. Zülsdorf-Kersting, & M. Köster (Eds.), *History education research. International perspectives and research traditions* (pp. 71–88). Wochenschau Pub.
Carretero, M., Pérez Manjarrez, E. (2022). Learning history. In K. Sawyer (Ed.), *Handbook of learning sciences* (3rd ed.). Cambridge University.
Carretero, M., Pérez-Manjarrez, E., & Rodriguez Moneo, M. (2022). School historical reenactments: challenges and failures. In M. Carretero, B. Wagoner, & E. Perez-Manjarrez (Eds.), *Historical reenactment. New ways of experiencing history.* Berghahn.
Carretero, M., & Van Alphen, F. (2014). Do master narratives change among high school students? A characterization of how national history is represented. *Cognition and Instruction*, 32(3), 290–312.
Carretero, M., & Van Alphen, F. (2018). History, collective memories, or national memories? How the representation of the past is framed by master narratives. In: B. Wagoner (Ed.), *Handbook of culture and memory* (pp. 283–303). Oxford University Press.
Carretero, M. & Voss, J.F. (Eds.). (1994). *Cognitive and instructional processes in history and social sciences.* Erlbaum.
Carretero, M., Wagoner, B., & Perez-Manjarrez, E. (2022). Historical reenactment. *New Ways of Experiencing History.* Berghahn.
Clark, A. & Peck, C. (Eds.). (2019). *Contemplating historical consciousness: Notes from the field*. Bergham Books.
Cooper, H., & Nichol, J. (Eds.). (2015). *Identity, trauma, sensitive and controversial issues in the teaching of history.* Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
Council of Europe (2001). Recommendations of the Committee of Ministers to member states on history teaching in twenty-first century Europe (see https://wcd.coe.int/ViewDoc.jsp?id=234237).
De Groot, J. (2016). *Consuming history: Historians and heritage in contemporary popular culture.* Routledge.
Dessingué, A. (2020). Developing Critical Historical Consciousness: Re-thinking the Dynamics between History and Memory in History Education. *Nordidactica – Journal of Humanities and Social Science Education*, 1, 1–17.
Dickinson, A. K., Lee, P. J., & Rogers, P. J. (1984). *Learning history.* Heinemann Educational Publishers.
Elmersjö, H. Å., Clark, A., & Vinterek, M. (2017). International Perspectives on Teaching Rival Histories. In H. A. Elmersjö, A. Clark, & M. Vinterek. *International Perspectives on Teaching Rival Histories Pedagogical responses to contested narratives and the history wars.* Palgrave Macmillan.
Epstein, T. (2009). *Interpreting national history: Race, identity, and pedagogy in classrooms and communities.* Routledge.
Epstein, T., & Peck, C. (Eds.) (2017). *Teaching and learning difficult histories in international contexts: A critical sociocultural approach.* Routledge.
Epstein, T., & Shiller, J. (2015). Race, gender, and the teaching and learning of national history. In W. Parker (Ed.), *Social studies today: Research and practice* (2nd ed., pp. 123–129). Routledge.
Ferro, M. (1984). *The use and abuse of history: How the past is taught to children.* Routledge.
Freeman, E. (2015). "What Happened Needs to Be Told": Fostering critical historical reasoning in the classroom. *Cognition and Instruction*, 33(4), 357–398.
Gross, M. H., & Terra, L. (Eds.). (2020). *Teaching and learning the difficult past.* Routledge.

Halbwachs, M. (1992). *On collective memory*. University of Chicago Press.
Hess, D. E. (2009). *Controversy in the classroom: The democratic power of discussion*. Routledge.
Hess, D. E., & McAvoy, P. (2014). *The political classroom: Evidence and ethics in democratic education*. Routledge.
Hobsbawm, E. J. (2012). *Nations and nationalism since 1780: Programme, myth, reality*. Cambridge University Press.
Kello, K. (2016). Sensitive and controversial issues in the classroom: Teaching history in a divided society. *Teachers and Teaching*, 22(1), 35–53.
Köster, M. Thunemann, H. & Zülsdorf-Kersting, M. (Eds.). (2019). *Researching history education*. Schwalbach/Ts.
Lindaman, D., & Ward, K. (2006). *History lessons: How textbooks from around the world portray US history*. The New Press.
Lopez, C., Carretero, M., & Rodriguez-Moneo, M. (2014a). Conquest or Reconquest? Students' Conceptions of Nation Embedded in a Historical Narrative. *Journal of the Learning Sciences*, 24(2), 252–285.
Lopez, C., Carretero, M., & Rodriguez-Moneo, M. (2014b). Telling a national narrative that is not your own. Does it enable critical historical consumption? *Culture & Psychology*, 20(4), 547–571.
Lowenthal, D. (2015). *The past is a foreign country – Revisited*. Cambridge University Press.
Luís, R., & Rapanta (2020). Towards (Re-) Defining historical reasoning competence: A review of theoretical and empirical research. *Educational Research Review*. 31, 100336.
Marko-Stöckl, E. (2010). My Truth, Your Truth—Our Truth? The Role of History Teaching and Truth Commissions for Reconciliation in Former Yugoslavia. *European Yearbook of Minority Issues*, 7(8), 327–352.
Mccaffery, N., & Hansson, U. (2011). *The troubles aren't history yet: Young people's understanding of the past*.
McCully, A., & Reilly, J. (2017). History teaching to promote positive community relations in Northern Ireland: Tensions between pedagogy, social psychological theory and professional practice in two recent projects. In C. Psaltis, M. Carretero & S. Ćehajić-Clancy (Eds.), *History education and conflict transformation. Social psychological theories, history teaching and reconciliation* (pp. 301–320). Palgrave Macmillan.
McGrew, S., Breakstone, J., Ortega, T., Smith, M., & Wineburg, S. (2018). Can students evaluate online sources? Learning from assessments of civic online reasoning. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, 46(2), 165–193.
Metzger, S. A., & Harris, L. M. A. (2018). *The Wiley international handbook of history teaching and learning*. John Wiley & Sons.
Minkina-Milko, T. (2012). Teaching and learning history for strengthening reconciliation and the peace-building process: Experience of the Council of Europe. In *Rethinking Education for Social Cohesion* (pp. 232–243).
Monte-Sano, C. (2016). Argumentation in history classrooms: A key path to understanding the discipline and preparing citizens. *Theory into Practice*, 55(4), 311–319.
Nokes, J. (2017). Historical reading and writing in secondary school classrooms. In M. Carretero, S. Berger & M. Grever (Eds.), *Palgrave handbook of research in historical culture and education* (pp. 553–571). Palgrave Macmillan.
Nordgren, K. (2016). How to do things with history: Use of history as a link between historical consciousness and historical culture. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, 44(4), 479–504.
Paez, D., Bobowik, M., & Liu, J. (2017). Social representations of the past and competences in history education. In M. Carretero, S. Berger & M. Grever (eds.) *Palgrave handbook of research in historical culture and education* (491–510), Palgrave.

Perez-Manjarrez, E. (2017). History on trial. The role of moral judgment in the explanation of controversial history. *History Education Research Journal*, 14(2), 40–56.
Perez-Manjarrez, E. (2019). Facing history: Positioning and identity negotiation in adolescents' narratives of controversial history. *Qualitative Psychology*, 6(1), 61–77. https://doi.org/10.1037/qup0000107
Perez-Manjarrez, E., & Carretero, M. (2021). Key aspects of citizenship and the intersections with history. In M. Grever (Ed.), *Bloomsbury history: Theory and method*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
Perez-Manjarrez, E. (2022), 'It Isn't About Who Was Worse': Colonialism and historical debate on Social Media. In M. Carretero, M. Cantabrana & C. Parellada (Eds.) *History education in the digital age* (pp. 125–138), Gewerbestrasse: Springer. ISBN 978-3-031-10742-9. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-10743-6
Perez-Manjarrez, E. (2023), 'Beyond two-sided stories.' Multi-perspectivity in history and civic learning. In H. Haste & J. Bempechat (Eds.), *New civics, new citizens: Critical, competent and responsible agents* (pp. 284–296). Leiden: Brill. ISBN: 978-90-04-5383-6. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004538320
Perikleous, L., & Shemilt, D. (2011). *The future of the past why history education matters*, Nicosia: AHDR.
Perrillo, J. (2018). Once again Texas. *Washington Post*. September, 21.
Psaltis, C., Carretero, M., & Čehajić-Clancy, S. (Eds) (2017). *History education and conflict transformation. Social psychological theories, history teaching and reconciliation*. Palgrave Macmillan.
Reicher, S., & Hopkins, N. (2001). *Self and Nation*. Sage.
Reisman, A., & Wineburg, S. (2012). Text complexity in the history classroom: Teaching to and beyond the common core. *Social Studies Review*, 51(1), 24–29.
Rose, J. (2016). *Interpreting difficult history at museums and historic sites* (Vol. 7). Rowman & Littlefield.
Rüsen, J. (2005). *History*. New York: Berghahn Books.
Sant, E. (2019). National myths and democratic history education: secondary students' discursive construction of Catalan nationhood. *Pedagogy, Culture & Society*, 1–19.
Santiago, M. (2017). Erasing differences for the sake of inclusion: How Mexican/Mexican American students construct historical narratives. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, 45(1), 43–74.
Seixas, P. (Ed.). (2004). *Theorizing historical consciousness*. Toronto University Press.
Seixas, P. (2017a). A model of historical thinking. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 49(6), 593–605.
Seixas, P. (2017b). Historical consciousness and historical thinking. In M. Carretero, S. Berger & M. Grever (Eds.), *Palgrave handbook of research in historical culture and education* (pp. 59–72). Palgrave Macmillan.
Seixas, P., & Morton, T. (2013) *The big six. Historical thinking concepts*. Nelson.
Sibley, C. G., Liu, J. H., Duckitt, J., & Khan, S. S. (2008). Social representations of history and the legitimation of social inequality: The form and function of historical negation. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *38*(3), 542–565.
Smith, L. (2006). *Uses of heritage*. Routledge.
Stradling, R. (2003). *Multi-perspectivity in history teaching: A guide for teachers*. Council of Europe.
Todorov, T. (1999). *The conquest of America: The question of the other*. University of Oklahoma Press.
Thorp, R. & Persson, A. (2020) On historical thinking and the history educational challenge. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, (52)8, 891–901.
Tutiaux-Guillon, N. (2017). History in French secondary school: a tale of progress and universalism or a narrative of present society?. In M. Carretero, S. Berger & M. Grever (eds.) *Palgrave handbook of research in historical culture and education*, (275–294), Palgrave.

Van Alphen, F. & Carretero, M. (2015). The construction of the relation between national past and present in the appropriation of historical master narratives. *Integrative Psychological and Behavioral Science*, 49(3), 512–530.

Van Boxtel, C., & van Drie, J. (2017). Engaging students in historical reasoning: The need for dialogic history education. In M. Carretero, S. Berger & M. Grever (Eds.), *Palgrave handbook of research in historical culture and education* (pp. 573–589). Palgrave Macmillan.

Van Boxtel, C., Grever, M. & Klein, S. (2016) (Eds.). *Sensitive pasts: Questioning heritage in education*. Berghahn Books.

Wertsch, J. V. (2018). National memory and where to find it. In B. Wagoner (Ed.), *Cambridge Handbook of culture and memory* (pp. 259–282). Cambridge University Press.

Wineburg, S. (2001). *Historical thinking and other unnatural acts*. Temple University Press.

Wineburg, S. (2018a). *Why Learn History (When It's Already on Your Phone)*. University of Chicago Press.

Wineburg, S. (2018b). Afterword: What's difficult about difficult history? In M.H. Gross & L. Terra (eds.) *Teaching and Learning the Difficult Past* (pp. 290–292). Routledge.

Wineburg, S., Martin, D., & Monte-Sano, C. (2011). *Reading like a historian*. Teachers College.