



International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance (Ed.)

# Research in Teaching and Learning about the Holocaust

## A Dialogue Beyond Borders

Edited by Monique Eckmann, Doyle Stevick  
and Jolanta Ambrosewicz-Jacobs



METROPOL

## **Research in Teaching and Learning about the Holocaust**

**IHRA series, vol. 3**

**International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance (Ed.)**

**Research in Teaching and Learning  
about the Holocaust  
A Dialogue Beyond Borders**

Edited by Monique Eckmann, Doyle Stevick  
and Jolanta Ambrosewicz-Jacobs



METROPOL

The Editorial board would like to thank  
the members of the IHRA Steering Committee on Education Research:

Debórah Dwork

Wolf Kaiser

Eyal Kaminka

Paul Salmons

Cecilie Stokholm Banke,

as well as

Stéphanie Fretz for the editorial coordination.

ISBN: 978-3-86331-326-5

© 2017 Metropol Verlag + IHRA

Ansbacher Straße 70

10777 Berlin

[www.metropol-verlag.de](http://www.metropol-verlag.de)

Alle Rechte vorbehalten

Druck: buchdruckerei.de, Berlin

# Content

<b>Declaration of the Stockholm International Forum on the Holocaust</b> .....	<b>9</b>
<b>About the IHRA</b> .....	<b>11</b>
<b>Preface</b> .....	<b>13</b>
<i>Ambassador Mihnea Constantinescu, IHRA Chair</i>	
<b>Foreword by the Editorial Board</b> .....	<b>15</b>
<i>Monique Eckmann, Doyle Stevick, Jolanta Ambrosewicz-Jacobs</i>	
<b>General Introduction</b> .....	<b>17</b>
<i>Monique Eckmann and Doyle Stevick</i>	
 <b>SECTION I</b>	
<b>Language-Region Studies on Research in Teaching and Learning about the Holocaust</b> .....	<b>33</b>
<b>Introduction</b> .....	<b>35</b>
<i>Monique Eckmann and Oscar Österberg</i>	
<b>Chapter 1: Research in German</b> .....	<b>37</b>
<i>Magdalena H. Gross</i>	
<b>Chapter 2: Research in Polish</b> .....	<b>55</b>
<i>Monique Eckmann</i>	
<b>Chapter 3: Research in Francophone Regions</b> .....	<b>67</b>
<i>Oscar Österberg</i>	
<b>Chapter 4: Research in Nordic Countries</b> .....	<b>85</b>

*Marta Simó*

<b>Chapter 5: Research in Romance Languages: Latin America, Spain, Portugal and Italy</b>	<b>103</b>
---	------------

*Mikhail Tyaglyy*

<b>Chapter 6: Research in the East-Slavic Linguistic Region</b>	<b>121</b>
---	------------

*Doyle Stevick*

<b>Chapter 7: Research in English</b>	<b>153</b>
---------------------------------------	------------

*Zehavit Gross*

<b>Chapter 8: Research in Hebrew</b>	<b>169</b>
--------------------------------------	------------

## **SECTION II**

<b>Thematic Studies on Research in Teaching and Learning about the Holocaust</b>	<b>187</b>
--	------------

<b>Introduction</b>	<b>189</b>
---------------------	------------

*Doyle Stevick*

<b>Chapter 9: Teaching the Holocaust</b>	<b>191</b>
--	------------

*Marta Simó, Doyle Stevick and Magdalena H. Gross*

<b>Chapter 10: Students Learning about the Holocaust</b>	<b>223</b>
--	------------

*Oscar Österberg*

<b>Chapter 11: Visits and Study Trips to Holocaust-Related Memorial Sites and Museums</b>	<b>247</b>
---	------------

*Monique Eckmann and Magdalena H. Gross*

<b>Chapter 12: Intergroup Encounters in the Context of Teaching and Learning about the Holocaust</b>	<b>273</b>
--	------------

*Monique Eckmann and Doyle Stevick*

<b>General Conclusions</b>	<b>285</b>
----------------------------	------------

### **SECTION III**

<b>Language Bibliographies</b> .....	<b>301</b>
<b>Introduction</b> .....	<b>303</b>
<b>German-Language Bibliography</b> .....	<b>305</b>
<b>Polish-Language Bibliography and Anglophone Literature about Poland</b> .....	<b>325</b>
<b>French-Language Bibliography</b> .....	<b>333</b>
<b>Nordic-Languages Bibliography and Anglophone Literature about (or from) Nordic Countries</b> .....	<b>341</b>
<b>Romance-Languages Bibliography</b> .....	<b>347</b>
<b>East-Slavic Regional Languages Bibliography (in Belarusian, Russian and Ukrainian)</b> .....	<b>357</b>
<b>English-Language Bibliography</b> .....	<b>367</b>
<b>Hebrew Bibliography</b> .....	<b>387</b>
<b>Authors</b> .....	<b>395</b>
<b>Multi-Year Work Plan: Education Research Report Executive Summary</b> .....	<b>399</b>



Monique Eckmann and Doyle Stevick

## **General Introduction**

### **1. The Purpose of the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance's Education Research Project**

In the fifteen years since the founding of the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance (IHRA), the field of teaching and learning about the Holocaust (TLH) has progressively expanded and been professionalized, institutionalized and globalized. Professionalization has a double meaning: first, educators, who during the starting phase are often volunteers, become professionals; second, the settings of teaching and learning become progressively professionalized and the subject is incorporated into formal school programs through inclusion in the curricula and increasingly also in teacher-training institutions or universities' faculties of education. In many countries, initiatives begun by NGOs have been completed through state involvement, and the Holocaust has been progressively included in official curricula.

This means that many countries have experienced a shift from bottom-up civil society efforts to state commitment, which can involve mainstreaming or top-down action. This change has created a paradigm shift for educators in most IHRA countries, because they are no longer educating against the mainstream and challenging the official narrative, but are rather presenting a mainstream, official discourse. These trends have been accompanied by a rapid expansion of educational research on TLH and empirical research in the didactics of history and the social and educational sciences. Also, these developments have provided a sufficient foundation for scholars to conduct systematic reviews of research, including the excellent one by Simone Schweber (2011). But, as Schweber herself acknowledges, her review is "limited to publications in English, which regrettably excludes the works in other languages and gives it an Anglo-centric bias" (2011, p. 462).

Despite these promising developments, few links existed between the field of educational research and the IHRA Working Groups and Committees that developed educational proposals: the IHRA did not know enough about educational research, and research milieus do not know enough

about the IHRA. To address this deficit and develop a picture of this emerging field, in 2013 the IHRA decided to carry out a systematic review of the existing empirical research on TLH across Member Countries, whenever possible, as part of a Multi-Year Work Plan (MYWP). Hence, this MYWP's Education Research project aims to provide an overview of the state of research and of the knowledge produced by empirical research studies concerning TLH. The goal is to reveal what has been established by empirical research about the current state of education concerning the Holocaust, taking us beyond anecdotal experiences, moral arguments and normative and prescriptive texts in order to identify the key challenges and opportunities facing the field. This effort provides the IHRA with not only greater insight into existing practices than has previously existed, but also important insights into effective research methodologies and useful conceptual categories for future research.

A Multilingual Expert Team (MET) collected empirical research on TLH in fifteen languages and conducted a scholarly, critical review of a selection of these studies. The multilingual nature of the project is crucial because it enables both cross-cultural discussions and the transfer of knowledge between various regions and countries.

The main goals of this study are:

- to create a collection of research studies that is as complete as possible, and to make the information about these studies available to researchers and educators and the wider public;
- to provide a cross-language and international mapping of research on TLH, i.e. to overcome the above-mentioned Anglo-centric bias and reach out across a wide range of countries to examine an additional fourteen languages;
- to provide an overview of the state of research and of the knowledge produced concerning TLH; and
- to foster dialogue between researchers, educators and educational policymakers.

This study is an innovative effort: a search and review of scholarship like this across fifteen languages and spanning the globe has, to the best of our knowledge, never been attempted before, and it is precisely the task of an organization such as the IHRA to undertake such a project, which is at the core of what the IHRA hopes to foster: transnational, trans-lingual and multicultural cooperation.

## **2. The Diversity of Empirical Research on Teaching and Learning about the Holocaust**

Because this project aims to produce a critical academic synthesis of what has been investigated through publicly available empirical research on TLH, it is actually a secondary analysis or meta-analysis of existing studies, not a new research study in itself. It was decided to take into consideration all empirical studies we could locate, with a focus on recent work (particularly since the founding of the IHRA). It was also decided not to include prescriptive or normative writings, even though they are highly important. In other words, we examine studies of what is happening, rather than moral arguments about what should be happening. We found it quite fruitful to leave for once the field of prescriptive writings and look at descriptive studies, analytical work and systematic observations across narrow and broad scales.

“Empirical research” refers to studies that collect and analyze original data. We relied on the following conception of empirical studies: they are based on an explicit theoretical and methodological background, and they include a systematic and transparent approach to collecting and analyzing original data. When we speak of empirical research, we mean qualitative and quantitative studies, large- and small-scale studies and studies based on data from interviews, observations, questionnaires, documents and so on. We have focused on deliberate educational efforts, and not on broader cultural phenomena that shape perceptions of the Holocaust. The selected studies therefore address students’ and teachers’ knowledge and attitudes about the Holocaust, their interactions in the classroom and in special encounters and study trips to museums and memorial sites.

Research studies are distinct from evaluations, and they serve a different purpose. A typical evaluation tries to assess whether a specific intervention is successful in achieving its own goals. Such evaluations differ from research partly because they often do not engage with other research in the field, they are not made public and their findings do not produce transferable or general knowledge. They indicate whether a specific approach works in a given context. They have value, but they are necessarily beyond the scope of this effort.

This study is focused directly on teaching and learning. While the content of documentaries, films, curricula and textbooks is important, the exclusion of these types of materials derived from three major considerations. First, the processes of teaching and learning fall within the

specific domain of educational research. Second, particularly for English-language publications, this decision has enabled us to focus on our core concern: deliberate efforts to educate about the Holocaust. Third, we felt largely liberated from the task of reviewing research on textbooks and curricula, thanks to the excellent global study just published through the joint effort of UNESCO and the Georg Eckert Institute (Carrier et al., 2015). Their study will stand for many years to come, and rather than duplicate efforts, we find our projects to be deeply complementary.

Researchers dealing with TLH draw upon a wide range of theoretical and disciplinary backgrounds. The predominant field, known as the didactics of history—or history education or social studies methods—addresses history teaching and historical thinking and learning. Educational research scholars address the processes of learning, and social psychologists deal with issues of history and identity; they research situations in which learning about a hurtful past might be threatening for learners' identities. Researchers conduct surveys in order to measure knowledge or attitudes, and they may engage in ethnographic participant observation when investigating field trips to museums or memorial sites. In sum, they draw upon social science and educational research methods, and not the kinds of historical research that generally guide Holocaust studies.

Among the researchers dealing with TLH, there is a split between those who emerge from social science disciplines—particularly history—and those trained specifically in educational research. Much influential writing on Holocaust education has come from Holocaust historians, who have produced powerful critiques of the historical accuracy of textbooks and curricula. Expertise in educational research is not essential for such historical critiques. Historians tend to focus on issues of content; analyses and critiques of textbooks and curricula are thus relatively common in the field, and they began appearing soon after TLH emerged as an area of emphasis in educational systems. Educational researchers study the processes of teaching and learning; they may conduct studies similar to those above, but they also enter the classroom, observe instruction and teacher-student exchanges and conduct interviews with students and teachers. The field is certainly richer for this dialogue between historical experts and experts in teaching and learning.

Despite the growing volume of research on TLH, there are relatively few scholars who focus primarily or exclusively on this subject. Instead, the field has many contributions from researchers whose primary focus is a

discipline or a related subject: they research TLH because it is a case study of some other phenomenon of interest, such as globalization, controversial issues in the classroom, history didactics or museum studies. These contributions benefit the field of TLH, but we seek to create dialogue across both different languages and different disciplines.

The significant expansion of TLH research, and the growing number of young scholars who are contributing to the field, suggests that research in this field is no longer “in its infancy” (Schweber, 2011, p. 475). It still displays characteristics of fields that are early in their development. There are large gaps in documenting what is known. There is still a heavy emphasis on normative or advocacy literature. In some contexts, there are not yet many TLH practices to document. Much documentation is personal and reflective, based on experience, or simply descriptive. It contains a preponderance of qualitative research in order to document what is occurring on the ground. The field has been carried a long way by the enduring commitment of a small number of dedicated scholars. It is diverse rather than standardized.

The rich variety of approaches has produced many useful insights, concepts and typologies, but the field remains largely under theorized, and many of the assumptions underlying studies remain implicit rather than stated explicitly and tested against data. More expensive and complex quantitative studies that can make statistically representative claims for large populations remain relatively rare. The field remains in quite different states of development in different linguistic communities of scholars, and it lacks mature exchanges between those language communities. Despite these challenges, the trends are moving forward. The number of studies and scholars is increasing ever more quickly, suggesting that our knowledge and research will continue to grow rapidly.

### **3. Project Methodology, Steps and Products**

#### **Overview of the Main Steps**

The first step consisted in identifying and collecting publications to evaluate whether they met our criteria for empirical research about deliberate educational efforts concerning the Holocaust, particularly since 2000, and to develop bibliographies that included the research publication’s abstract

(or, if unavailable, a summary composed by members of the research team). These bibliographies with abstracts provided the basis for composing the language chapters; with the bibliographies completed and the language chapters drafted, the research team was able to begin analyzing critical themes across languages.

The first phase of selecting and reviewing research revealed dramatic differences across language contexts and made it clear that there were many possible approaches to organizing the empirical literature. One possibility was to distribute the literature into five broad “M” categories: Methods (how teaching is conducted), Materials (including textbooks, films and documentaries, etc.), Measures (quantitative studies of inputs and outcomes), Meaning and Morals (interpretive studies of how meaning is constructed and how our moral views take shape) and Memorials and Museums (sites of deliberate learning outside of schools). For several reasons discussed above, as well as the desire to go into greater depth on fewer topics, the decision was made to focus primarily on teaching and learning, the project’s core concern. The second phase was thus focused on four topics: Learning and Students; Teaching and Educators; Intergroup Encounters; and Visits to Memorial Sites and Museums Sites.

The bibliographies with abstracts provided the foundation for a grounded theory approach to the empirical research available in each language, language family or language region. On the basis of these lists, the team produced a series of language chapters, which are discussed in more detail below.

The project has three major products:

1. The individual language bibliographies with abstracts<sup>1</sup>
2. The language reports (chapters of the first section)
3. The thematic reports (chapters of the second section)

The process that guided the project is described in more detail below.

### **Locating and Abstracting Empirical Research in Each Language**

The research team devised nine strategies to locate empirical research related to Holocaust education. These strategies had quite different levels of success in each language context. In Anglophone contexts, a great deal of research is available online through electronic databases, in peer-reviewed

1 See IHRA website [www.holocaustremembrance.com](http://www.holocaustremembrance.com)

journals and through databases of theses and dissertations. Tools such as Academia.edu and Google Scholar could be useful as well, because they are building some common frames of reference, keywords (for example, Holocaust education) and indexing that facilitate searches.

In Europe, books and chapters in books continue to play a major role in academic culture, and they are often not abstracted, making it quite time-intensive to find, assess and summarize them. Personal contacts with individual scholars and research networks were quite helpful for many contexts, and researchers' physical presence made a significant difference, particularly in Ukraine and its environs.

Another challenge was that of terminology. It was not sufficient to simply apply the same search terms in multiple contexts. "Holocaust" is common in some contexts, while "Shoah" is preferred in others, for example. In addition, because TLH is often a specific case study within other research topics, such as historical learning in general or the role of memory in education, search terms focused on the Holocaust sometimes missed relevant studies. Further, titles are not necessarily transparent about whether publications are empirical or normative. These search strategies were conducted by one person or a team of two persons working in each specific language or group of languages. Of course, English is a special case, as it is the most commonly shared language among researchers. Although many studies are published in English, we found a large number of studies in languages such as German, French, Norwegian and Spanish.

In addition to focusing upon empirical research, we adopted as a general cut-off point the year of the founding of the IHRA. Because most TLH does not begin before the fifth grade, a school generation of children—students between the fifth and twelfth grades—cycles through the subject every eight years. Putting aside the typical delay between the gathering of data and the publication of results, the period between 1999 and 2014 thus covers two full school generations of students. We made selective exceptions for notable or influential studies, but generally stayed with studies from this millennium.

Through this process, the team identified roughly 640 research publications corresponding to roughly 370 separate research studies from the following language regions (arranged according to the numbers of separate studies). Two special cases are the English list, as the *lingua franca* for TLH, and the Hebrew list, which relates to the country with the most direct personal connections to the Holocaust.

*Overview: (Approximate) Numbers of Publications and Studies*

Language/region	Research publica- tions (articles, books)	Number of separate research studies
German language	102	84
Polish language	47	40
French language	53	34
Nordic languages	36	28
Romance languages	75	19
East-Slavic languages (Russian, Belorussian, Ukrainian)	62	15
English language	200 (ca 1/3 on Anglo- phone contexts)	100 (ca 35)
Hebrew (without English publications)	59	50
Other	5	5
<b>Total</b>	<b>639</b>	<b>375</b>

The number of publications is larger than the number of studies, because some studies are addressed in multiple publications, and sometimes in multiple languages. Within these eight groupings, a variable number of studies was found. There were not as many studies in English as one might expect. In general, the numbers would increase considerably if studies of textbooks and curricula were included. In some contexts, the numbers of studies are attributable to a relatively small number of very active scholars in the field. Nevertheless, we see an emerging common discourse within each of these regions.

► The first product of this project is the set of eight bibliographies, with abstracts of summaries in English that provide a small window into studies in all fifteen languages reviewed. These bibliographies can be consulted on the IHRA website ([www.holocaustremembrance.com](http://www.holocaustremembrance.com)).



## The Language Chapters

Despite the fact that the Holocaust has a shared impact and legacy in Europe, it seemed evident that different cultures interpret that history differently, using different terms and different discourses, and that these differences extend to researchers in TLH. Our first examination and insights in the field suggested to us that the questions, concepts and methods differ even between German, French and English, and seemed certain to differ in other languages as well. Further, it seemed that most discussions of TLH take place within these language communities or regions, rather than between them. This possibility led to the decision to write chapters not on separate countries, but on specific languages, which are often shared across the national boundaries of countries with quite distinct experiences of the Second World War and the Holocaust.

Individually or in pairs, the research team members examined the lists produced and wrote language chapters in order to contextualize and to map the identified research. In some cases, the research mostly aligned with a single country, as with Polish, but even in such cases the language chapters are not country reports, nor are they comprehensive representations of a single country. Rather, we have often had to provide territorial context, because most research in a given language references a small number of specific places. German, for example, addressed activity in Germany, Austria and parts of Switzerland, while French is relevant not just in France, Switzerland and Belgium, but also in Quebec, Canada. Thus, for example, the French-language chapter does not represent a geographical region, but a space of exchange among researchers. Spanish and Portuguese, in turn, are closer to a language family that can be read and shared in both the Iberian Peninsula and Latin America. This broad linguistic range allows an exchange of ideas within a shared language community and yet across broad territories and historical and cultural differences. It is this kind of exchange that we hope to extend with these language chapters.

Indeed, the language chapters reveal great differences across the contexts in which research is embedded. Of course, their experiences of the Second World War, the National Socialist regime and the Holocaust differ deeply between countries. But their post-genocide history differs as well, particularly regarding the history of memorialization and the culture of memory, the way countries and regions deal with the difficult past and how they take responsibility. These dimensions influence the way the

Holocaust is transmitted and the ways that researchers address the activities of teaching, learning and transmitting, whether in schools, memorials or museums.

The extent of empirical research in each academic culture also varies widely and is often a product of recent history. Countries that were part of the Soviet Union, where historical inquiry was suppressed, foreign research and media were kept out, survivors were unfree to publish memoirs and Jewish Holocaust victims were labeled simply as Soviet victims, were not in the same position to address the Holocaust as countries that had been fully democratic since the war. Other countries experienced authoritarian governments after the war. And many countries had a self-image as victims, or perhaps as rescuers or saviors.

For scholars who publish in multiple languages, which is a great challenge and an important contribution, we tried to address their work in the language in which the initial research was published and in the context they are studying. Such scholars often introduce articles relating specific aspects of the same research studies into another language's research community (often into English, sometimes German or French and more rarely other languages). We considered that working from the primary languages of such studies would bring us closer to their original conceptualization and data.

The varied extent of research in each context had important implications. For an extensive literature as in English, the research team had more freedom to focus on its specific target: empirical research on TLH. In other language communities, such as Spanish, there is less focus on students and teachers, and more on educational materials such as textbooks, films and graphic novels, as well as conceptual lenses, particularly around issues of memory.

In countries where there has not yet been much TLH, the first descriptive accounts of what is happening often come from teachers who document their own practices. We thus identified what seem to be three phases accompanying the emergence of TLH in different language communities. The first consists of normative literature arguing that the Holocaust should be taught, why and often how, as well as personal accounts of one's own practice, often anecdotal, less frequently systematic. From there, we begin to see empirical studies that focus on printed materials like curricula and textbooks (which are easy to acquire and "sit still" for convenient analysis). Then we begin to see studies of classroom practices.

► The second product is a set of eight language chapters, contextualized in their regional and national backgrounds.

### **Thematic Analysis and Chapters**

The team then undertook a transversal thematic analysis in order to work out the main trends in research, the methods employed and the conclusions of the studies. These studies are of course not always comparable, given the variety of methodological approaches and contexts. The research reviews do not produce generalizations about universally valid best practices or great surprises that contradict commonly held perceptions in the field. Rather, their insights come in the form of nuances, patterns of thought, implicit assumptions, descriptions of what is occurring that fill gaps in the research and windows into how diverse societies struggle with difficult histories. They provide the basis for constructing high-quality research, and their primary contribution may lie more in providing us with questions than answers: a vast set of insightful questions and hypotheses is timeless, while the answers often change. In order to develop the lists from which articles would be selected for review, each individual who had developed a language corpus listed and selected the pieces that were particularly relevant, insightful or important in regard to the chosen themes. These suggestions were compiled into a thematic list. Those who were conducting the thematic analyses reviewed these new lists, but also read through all of the language lists to see if there were other studies that struck them as important. This means that each thematic chapter includes a mix of research studies that the authors could read on their own—which made deep, direct analysis possible—and studies for which they depended on other team members. This circumstance certainly impacted the final form of the studies, though we did our best to ameliorate this inevitable limitation through written discussions, guided inquiries and Skype discussions.

► The third output is a set of thematic analyses shaped in four thematic fields:

- Teaching the Holocaust
- Students Learning about the Holocaust
- Visits and Study Trips to Holocaust Memorials and Museums
- Intergroup Encounters in the Context of TLH

#### **4. What Can Empirical Research on Teaching and Learning about the Holocaust Tell Us?**

Scholarship on TLH is concerned with both solving practical problems and answering academic questions. The former involves issues of practice—"Which teaching methods are effective in specific countries or classrooms?"—and the latter questions that require an explanation—for example, "How do we explain the spread of TLH around the world?" and "How do we understand the reasons that TLH remains controversial in many places?" The interdisciplinary TLH research into classroom, museum and educational studies is thus conducted within two dominant research paradigms or ways of seeing and thinking about TLH. The first (positivist) paradigm is concerned with establishing causes; it addresses effectiveness, what works and what outcomes or effects certain methods or materials have. This approach aims to develop generalizable truth claims and is common in program evaluations and research intended to resolve practical issues; it often relies on quantitative data, but not exclusively. The number of large-scale quantitative studies remains small, and so therefore does our ability to make broad conclusions, which is one important reason that our ability to make confident claims or assertions about TLH in general remains quite limited.

The other paradigm—which we will call an interpretive paradigm—focuses on the goal of understanding; it explores how meaning is negotiated and constructed between diverse actors in specific cultural contexts. Qualitative and anthropological or ethnographic approaches are more common in this paradigm. At this stage in the development of TLH research, most studies fall within this interpretive paradigm. While there are still many undocumented areas in TLH research, the language chapters show that we have an increasingly good sense of what the major issues and specific challenges are across many contexts. Because TLH is neither a topic out of history nor a question out of society, it must be understood in its historical, geographical and cultural contexts. The powerful role of context in TLH is the other primary reason that it is difficult, if not impossible, to provide universal answers to practical questions about TLH.

These two paradigms are distinct but often complementary. Qualitative research can document trends in specific contexts and contribute to the development of typologies that can later be investigated statistically. And these approaches can be applied to the same issues: a positivist frame-

work might be used to investigate the impact of gender, in terms of cause and effect, while an interpretive framework could be used to investigate how the social construction of gender influences the interpretation of the Holocaust, a way of thinking centered on the construction of meaning.

The few large-scale quantitative studies, particularly from England and Sweden, enable us to make generalizations at the national level but do not tell us about other countries. Still, they allow us to ask informed questions and develop hypotheses about what may be happening in similar contexts. This ability to learn from diverse cases and transfer insights from one context to another makes it valuable to consider examples beyond our own immediate concerns and justifies the broad approach to this project. The broad range of practices occurring around the world functions as a global laboratory for TLH.

The question of how to make reasonable inferences about the transferability of insights from one context to another is more complicated. Sweden, for example, may share dynamics with other Scandinavian countries for cultural reasons, or with other ostensibly neutral countries like Spain or Switzerland for political or structural reasons. This question of transferability is therefore the key epistemological question we face when considering qualitative studies. It involves not only the researchers' claims, but also the local knowledge and informed judgment of research consumers from other contexts. This question of what can be learned from other societies becomes even more complex for countries that have a unique relationship to the Holocaust, like Israel, Germany or Poland. What might other countries learn from these cases? Some outlier, unique or exemplary cases may still shed light on other cases, however. For example, Israel is an outlier in part because its students receive about 140 hours of instruction about the Holocaust. While teachers in many countries experience tensions between approaches that emphasize individual experience and traditional instruction about historical forces, and between experiential and cognitive learning, the time available to teachers in Israel often enables them to use all these approaches and thus to find them complementary and mutually supporting.

A consistent finding in our review is that teachers and students perceive and experience TLH to be qualitatively different from other subjects and take the subject quite seriously. TLH, for example, includes historical knowledge, thinking and understanding, but also emotions and dispositions, which are largely under-researched. For these reasons, the range of studies concerning TLH is particularly broad.

The many gaps that exist in the research mean that we cannot definitively say what constitutes TLH in all IHRA Member and Observer Countries. Even attempting to define TLH at the country level can be misleading because of the deep variation in how it is addressed by different teachers in different classrooms, even within the same school. It is generally clear that what constitutes TLH in teachers' practice is highly diverse and variable, with both teachers and students reporting a lack of clarity about its purposes; students and teachers alike generally express high levels of interest and engagement, as well as high expectations, yet often experience significant discomfort and tension around the subject. Taken together, there is much more consensus about the importance of addressing the Holocaust than about "why, what and how to teach" it (see the IHRA's educational guidelines),<sup>2</sup> and about how to know if those goals have been achieved.

Research related to education about the Holocaust has been strongest with respect to the content of curricula and textbooks. The recent work of Bromley and Russell (2010) and Carrier et al. (2015) have made great contributions to providing baseline knowledge about emerging trends around the world and the contemporary status and representation of the Holocaust in the world's textbooks and curricula. We know much less about the typical use of textbooks in classrooms, or about the fidelity of implementation of TLH curricula in contexts where it may be unpopular or controversial. Furthermore, for some European countries, there may be just one or two articles about some specific aspect of TLH in English. This dearth of general knowledge makes it much more difficult both for domestic actors to assess the adequacy of TLH and make a research-based case for reform, and for international organizations to support the needs of partners in specific contexts. In sum, straightforward descriptive data on TLH are lacking in many contexts, and in each case would mark a significant contribution.

Research into TLH is largely under-theorized. Most research begins with an underlying theory about the state of some phenomenon of interest, or how some dynamic works, though these theories are often not made explicit. One reason for this deficiency is that it is more difficult to conduct research that matches the sophistication of the models or theories in use. The question of knowledge is a good example. It is relatively straightforward to ascertain whether individuals retain an individual fact; it is

2 <https://www.holocaustremembrance.com/educate/teaching-guidelines> (accessed 15 August 2016).

more difficult to analyze the understanding and interpretation of that fact. Studies such as those by Cohen (2013) and Foster et al. (2016) are examples of well-theorized studies in which conceptions of learning are sophisticated, clearly operationalized and closely linked to the data.

This project took a grounded theory approach to the literature. Grounded theory approaches seek to consider literature or data without preconceptions, allowing trends, concepts, typologies or theory to emerge. Hypothesis-driven—or theory-driven—approaches, in contrast, apply a theory or hypotheses to the data in order to test them, and theory functions as a lens through which to look at data. Both approaches to developing and testing theory make important contributions to our understanding.

Impact studies often approach TLH as if it were an inoculation, trying to assess its impact after a single exposure over a long period of time. We may be disappointed if we cannot measure the long-term impact of such a unit, but it is not clear that we should be. Alternative theories might consider such a unit a phase in a student's broader development, one in which they will encounter the Holocaust again, rather than a "one and done" phenomenon. Students may learn more in the future, may handle media representations more critically and may seek out further learning themselves. A more robust theory of lifelong exposure to the Holocaust could alleviate anxieties in the field by considering the shift in students' trajectories and openness to further learning after exposure to the subject. A shift from knowledge retention—do they know everything they should?—to a focus on critical engagement may be constructive as well.

## Looking Ahead

The bibliographies, language chapters and thematic chapters teach us a great deal about TLH, but more importantly they point to productive directions for future research. Like any good research, this process has raised more questions than it has answered, and it has revealed not just what we have learned, but the gaps in our knowledge as well. The breadth and diversity of existing research is both inspiring and incomplete.

The existing research declines to give us easy answers, and instead challenges us to explore more deeply, with new tools, better questions and new contexts. It does not provide simple recipes to follow, but rather sensitizes us to meanings, distinctions, patterns and trends that advance research and practice.

Faculties of education, cultural studies and teacher-training institutions are increasingly involved in research on education about the Holocaust, and the Working Groups of the IHRA want to intensify dialogue with them. This study provides an opportunity not only to gain essential knowledge regarding a research-informed approach in our work, but also to bring together distinct circles, and for the IHRA to create stronger links with educational science departments and universities as well as with educational policy-makers. When confronted with all the things we still do not know about TLH, it may be tempting to describe the glass as half empty, but that would be misleading. The glass, as it were, is not only half full, it is being filled, and more and more quickly. The quality and sophistication of thought in this field is excellent. Engaging with this research is a gratifying and intellectually stimulating experience. And it is becoming even richer as we bring the diverse scholars working across cultures and languages into deeper dialogue with one another.

In addition to cross-cultural and international contributions, TLH has many interdisciplinary contributions. Scholars contributing to TLH come from a wide range of conceptual and disciplinary backgrounds; although the didactics of history has a prominent place in TLH, it is one discipline among many. This diversity means that these contributors often use TLH as a case study to speak to colleagues in their specific disciplines rather than to scholars in other disciplines who address the same subject. The richness of different disciplinary contributions is thus accompanied by a structural challenge in that researchers who contribute to TLH are often not in dialogue with one another. The authors of this project hope that this book will enhance this dialogue, and that the research gathered and discussed in these pages will be helpful for researchers and educators worldwide.



## Authors

**Jolanta Ambrosewicz-Jacobs**, PhD, is Lecturer, UNESCO Chair for Education about the Holocaust, Institute of European Studies, Jagiellonian University in Krakow, Poland. She was the 2011/2012 Ina Levine Invitational Scholar at the USHMM. Her publications include *Me-Us-Them. Ethnic Prejudices and Alternative Methods of Education: The Case of Poland* (Krakow, 2003), *The Holocaust. Voices of Scholars* (Ed.) (Krakow, 2009), *Remembrance. Awareness, Responsibility* (co-editor with Krystyna Oleksy) (Oświęcim, 2008) and *Why Should We Teach about the Holocaust?* (co-editor with Leszek Hońdo) (Krakow, 2005).

**Monique Eckmann**, Sociologist, is Professor Emerita at the School for Social Work, University of Applied Sciences Western Switzerland, Geneva. She has been a member of the Swiss delegation to the IHRA since 2004. Her research areas include education against racisms and antisemitism, memory and identity and intergroup dialogue. Her recent publications are *Mémoire et pédagogie. Autour de la transmission de la destruction des Juifs d'Europe* (with Charles Heimberg) (Geneva, 2011) and "Specific Challenges for Remembrance and Education about the Holocaust in Switzerland" in IHRA et al. (Eds.). *Bystanders, Rescuers or Perpetrators? The Neutral Countries and the Shoah* (Berlin, 2016).

**Magdalena H. Gross** is an Assistant Professor of education at the University of Maryland, College Park. Her research focuses on global history education with a primary focus on Holocaust education in Poland. She has published in *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, *History of Education Quarterly*, *Intercultural Education* and elsewhere. Her work includes "Struggling to Deal with the Difficult Past: Polish Students Confront the Holocaust" (JCS, 2014), "Encountering the Past in the Present: An Exploratory Study of Educational Tourism" (with Ari Y. Kelman) (IRE, 2016) and "Domesticating the Difficult Past: Polish Students Narrate the Second World War" in Zehavit Gross and Doyle Stevick (Eds.). *As the Witnesses Fall Silent* (Cham, 2015).

**Zehavit Gross**, Associate Professor at the School of Education, Bar-Ilan University, Israel, heads the graduate program in Management and Development in Informal Educational Systems. She holds the UNESCO Chair in Education for Human Values, Tolerance, Democracy and Peace and heads the Sal Van Gelder Center for Holocaust Research and Instruction and is the President of the Israeli Society of Comparative Education (ICES). She specializes in religious education, Holocaust education and peace education. With Doyle Stevick, she co-edited *As the Witnesses Fall Silent: 21<sup>st</sup> Century Holocaust Education in Curriculum, Policy and Practice* (Cham, 2015).

**Oscar Österberg**, PhD, works at the Living History Forum, Stockholm. His research areas include the place of the Holocaust and other catastrophic events in historical cultures. Selected publications include “Eftervärldens dom har fallit hård”. Lidice, Oradour-sur-Glane och St’Anna i berättelser om det andra världskriget” in *Katastrofernas århundrade. Historiska och verkningshistoriska perspektiv* (Lund, 2009) and “Taming Ambiguities. The Representation of the Holocaust in Post-War Italy” in *The Holocaust–Post-War Battlefields* (Malmö, 2006).

**Marta Simó** is a PhD candidate and Researcher in the Sociology Department at Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona. Her research areas are Holocaust Studies, memory and identity and sociology of religion. Recent publications include “Challenges for Memory, Teaching and Learning about the Holocaust in Spain” in IHRA et al. (Eds.). *Bystanders, Rescuers or Perpetrators? The Neutral Countries and the Shoah* (Berlin, 2016) and “ITS, Spain and the Holocaust” in Rebecca Boehling, et al. (Eds.). *Freilegungen—Spiegelungen der NS-Verfolgung und ihrer Konsequenzen* (Bad Arolsen, 2015).

**E. Doyle Stevick** is Associate Professor of educational leadership and policies and Director of European Studies at the University of South Carolina. He has twice been a Fulbright Fellow to Estonia. His research areas include education about the Holocaust, global citizenship education, education policy and comparative and international education. His co-edited books with Bradley Levinson include *Reimagining Civic Education* (Lanham, 2007) and *Advancing Democracy through Education?* (Charlotte, 2008), and with Zehavit Gross, *As the Witnesses Fall Silent* (Cham, 2015).

**Mikhail Tyaglyy** is Research Associate at the Ukrainian Center for Holocaust Studies (UCHS) in Kiev and managing editor of the scholarly journal *Голокост і сучасність. Студії в Україні і світі* (*Holocaust and Modernity: Studies in Ukraine and the World*), published by the UCHS. He has authored the book *Места массового уничтожения евреев Крыма в период нацистской оккупации полуострова (1941–1944)* (*Sites of Mass Murder of Crimean Jews during the Nazi Occupation of the Peninsula, 1941–1944*) (Simferopol, 2005). His articles on the Nazi genocide of Soviet Jews and Roma have appeared in *Holocaust and Genocide Studies* and other academic journals.