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

Ansbacher Straße 70
10777 Berlin
www.metropol-verlag.de

Druck: buchdruckerei.de, Berlin

Content

Monique Eckmann and Oscar Österberg

Research in German

This overview of empirical studies on Holocaust education brings together research done in Germany and Austria, and by Swiss scholars who publish in German. The logic behind grouping these countries together—despite their very different historical experiences during the Second World War—is above all their common language and the growing common disciplinary discourse among them. There is a noticeable tendency among German-language scholars to engage primarily with other research published in German. Because this project examines the state of research on teaching and learning about the Holocaust (TLH), this transnational phenomenon is of particular interest. However, it is not self-evident that scholarship in neutral Switzerland should be analyzed together with research conducted in the former "perpetrator nations" of Austria and Germany, nor is this grouping unproblematic. There is a much longer and larger tradition of research into the Holocaust in Germany, as well as stronger political expectations that the Nazi period be dealt with critically. In addition, public-memory discourses in these countries tend to be different. In Germany, for example, there is an ongoing debate about the country's public memory in regards to both the Nazi period and the former East Germany (the German Democratic Republic, or GDR) (see, for example, Assmann, 2013; Giesecke & Welzer, 2012; Knigge, 2010, 2013; Meier, 2010; Morsch, 2010; Wippermann, 2009). Needless to say, this examination also concerns history education.

A second issue concerns the use of terminology. While "Holocaust" has been an established word in the German language for decades, it is difficult to conceive of a German educator focusing only on the Holocaust in the strict sense applied, for example, in the Stockholm Declaration (see p. 9). In an Austrian or German setting, the genocide of European Jewry must be located in the broader context of national history (see Eberle, 2008). Most of the German studies examined here focus on education regarding the crimes committed by the Nazi regime or under Nazi rule more generally. This tendency creates difficulties when searching for empirical studies, however, because it is far from certain that these studies will be classified

as works on "Holocaust education" or even have "Holocaust" in their titles. The search has been conducted in several ways. Academic search engines such as JSTOR, the Education Resources Education Center (ERIC) and Google Scholar have been consulted using different combinations of terms such as "Holocaust," "Auschwitz," "Erziehung," and "Bildung." Similar research was conducted using the search engine of the *Deutsche Nationalbibliothek*. The sites of some important publishing houses in this area, such as Metropol Verlag and LIT Verlag, have been consulted. Finally, the reference lists of reviewed studies have been scanned.

In German-speaking areas, in general, much of the empirical research we have found is conducted by scholars within the discipline of history didactics, many of whom are trained historians. There are, however, contributions from other disciplines, above all the educational sciences.

1. Austrian, German and German-Swiss Empirical Research on Teaching and Learning about the Holocaust

In Germany, the discipline of history didactics dates to at least the 1970s, but it has gained momentum in recent decades, especially guided by the concept of *historical consciousness*, which can be understood as a mental framework for handling human existence in time. It is clear that this development has been driven, to a considerable degree, by the need to "handle" the Nazi past in the former West Germany and the often stormy public debates concerning this need.

Starting in the late 1970s, Bodo von Borries undertook empirical research into historical consciousness and thereby contributed a great deal to the establishment of history didactics as an empirical discipline. His empirical studies on historical thinking and learning use different methodologies. Initially, he employed qualitative methods such as classroom observations, interviews and experience reports, but later he also began using quantitative methods. He repeatedly demonstrated the existence of a gap between the officially declared goals of history teaching in schools and the actual outcomes. Furthermore, von Borries' results made it clear that the historical thinking of youths was shaped not only by formal instruction, but also by influence from their families and the mass media. A major European survey carried out in the 1990s, *Youth and History*, addressed these aspects from an international, comparative perspective.

Before the 1990s, there were already some empirical studies of how (West) German students viewed the Nazi period, conducted by scholars such as Walter Jaide, Heinrich Roth, Ludwig von Friedeburg and Peter Hübner, Kurt Fackinger and Rudolf Raasch, Ursula Steudel and Peter von Wrangel, Werner Cahnmann, Karl Filser and von Borries (see Zülsdorf-Kersting 2007 for a discussion of these works). Most of these studies could best be classified as research on historical thinking. During this period, there were also some studies, such as those by Elbeling (1964), Harnischfeger (1972) and Geißler (1981), which more carefully examined the importance of different aspects of education for students' beliefs about the Nazi period and the persecution of Jews. After 1990, empirical studies on history education increased considerably. In what follows, some general features of the works identified so far are presented in subchapters, based on the categories of research into history education and typology suggested by Peter Gautschi. Gautschi distinguishes between phenomenon research, outcomes research, intervention research and research on historical thinking and learning (Gautschi, 2007). One should note that a single study can fall into several categories.

Phenomenon Research

Phenomenon research includes descriptive educational research. This category includes, for example, textbook studies. Given the public significance of the Holocaust in recent years, it is noteworthy that comparatively little empirical work in this field has been identified. Of the work found, most focuses on Germany (von Borries, 2000; Popp, 2004, 2010, 2012; Zülsdorf-Kersting, 2006; Stachwitz, 2006; Sandkühler, 2012; Wenzel, 2013), sometimes in comparison with Austria (Markova, 2013) or another country (Bilewicz, 2012; Kühberger, 2012). A few studies also deal with other countries; for example, Heidrun Dolezel (2013) focuses on the Czech Republic. Here, it is important to bear in mind the heterogeneous nature of the educational system in Germany. Germany is a federal state in which jurisdiction over education belongs to the individual states, not the federation. There is no federal ministry of education. Instead, each state's education ministry examines whether school textbooks meet the curriculum demands of the state in question. This means that publishers often have to produce different versions for different states. There are also a large number of different history textbooks, as well as other publications meant for school use.

For these reasons, it is comparatively cumbersome to conduct textbook research in Germany.

The same problem applies to the curricula requirements of the different German states, even if there is a "Standing Conference of Ministries of Education and Cultural Affairs," which should ensure that the requirements across states are comparable.

Lately, a shift in which German curricula focus on key skills rather than specific content also makes it quite difficult to analyze the importance attributed to different historical periods and phenomena by curriculum designers. Despite these difficulties, some authors have included curriculum analysis in their research. Ehmann (2005), for example, examines the curricula of states that had belonged to the GDR; Enzenbach (2011) focuses on Berlin; Schmidt-Denter and Stubig (2011) focus on Bavaria, Hessen, Saarland, Sachsen and Sachsen-Anhalt; and Becher (2009) offers an overview of the curriculum in Baden-Würtenberg, Bavaria, Berlin, Bremen, Hamburg, Hessen and Thüringen.

Other studies have examined how the Holocaust is addressed in different German teacher-training programs. Ehmann (2005) presents a critical overview of the developments in teacher training regarding the Nazi period and the Holocaust in former East German states after 1990, while Grenz (2013) discusses how the Holocaust has been made a theme in didactic seminars for future German-language teachers. Thyroff and Gautschi (2014), in turn, analyze a training program for future Swiss teachers, carried out in cooperation with Yad Vashem's International School for Holocaust Studies in Jerusalem. The program focuses not only on pedagogical concepts for education about the Holocaust in Swiss secondary schools, but also on cultures of memory in Switzerland and Israel.

Other studies examine teachers' experiences. Eckmann and Heimberg (2009) present the initial findings of a study, based on semi-structured interviews with Swiss secondary school teachers, that examines how the Holocaust is conveyed in history instruction and teachers' perceptions of difficulties related to this. Using both quantitative and qualitative methods, Enzenbach (2011) looks at whether teachers in Berlin bring up the Holocaust already in grades four to six, and if so, how. Priebe (2006) notes that Holocaust education might have to meet quite specific challenges in schools for students with special needs (*Förderschulen*). He therefore examines how teachers in these schools bring up the Holocaust and the difficulties they experience in the process.

One approach in recent years has been to conduct studies in classroom settings. Perhaps the most ambitious undertaking has been that by Wolfgang Meseth, Matthias Proske and Frank-Olaf Radtke, who are less interested in the established key concepts of German history didactics, such as historical consciousness, historical thinking and historical literacy, than in what they call "pedagogical communication." The researchers in the project audio recorded thirty-two history lessons and, after transcribing them, analyzed ten of them. What the research team tried to understand was how discussions in the classroom are shaped by the specific setting created by formal education. The project has generated a number of publications (see, for example, Meseth, Proske, & Radtke, 2004).

An offspring of this undertaking is the analysis by Meseth and Haug (2013), which investigates the group dynamics that occur when school classes take part in educational activities at memorial sites. The fact that both students' ordinary teachers and educational staff from the site are present creates a special social setting that has so far been neglected by educational research. Gudehus (2006) is interested in the pedagogical communication that takes place on the guided tours at memorial sites. He has studied tours in four German memorial sites connected to the Nazi period and analyzed the guides' narratives and interpretations, as well as the sources they draw on.

Pedagogical activities at German memorial sites have been studied by other scholars as well. Annette Eberle (2008), for example, analyses pedagogical work at some Bavarian memorial sites connected to the Nazi period. She not only focuses on former concentration camps—including the often neglected satellite camps—but also includes a site connected to the resistance against the regime (*Die Weiße Rose*) as well as the documentation centers at the *Reichsparteitagsgelände* (Nazi Party Rally Grounds) and Obersalzberg.

In a similar vein, Lutz (2009) analyzes the pedagogical work conducted in more than twenty German museums, memorial sites and educational centers and also addresses the strained connection between commemoration and learning in the educational work of memorial museums for Nazi victims. Klenk (2006) focuses on general conditions and pedagogical activities in seven regional memorial sites.

All of the works mentioned so far have focused on German-speaking countries, but some studies also present an international outlook. A prominent example is Heyl's (1997) comparative study of the development of

Holocaust education in the former West Germany, the Netherlands, Israel and the United States. In Heyl's analysis, the four cases represent four different approaches resulting from their different historical experiences, and they have different educational outcomes. In an ethnographic field study, Deckert-Peaceman (2002) analyzed classroom teaching about the Holocaust in US primary schools, and Hartmann (2012) examined educational material and programs for younger students at Yad Vashem. Israel has also been the locus for Eckmann's (2013, 2014) studies of dealing with the Holocaust in the context of Israeli-Palestinian encounters.

Outcomes Research

A major focus of outcome research is measuring students' learning outcomes. One area in which this approach has been fairly common regards visits to memorial sites. Using a quantitative survey, Fuchs (2003) has, for example, tried to measure the effect on German students of visiting Auschwitz-Birkenau Memorial and State Museum. In a similar vein, Klein (2012, 2013) has studied German students' strategies of appropriation of Berlin's Holocaust Memorial. Based on a number of interviews, Pampel (2007) analyzes how visitors experience memorial sites, their motives and expectations and how they handle their impressions, while Fechler (2000) points to the challenges of TLH in a multicultural setting based on the case of a German grade ten class visiting an exhibition about the Nazi period, which led to an intense conflict between ethnic-German students and students with an immigrant background after some ethnic-German students had written neo-Nazi slogans in the museum's guestbook. Zülsdorf-Kersting (2007) followed twenty-eight German students, monitoring how their views of Nazism and the Holocaust developed over the course of a school year.[1] Using both interviews and questionnaires, he concludes that history education seems—at least as it was conducted in this case—to have a limited ability to change students' beliefs and understanding. Weber (2010) compares the learning outcomes of a group of German educators who visited Auschwitz-Birkenau Memorial and State Museum in 1985 with those of a similar group who made the same visit in 2005. Hoffman (2011) looks into the use of literature and analyzes German and Polish students' reception of Mirjam Pressler's historical young-adult novel *Malka Mai*. The

1 This study is examined in more detail in Chapter 10.

novel tells the story of a Jewish family's escape from Poland to Hungary in 1943. Hoffman claims that literature offers interpretive patterns that lie beyond the bounds of family loyalty and institutional claims to national identity formation.

Intervention Research

The objective of some of these empirical studies is to develop new and better ways of teaching. This is true of the studies by Becher (2006, 2009, 2012, 2013), who aims to develop suitable methods for Holocaust education in German primary schools. A similar ambition governs Sternfeld's (2013) work, which tries to find ways to communicate the Holocaust in light of the fact that Austria today is a destination country for migrants and has been so for several decades. Her analysis focuses on perspectives that derive from the recognition that Austria is a country of immigration and the implications of this fact for the cultures of remembrance in a shared present. Terrahe (2008) follows a similar track when he tries to find a way to teach about the Holocaust in German primary-school courses, based on an empirical study using children's literature. Eser Davolio (2000, 2012), in turn, created experimental teaching modules about the Holocaust in Switzerland and evaluated them by testing attitudes before and after the intervention. She finds that the modules can have positive as well as negative effects, and notices the importance of peer influence. Fink (2009) analyzed the contribution of oral testimonies to the development of Swiss pupils' historical thinking. The vantage point was an exhibition, *L'histoire c'est moi* (I am History), which consisted of a mosaic of more than 500 oral testimonies regarding the period of Second World War in Switzerland. Katja Ganske's (2014) empirical study of German tenth graders' involvement in a human rights-oriented project at Buchenwald probably also belongs in this category, as does Ester H. Zumpe's (2012) analysis of the possible nexus between human rights education and *Gedenkstättenpädagogik* (memorial-site pedagogy) in an empirical study of German students taking part in workshops at the *Gedenkstätte KZ Osthofen* (Osthofen Concentration Camp Memorial), the *Gedenkstätte und Museum Sachsenhausen* (Memorial and Museum Sachsenhausen) and the *Dokumentationszentrum Reichsparteitagsgelände* in Nuremberg.

Research on Historical Thinking and Learning

Studies in this field focus on subject positions and ways of thinking regarding history and the formation of historical consciousness. Arguably, this is the oldest line of research in Germany, and there also seems to be a remarkable continuity in results (see discussion below, p. 46-47). Using questionnaires, Barlog-Scholz (1994) analyzed knowledge about concentration camps among upper-secondary school students in Nordrhein-Westfalen and Baden-Württemberg. Although she found that students possessed some knowledge about the topic, she found no strong correlation between knowledge and political engagement, and only a weak correlation between knowledge and visits to a memorial site. This was followed by Pohl's (1996) study of 2,156 grade nine and ten students, which noted that most students had great gaps in their knowledge about the Nazi past, and that they tended to focus on the leading historical actors. Ahlheim and Heger (2002) distributed a questionnaire to 2,167 students at the University of Essen and identified considerable gaps in factual knowledge about National Socialism and the Holocaust, although there seemed to be a weak correlation between a lack of knowledge and a desire to close the book on this chapter of history or tendencies to trivialize the Holocaust. While most respondents believed the topic to be important, many also admitted to feeling uneasy about this aspect of their country's past.

One of the most important studies within this field is arguably that by Welzer, Moller and Tschuggnall (2002), which examines the intergenerational communication of historical consciousness. This analysis of family discussions and individual interviews with family members from three generations demonstrates that German families transmit significantly different images of the Nazi past than schools do. In family memory, the focus rests above all on stories about the suffering of one's own relatives (see also the discussion in Behrens & Moller, 2004). Continuing this line of research, Flügel (2009, 2012) reconstructs primary-school pupils' relationships to the theme of Nazism. She demonstrates how interwoven these are with general German memory discourses about this issue, but also how, already by the age of nine or ten, children reflect upon their need to learn about this dark side of German history. Hanfland (2008) and Klätte (2012) reach similar conclusions.

A research interest that has arisen in recent decades is the relationship between students' backgrounds and differences in their historical think-

ing. One vector concerns the differences between Eastern and Western Germany. Using questionnaires, Brusten and Winkelmann (1994) asked 699 Western German and 643 Eastern German university students in Wuppertal, Halle, Magdeburg and East Berlin about the Holocaust. The results showed that at least 81 percent possessed medium or high levels of factual knowledge about the Holocaust. Most respondents claimed to feel distressed about the event and 25 percent also claimed to have feelings of guilt and shame. Only 25 percent of the Western German and 12 percent of the Eastern German students wanted to turn a page on the past. There were on average no great differences between former West and East Germans. There was, however, a strong correlation between students' political orientation and their knowledge, emotions and attitudes. However, based on open interviews in Eastern and Western Germany with representatives of the generation born between 1951 and 1967, Kohlstruck (1997) notes that there are noticeable differences between "East" and "West" in the way respondents relate to the Nazi past. Similar analyses have been conducted by Leonard (2002) and Moller (2002, 2003).

A second vector deals with historical thinking about the Nazi period and the Holocaust in contemporary Germany's multicultural society. Here, we find studies such as that by Kölb (2008), which analyzes the expectations of a group of German students with an immigrant family background who were about to participate in a class trip to Auschwitz-Birkenau Memorial and State Museum. Another important study by Georgi (2003), based on fifty-five interviews with young Germans with an immigrant family background between the ages of fifteen and twenty, constructs a typology of "immigrant" positions to the German Nazi past (see below). With a slightly different take, Köster (2013) studied the understanding of historical texts about the Nazi period among German tenth grade students with a view to finding out more about potential differences between those with a "German" background and those who come from immigrant families. Kühner (2008) analyzes the several ways in which students and teachers position themselves towards Nazi Germany and how the attribution of guilt, shame or responsibility to different groups of "Others" serves as a pattern of interaction in a migration society. Migration can therefore offer a tool to project one's own fears or emotions, but it can also offer opportunities for dialogue about and a higher degree of reflexivity regarding the past and the present.

The issue of historical thinking in contemporary society has also been investigated by Swiss scholars. In the specific field of historical thinking

about the Holocaust, Peter and Bürgermeister (2012), for example, carried out group interviews about the Second World War and the role of the Independent Commission of Experts Switzerland—Second World War (ICE) in various Swiss locations with individuals from different generations. These interviews revealed three main understandings of Switzerland's role and politics during the Second World War: Switzerland was surrounded by Nazi forces and threatened, but it had nevertheless engaged in humanitarian action; the Holocaust is recognized as a crucial event, but it was something "German" rather than Swiss; and there is an ambivalent attitude towards the memory of the Holocaust in Switzerland.

2. Issues in Recent Research

As this overview demonstrates, there has been empirical research on a large variety of topics regarding TLH in the German language. Nonetheless, in recent years German researchers have focused on a few issues of contemporary concern. What follows only aims to highlight the main concerns of these studies.

Effects

Not surprisingly, one question that has long haunted German educators and decision makers is whether school education about the Nazi period and the Holocaust has the desired effects. Here, for example, the findings of the Frankfurt-based research team around Wolfgang Meseth and Matthias Proske (Hollstein et al., 2002; Meseth, Proske, & Radtke, 2004) have provoked reactions from historians and educators. Whereas the Frankfurt team claims that one should not expect too much in regard to the transformative power of history education, and that instruction about the Holocaust at best can train students to use socially acceptable ways of speaking about the past, others have pointed out that the purpose of history education is not to reproduce historical narratives, but rather to engage with these narratives critically (see, for example, Henke-Bockschatz, 2004). Zülsdorf-Kersting's analysis of how German ninth and tenth grade students appropriate history education about the Holocaust, however, demonstrates that the outcomes often fall very short of politicians' and/or educators' expectations. Ethnic-German students still tend to construct narratives that excul-

pate the great majority of the German population, and they tend to use the same simplified images of history and interpretations that had already been identified by German studies scholars several decades ago. Driven by their own interests, students tend to construct history based on explanatory patterns that they bring with them to class, and subsequent formal instruction seems unable to challenge these modes of thinking (Zülsdorf-Kersting, 2007). Instead, the communication in the family and representations in mass media seem to play an important role in the formation of students' construction of history (ibid.).

At what Age Should Instruction Begin?

The fact that students develop impressions of the Holocaust and the Nazi period from their families and peers and the media leads to the question of the age at which to begin teaching about the Holocaust. In his programmatic radio talk about education after Auschwitz, Theodor W. Adorno argued that it was important to begin educational efforts at an early age (Adorno, 1977).

Yet in Germany, as in many other countries, Nazi Germany and the Holocaust are normally addressed in school curricula around the age of fifteen. In the late 1990s, this fact led to a debate between Gertrud Beck and Matthias Heyl about the desirability of beginning teaching about the Holocaust at an earlier age. Beck argued that primary-school children already possessed knowledge about Nazism and the Holocaust. These matters were furthermore a "taboo" for adults rather than for children, but this might create diffuse anxieties and prejudices in children, something that could be prevented by early education. The purpose of the instruction should furthermore be to promote human dignity, tolerance and open-mindedness among students (Beck, 1998). Heyl countered by arguing that young children might be overwhelmed or even traumatized by the topic, and that they should therefore be sheltered from this complex and unsettling aspect of German history. He further argued that the Holocaust should not be used instrumentally to address present problems concerning multiculturalism or tolerance (Moysich & Heyl, 1998). Over the last decade, several empirical studies have addressed this question and argued, based on their findings, that the issue could be raised at an earlier age—and that, in fact, this has already happened in German primary schools (Becher, 2009; Enzenbach, 2011; Flügel, 2009; Hanfland, 2008).

The Multicultural Setting

Another concern has been to assess how education about Nazi Germany and the Holocaust play out in the multicultural society that is current-day Germany (see also above, p. 45). As mentioned, several studies seem to confirm that ethnic-German students tend to construct history in ways that exculpate Germans from the crimes of Nazi Germany. On the one hand, this phenomenon indicates that these students indeed find these crimes condemnable, and some even invent resistance fighters in their own family. On the other hand, it also demonstrates the difficulties this way of understanding the Nazi era creates for students in terms of historical orientation and identity formation (Zülsdorf-Kersting, 2007, p. 456; see also the discussion in Giesecke & Welzer, 2012). The dilemma of course raises the question of whether similar tendencies can be observed among young Germans with an immigrant background. Viola Georgi (2003) identified several orientations regarding the Holocaust among her respondents. Some identified with the victims of Nazi persecution and often made analogies to their lives as immigrants in present-day Germany. Others instead connected to the "German" discourses and often reproduced simplifications and evasions similar to those of ethnic-German students. Georgi explains this voluntary participation in "German communicative memory" as resulting from the need to be part of German society. Other students focused exclusively on their "own" ethnic community and its history. A variation of this orientation could be found among those who "instrumentalize" the Holocaust in order to highlight the sufferings of their "own" ethnic group. Some students, finally, adopted a universalist position, viewed the Holocaust from a non-partisan perspective and discussed how humans under certain historical, political and social circumstances can become victims, perpetrators or bystanders.

Georgi's findings have received support in subsequent research. Kölb (2008), for example, establishes the presence of several different ways of representing the Nazi past in ethnic-minority students' historical consciousness, and Köster (2013) finds that students from immigrant families are not inclined to a particular interpretation of the Holocaust, and that they even sometimes exculpate the Germans of the Nazi period more than German students do. This, however, does not necessarily mean that interests stemming from family history are less important to these students than they are to ethnic-German students in influencing their historical construction of

the Holocaust and Nazi Germany. Elke Gryglewski (2013) demonstrates that different constructions of history depend not only on origin, but also on social position and experiences of discrimination.

Gedenkstättenpädagogik

A specific field of empirical research has emerged in the last decades that focuses on visits to *Gedenkstätten* (memorial sites).[2] This body of research has developed in connection with the expansion, professionalization and conceptualization of educational activities at such sites (Thimm, Koessler, & Ulrich, 2010; Gryglewski, Haug, Kößler, Lutz, & Schikorra, 2015), and covers different areas such as analyses of the exhibitions and educational activities at the sites; studies of peoples' expectations before a visit and/or experiences or recollections of visits; attempts to measure the effects of visits; and analyses of visitors' socio-demographic composition. Lutz (2009) focuses, above all, on the first aspect, and he demonstrates that newer exhibitions embrace a much more comprehensive use of material than was previously the case, and that they also display a more reflective and sensitive handling of texts, photographs and artifacts. Eberle (2008), in turn, is interested in the pedagogical activities at memorial sites connected to Nazi crimes. Summing up the practices in Bavarian memorial sites/educational projects, she identifies three different interrelated elements: documentation of the historical-authentic place, commemoration of the victims and pedagogically guided attempts to "learn from history." Different sites,

2 A *Gedenkstätte* is generally a memorial site located in a place with a strong connection to a horrible or catastrophic event. The term is strongly associated with memorials dedicated to the Nazi era, but it is nowadays also used in connection to Communist oppression. Sometimes the term is used not only for "original sites," such as former concentration camps, but also for memorials constructed after the fact. Volkhard Knigge has described *Gedenkstätten* as having seven specific characteristics: they are crime sites; they are sites of *martyrium*, elevated places of suffering; they are often graveyards, both symbolically and objectively; they are political monuments; they are places for learning; when located on the site of a historical event, they are palimpsests and, as such, ambiguous; and they are, especially in contemporary media-dominated society, places for individual and collective projections (see Knigge, 2004). It is important to note, however, that not all memorials and museums related to the crimes of the Nazi regime are called *Gedenkstätten*, nor are all such institutions related to the Holocaust.

however, tend put their emphasis on different elements. Sites such as *KZ-Gedenkstätte Dachau* (Dachau Concentration Camp Memorial Site) and *KZ-Gedenkstätte Flossenbürg* (Flossenbürg Concentration Camp Memorial Site), with their documentation centers, for example, place comparatively significant weight on the first element. At all the studied sites, there are attempts to help visitors "learn from history." However, there seem to be few systematic attempts to evaluate the fulfilment of this objective. A special challenge for educational efforts is posed by the commemoration of victims, many of whom must be perceived as "strangers" to the visitors. In this respect, Eberle argues that memorial sites compensate for a "deficit" in society's memorialization, as neither German schools nor families tend to commemorate victims of Nazism in ways that reflect the "victim-perpetrator conflict [*Opfer-Täter-Konflikt*]" (ibid., p. 240).

In another study, Christian Gudehus (2006) analyzed sixteen guided tours at German memorial sites in order to better understand what is actually transmitted on such occasions. He identifies three core narratives that are (re)produced by the guides. The first consists of the story about what happened at the camp, with a focus on the suffering of the prisoners, even if it also often brings up questions about what local people knew about what was going on. The second is an explanatory narrative about the Holocaust and Nazism. The explanation unfolds on two levels. On the first level, the Holocaust is presented as the culmination of a longer process. The story is teleological-chronological. On the second level, the focus rests on individual action. The third core narrative is centered on the postwar representation of what happened. Common to all three narratives is a marked distance from the perpetrators and their deeds. The perspective of the perpetrators is generally excluded. Gudehus finds many similarities, both in content and form, between the stories told at different German memorial sites, a dynamic that suggests that there is a tendency to legitimate specific (re)constructions of the past as authoritative, producing a narrative that does not encourage discussion or questioning. Meseth and Haug (2013) study the special social setting, so far neglected by educational research, that is created when school classes take part in educational activities at memorial sites.

The fact that both their ordinary teachers and the educational staff from the site are present can, for example, create tensions and influence pedagogical communication. This line of investigation is further developed by Haug (2015).

Other scholars have been more interested in trying to measure the effects of such visits. Barlog-Scholz (1994), for example, found that students' visits to memorial sites hardly left any impression on them, in terms of either knowledge or attitudes. In his study of German university students' visits to Auschwitz-Birkenau Memorial and State Museum, however, Fuchs (2003) finds clear effects in terms of how they explained the Holocaust, how they viewed the question about closing the book on this chapter of German history and how they viewed contemporary society's need to protect minorities. Pampel (2007), in turn, claims that the learning that takes place at memorial sites is mainly a result of looking at artifacts and buildings and non-cognitive experiences. The importance of visits to memorial sites does not rest so much upon the acquisition of new information, and students seldom refer to changes in their historical or political beliefs. Rather, the value of the visits rests on the impressions that visitors take with them, impressions that can also serve as an impetus for further engagement with the topic. In a later study, Pampel (2011) returns to the topic of school classes' reception and interpretation of history when visiting memorial sites, and he argues that such visits must above all be seen as moments for reflection and non-cognitive learning (Pampel, 2011).

3. Conclusion

Comparatively speaking, a great deal of empirical research on Holocaust education has been conducted over the last few decades in the German language in Germany, Austria and Switzerland. Although nothing distinctly sets these studies apart from research conducted in other languages and other countries, there are some noteworthy features about German-language scholarship in this area. To begin with, the number of researchers writing in German is large enough that there is a specifically German-language "communicative loop" regarding research into education about Nazi Germany and the Holocaust. There are, for example, academic discussions and debates that will not reach an audience outside the German-speaking world, and there are theoretical and methodological developments in this area in the German-speaking literature that are independent of developments elsewhere.

A second feature, mainly valid for the Federal Republic of Germany, is that there has never been any public doubt about the need to devote time

to education about the National Socialist regime of 1933–1945 and the crimes and oppression connected with it. This trend preceded all tendencies towards the globalization or universalization of Holocaust memory by decades. In fact, the obligation to deal with this part of its history has been part of Germany's postwar civic identity, and German educators have frequently quoted Adorno's famous 1966 statement that the first requirement of education is that Auschwitz not happen again (Adorno, 1977, p. 674; see also Meseth, 2000). One should note, however, that there has been a tendency to give a certain "ethnic" character to this aspect of German identity, as this obligation has to a considerable degree been connected to descent rather than citizenship. The—at least officially accepted—concept of a special German responsibility with a corresponding obligation to "handle" the past has been strongly linked to an "ethnic" understanding of what it means to be German; this framing poses the risk of excluding German citizens whose families immigrated to the country after 1945. This risk is demonstrated by the German discussion in this context regarding different generations in the postwar population, where the concept of "generation" is defined not only by a person's year of birth, but also their genealogical position within a family. In other words, some Germans have grandparents who lived in Nazi Germany, while others do not. Do they all have an equal obligation to deal with the history of the Nazi period? (Kohlstruck, 1997; Welzer et al., 2002). Arguably, this tendency has strongly contributed to making the transformation of Germany into a multicultural society a special challenge for German educators.

A third feature of German-language research is the existence of a field of research focused specifically on memorial-sites pedagogy. This is most likely a reflection of not only the public importance given to the 1933–1945 period, but also the simple fact that there are a large number of "authentic" memorial sites from that era in Germany and Austria.

Additional Bibliography

Adorno, T. W. (1977). Erziehung nach Auschwitz [Education After Auschwitz]. In R. Tiedemann (Ed.). *Theodor W. Adorno. Kulturkritik und Gesellschaft II. Gesammelte Schriften* [*Theodor W. Adorno: Cultural criticism and society II. Collected writings* (Band 10:2)]. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

Assmann, A. (2013). *Das neue Unbehagen an der Erinnerungskultur. Eine Intervention* [*The new discomfort in the face of memorial culture: An intervention*]. München: C. H. Beck.

Gautschi, P. (2007). Geschichtsunterricht erforschen—eine aktuelle Notwendigkeit [To research history education—a present necessity]. In P. Gautschi, D. V. Moser, K. Reusser, P. Wiher (Eds.). *Geschichtsunterricht heute. Eine empirische Analyse ausgewählter Aspekte* [*History education today: An empirical analysis of selected aspects*] (pp. 21–59). Bern: h.e.p. verlag ag.

Giesecke, D., Welzer, H. (2012). *Das Menschenmögliche. Zur Renovierung der deutschen Erinnerungskultur* [*That which is possible for man: On the renewal of German memorial culture*]. Hamburg: Körber-Stiftung.

Gryglewski, E., Haug, V., Kößler, G., Lutz, T., Schikorra, C. (Eds.) (2015). *Gedenkstättenpädagogik. Kontext, Theorie und Praxis der Bildungsarbeit zu NS-Verbrechen* [*Memorial site pedagogy: Context, theory and practice in educational work about Nazi crimes*]. Berlin: Metropol.

Knigge, V. (2004). Museum oder Schädelstätte? Gedenkstätten als multiple Institutionen [Museum or Calvary? Memorial sites as multiple institutions]. In Stiftung Haus der Geschichte der Bundesrepublik Deutschland (Eds). *Gedenkstätten und Besucherforschung* [*Memorial sites and visitors' research*]. (pp. 26–28). Bonn: Stiftung Haus der Geschichte der Bundesrepublik Deutschland.

Knigge, V. (2010). Zur Zukunft der Erinnerung [On the future of remembrance]. *Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte*, *25–26*, 10–16.

Knigge, V. (2013). Erinnerung oder Geschichtsbewusstsein? Warum Erinnerung allein in eine Sackgasse für historisch-politische Bildung führen muss [Remembrance or historical consciousness? Why memory alone must lead to a dead end for historical-political education]. *Gedenkstättenrundbrief*, *172* (12/2013), 3–15.

Meier C. (2010). *Das Gebot zu vergessen und die Unabweisbarkeit des Erinnerns. Vom öffentlichen Umgang mit schlimmer Vergangenheit* [*The*

command to forget and the inevitability of remembrance: Publicly dealing with a bad past]. München: Siedler.

Meseth, W. (2000). Theodor W. Adornos "Erziehung nach Auschwitz." Ein pädagogisches Programm und seine Wirkung [Theodor W. Adorno's "Education after Auschwitz." A pedagogical program and its effect]. In B. Fechler, G. Kößler & T. Lieberz-Groß (Eds), '*Erziehung nach Auschwitz' in der multikulturellen Gesellschaft. Pädagogische und soziologische Annäherungen* ['*Education After Auschwitz' in a multicultural society: Pedagogical and sociological approaches*] (pp. 19–30). Weinheim/Munich: Juventa.

Morsch, G. (2010). Geschichte als Waffe. Erinnerungskultur in Europa und die Aufgabe der Gedenkstätten [History as weapon: The culture of remembrance in Europe and the mission of memorial sites]. *Analysen und Alternativen*, *5*, 109–121.

Moysich, J., Heyl, M. (Eds.) (1998). *Der Holocaust. Ein Thema für Kindergarten und Grundschule?* [*The Holocaust: A theme for kindergarten and primary school?*]. Hamburg: Krämer.

Pampel, B. (2011). Was lernen Schülerinnen und Schüler durch Gedenkstättenbesuche? (Teil-)Antworten auf Basis von Besucherforschung [What do students learn by visiting a memorial site? (Partial answers based on research about visitors]. *Gedenkstättenrundbrief*, *162*(8), 16–29.

Wippermann, W. (2009). *Dämonisierung durch Vergleich. DDR und Drittes Reich* [*Demonization by comparison: The GDR and the Third Reich*]. Berlin: Rotbuch.

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: 21st 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.