United Nations
Educational, Scientific and
Cultural Organization

How does education about the Holocaust advance global citizenship education?

Education 2030

UNESCO Education Sector
Education is UNESCO's top priority because it is a basic human right and the foundation on which to build peace and drive sustainable development. UNESCO is the United Nations' specialized agency for education and the Education Sector provides global and regional leadership in education, strengthens national education systems and responds to contemporary global challenges through education with a special focus on gender equality and Africa.

The Global Education 2030 Agenda
UNESCO, as the United Nations' specialized agency for education, is entrusted to lead and coordinate the Education 2030 Agenda, which is part of a global movement to eradicate poverty through 17 Sustainable Development Goals by 2030. Education, essential to achieve all of these goals, has its own dedicated Goal 4, which aims to ***"ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all."*** The Education 2030 Framework for Action provides guidance for the implementation of this ambitious goal and commitments.

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
Education Sector

Education 2030

How does education about the Holocaust advance global citizenship education?

By E. Doyle Stevick
Doyle Stevick is Associate Professor in the Department of Educational Leadership and Policies at the College of Education of the University of South Carolina, United States of America. He is the author of several publications on Education about the Holocaust and Citizenship Education.

Disclaimer
This paper was commissioned by UNESCO. The views and opinions expressed in this paper are those of the authors and should not be attributed to UNESCO. The paper can be cited with the following reference: "Paper commissioned by the UNESCO Education Sector" For further reference please contact gced@unesco.org.

Cover:
Photo: © USHMM, December 2017

Table of content

1. Introduction ..... p. 5

2. Defining EH and GCED, and conceptualizing and measuring their effects ..... p. 6

3. How the purposes of Education about the Holocaust and Global Citizenship Education align ..... p. 8

4. Education about the Holocaust and the cognitive domain of Global Citizenship Education ..... p. 10

4.1 Topical relevance of the Holocaust to the cognitive domain of Global Citizenship Education ..... p. 10
4.2 Empirical research in Education about the Holocaust and cognitive domain outcomes ..... p. 10

5. Education about the Holocaust and the socio-emotional domain of Global Citizenship Education ..... p. 14

5.1 Topical relevance of the Holocaust for the socio-emotional domain of Global Citizenship Education ..... p. 15
5.2 Empirical research in Education about the Holocaust and socio-emotional domain outcomes ..... p. 15

6. Education about the Holocaust and the behavioural domain of Global Citizenship Education ..... p. 17

6.1 The relevance of the Holocaust to the behavioural domain of Global Citizenship Education ..... p. 17
6.2 Empirical research in Education about the Holocaust and behavioural domain outcomes ..... p. 19

7. Conclusion ..... p. 20

8. References ..... p. 21

Abstract

The Holocaust, the effort to destroy the Jewish people by the Nazi regime and its collaborators, marked one of humanity's greatest failures. It forced difficult new discussions around the world about our obligations to one another and about the rights and duties of citizenship. The broad ideals of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the United Nations Charter took shape with the nightmares of all-consuming war and genocide still fresh in the global consciousness. The urgent need to prevent such atrocities in the future required both the creation of new international institutions and a bold vision of our shared humanity to be inculcated in the hearts and minds of the world's peoples. The concrete horrors and inhumanity of the Holocaust marked the antithesis of the Global Citizenship that the world needed to cultivate for the future.

Though Education about the Holocaust (EH) and Global Citizenship Education (GCED) may vary in overall orientation, scale and scope, they are historically linked and deeply interconnected. EH looks to a past that will soon exceed living memory, fostering an understanding of a specific history in Europe, but one rife with universal concerns and ethical and moral challenges for us today. Global Citizenship Education (GCED), though broad, universal and future-oriented, must still produce specific actions in particular contexts to fulfil its mandate. Might an understanding of the principles of citizenship and the extreme manifestations of the abject failure of those principles reinforce each other, as fixed points on a moral compass, as we cultivate new generations of global citizens? This critical review of educational research considers the ways in which EH, a subject of critical importance in its own right, may function effectively as a pillar of Global Citizenship Education (GCED).

Despite their differences, EH and GCED have both spread rapidly around the world with the support of major international organizations, including the United Nations and UNESCO. As governments adopt and implement these two related fields into their education systems, it is important to understand the relationship between the two, and in particular, how they are complementary. EH has three dimensions that make it a promising pillar in efforts to prepare students to become global citizens: its significance and topical relevance; its position as the historical backdrop against which the Universal Declaration of Human Rights was conceived; and its potential for cultivating the cognitive, socio-emotional and behavioural outcomes associated with Global Citizenship Education (UNESCO, 2015). UNESCO has synthesized its guidance for policy-makers to implement Education about the Holocaust and preventing genocide (2017).

This paper reviews empirical studies about EH that relate directly to GCED. It demonstrates that EH can be an effective means to further the goals of GCED. In addition, it argues that the global policy climate is conducive to the widespread adoption of EH in conjunction with GCED due to the receptiveness of local actors (e.g. van Driel, 2016) and the substantial international capacity of dedicated Holocaust organizations like Yad Vashem, the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, Facing History and Ourselves, Memorial de la Shoah, the Anne Frank House and others, whose mission statements articulate goals that align closely to the desired outcomes of GCED. Although Annan (2010) observes that some ambitious aspirations for EH (such as genocide prevention) remain unresearched, unproven or difficult to document, existing research suggests that EH can advance many of the goals of GCED and has the potential to address others. Further experimentation and research into their usefulness and complementarity in new contexts is warranted.

1. Introduction: The spread of Education about the Holocaust and Global Citizenship Education

The genocide of the Jewish people by the Nazi regime and its collaborators, the Holocaust or Shoah, compelled the world to develop both a new vocabulary to describe the atrocities and a new vision of universal human rights in an effort to ensure that such crimes would not be repeated. The following decades demonstrated that genocide and crimes against humanity were indeed issues of global concern, and efforts to prevent them must be a shared, global commitment. One key dimension of this effort is education. The Holocaust must be understood in its own right and for its contributions to understanding genocide more generally. In other words, for EH to contribute to the prevention of such atrocities, it must be understood in its historical specificity and more generally in its sociological and philosophical universality as a genocide. This broader general understanding may be advanced through a comparative approach to learning about genocide.[1] To achieve these ends, EH is being adopted around the world with the support of local communities, national governments and global organizations like UNESCO, which is responsible for 'promoting awareness of Holocaust remembrance through education,' according to resolution 34 C/61 of its General Conference, and the United Nations, whose General Assembly resolution on Holocaust remembrance (60/7) encourages Member States '…to develop educational programmes that will inculcate future generations with the lessons of the Holocaust in order to help prevent future acts of genocide.'

As Kofi Annan (2010) explained, EH is being promoted internationally and embraced locally not just for its historical significance, but also 'because, in our increasingly diverse and globalized world, educators and policy-makers believe education about the Holocaust is a vital mechanism for teaching students to value democracy and human rights, and encouraging them to oppose racism and promote tolerance in their own societies.' By itself, however, awareness of the Holocaust and other genocides is no guarantee that other atrocities will be prevented. Students and societies must develop a moral consensus that hatred and persecution are unacceptable and acquire an ethical commitment to act when rights are violated. The commitment to act must be rooted in a sense of civic effectiveness, a belief that action can make a difference and a knowledge of the institutions through which change can be pursued effectively. In other words, EH, and comparative genocide education more broadly, can be more fully realized through the relationship with GCED.

The strong connection between EH and GCED is thus clear. In one sense, they represent two sides of the same coin, one marking the depths of human suffering and persecution, while the other cultivates the positive values that might prevent such tragedies in the future. Both are needed for a comprehensive understanding. As Brian Urquhart (2001), former Undersecretary-General of the United Nations, observed, the worthy goals and lofty ideals that we embrace together are abstract goods informed by the concrete horrors of the twentieth century. The preamble to the UN Charter evokes that context: 'We the peoples of the United Nations determined...to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind...to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom...' And the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which was conceptualized against the backdrop of the Holocaust, asserts that 'Recognition of the inherent dignity and of the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family is the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world.' This historical context makes clear that the Holocaust is a pillar of GCED; learning the specific history of the Holocaust, which clarified our universal values about what is right and good, is essential to understanding, committing to and upholding those values.

Like EH, GCED is an area of emerging international consensus thanks to the Sustainable Development Goals, whose Target 4.7 seeks to ensure that, by 2030, 'all learners acquire the knowledge and skills needed to promote sustainable development, including, among others, through education for sustainable development and sustainable lifestyles, human rights, gender equality, promotion of a culture of peace and non-violence, global citizenship and appreciation of cultural diversity and of culture's contribution to sustainable development.'

In addition to these national and international commitments to EH, the field has a global scope notably because of the broad array of institutions whose missions embrace GCED goals while advancing EH around the world. Yad Vashem, for example, maintains the Holocaust's 'Jewish character within the universal context'; it 'reinforces the commitment of Jewish visitors to their people and their ethical brotherhood with other nations, [and helps non-Jews] empathize with the fate of the Jewish people and…be inspired to join the drive to a more humane future for

[1] While there are some initiatives in the area of teaching comparative genocide, it has not yet been adopted or researched extensively enough to show evidence for its apparent promise, and it warrants further experimentation and investigation. See the discussion of Boix-Mansilla (2000) for criteria for evaluating students' comparisons, and Abowitz (2002) for an exploration of how considering multiple cases can produce generalized knowledge or concepts.

humanity as a whole.'[2] The United States Holocaust Memorial Museum similarly sees a fundamental civic purpose in learning about the Holocaust, embracing the mission to 'advance and disseminate knowledge about this unprecedented tragedy; to preserve the memory of those who suffered; and to encourage its visitors to reflect upon the moral and spiritual questions raised by the events of the Holocaust as well as their own responsibilities as citizens of a democracy.'[3] Facing History and Ourselves seeks to 'engage students of diverse backgrounds in an examination of racism, prejudice, and antisemitism in order to promote the development of a more humane and informed citizenry'[4], and similar sentiments appear in the missions of the Anne Frank House, Memorial de la Shoah, and others. With extensive educational efforts around the world, these organizations represent a substantial non-governmental infrastructure that can support countries that seek to implement EH and advance their shared GCED-related goals.

The growing global consensus around EH and GCED in governmental and non-governmental spheres has many roots. EH, for example, is advocated for its historical significance, on the basis of many compelling moral arguments and foundations, and because it is perceived by advocates, scholars and educators as having great potential for advancing a wide range of social, citizenship, and educational goals. As Stevick and Gross (2015, p. 5) note, scholars have linked EH to anti-racism (e.g., Carrington & Short, 1997), combatting prejudices like anti-Semitism (Gordon, Simon, & Weinberg, 2004), homophobia (van Dijk, 2010), democratic education (Kavadias, 2004), education for human rights (Eckmann, 2010; Mihr, 2015; Wogenstein, 2015; Gross, 2016), citizenship education (e.g., Maitles, 2008; Maitles & Cowan, 2004), intercultural education (van Driel, 2003) intergroup encounters (Bekerman & Zembylas, 2010), remembrance (Boschki, Reichmann, & Schwendemann, 2010; Von Der Dunk 2002), and transformative learning (Boyd, 2009; Carlberg, 2008; Tinning, 2014). Comparative genocide, multicultural education, and peace education merit similar consideration. These various emphases and concerns, which range from individual to collective learning, all fit under the umbrella of GCED. Not surprisingly, GCED also adopts 'a multifaceted approach, employing concepts and methodologies already applied in other areas, including human rights education, peace education, education for sustainable development and education for international understanding' (UNESCO 2014, p. 15). The high level of mutual compatibility between these fields illustrates a general scholarly consensus that EH has considerable potential, but to understand it as part of GCED, it is critical to look more concretely at specific goals and the evidence that supports them.

2. Defining EH and GCED, and conceptualizing and measuring their effects

How does knowledge relate to attitudes, and attitudes to civic behaviour, and civic behaviour to changes in government policy and international relations? In other words, what contribution could EH and GCED make to preventing atrocities? By investigating these relationships, we can clarify the nature of the challenges we face and the expectations we have for EH and GCED. Certainly, research can help us to understand educational processes — that is, the development of knowledge, skills and attitudes — and how that learning relates to civic behaviour, and in turn, the impact of civic behaviour on the conduct of governments, locally and internationally, to uphold rights and support peace. But these are not matters of simple causation, where a single factor produces a clear outcome. The relationships between these elements are complex, and, as scholars develop more adequate models to explain how these relationships work, we can understand more clearly the potential contributions of EH and GCED towards our common global goals. But before the key components of a model can be explored, the key terms must be defined.

Terminology

The **Holocaust** refers to the systematic killing of the Jewish people by the Nazi regime and its collaborators between 1941-1945. The persecution of the Jews and other groups under the Nazi regime, beginning in 1933, and during the Second World War, provide essential context.

Genocide, according to the Genocide Convention, is any act 'committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group.'

[2] Yad Vashem mission statement, http://www.yadvashem.org/yv/en/about/mission_statement.asp#!prettyPhoto
[3] United States Holocaust Memorial Museum mission statement, https://www.ushmm.org/information/about-the-museum/mission-and-history
[4] Facing History and Ourselves mission statement, https://www.facinghistory.org/about-us

Education about the Holocaust (EH) refers to deliberate efforts, both formal and informal, to teach about the Holocaust.

Global Citizenship (GC) refers to de facto interconnectedness of all people beyond national borders, and the responsibilities we have to one another around the world.

Global Citizenship Education (GCED) is a 'framing paradigm which encapsulates how education can develop the knowledge, skills, values and attitudes learners need for securing a world which is more just, peaceful, tolerant, inclusive, secure and sustainable' (UNESCO, 2014 p. 9).

GCED includes the **cognitive domain**, which consists of 'knowledge, understanding and critical thinking about global, regional, national and local issues and the interconnectedness and interdependency of different countries and populations' (UNESCO, 2015, p. 15).

GCED's **socio-emotional domain** involves 'a sense of belonging to a common humanity, sharing values and responsibilities, empathy, solidarity and respect for differences and diversity' (UNESCO, 2015, p. 15).

GCED's **behavioural domain** seeks to lead students 'To act effectively and responsibly at local, national and global levels for a more peaceful and sustainable world' (UNESCO, 2015, p. 15)

The Holocaust has at its core the persecution and mass killing of the Jews of Europe by the Nazi German regime and its allies and collaborators between 1941-1945. Leading scholars and organizations expand their frames of reference to varying degrees to include, for example, the Nazi rise to power and the persecution and killing of other minorities. EH is more variable still, although here we make use of the conception advanced by a study conducted by the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance (IHRA) in 2017,[5] which focused upon deliberate efforts to educate about the Holocaust (which thus includes not just children's schooling, but also the learning that takes place at museums and memorial sites, adult learning, non-traditional education, and so forth.) Here, we are primarily concerned with the public, school-based education of youth. Despite this focus, the term EH includes a wide array of diverse content and practices and should not be understood to signify a single thing but rather a range of instructional practices used to advance understanding of the historical phenomenon of the Holocaust. The Holocaust is also often included and contextualized within the broader field of comparative genocide studies, something which has developed in recent decades.

GCED is even more wide-ranging and diverse than EH. Here we rely on UNESCO's understanding which sees GCED as a 'framing paradigm which encapsulates how education can develop the knowledge, skills, values and attitudes learners need for securing a world which is more just, peaceful, tolerant, inclusive, secure and sustainable' (UNESCO, 2014, p. 9). Knowledge, skills, values and attitudes are often conceptualized at the individual level, as characteristics that can be fostered in a single person, with an emphasis on cognitive displays, which are easier to measure than values and attitudes. A more collective conception that explores shared cultural frames of reference should inform future research. Beyond knowledge, skills, values and attitudes, however, GCED implies action, a sense of civic self-efficacy, and a belief that our conduct is meaningful on the global stage. Documenting a link between educational approaches and behavioural changes is even more difficult and elusive than measuring values and attitudes effectively.

For these reasons, it is easy to understand Kofi Annan's (2010) frustration that 'it is surprisingly hard to find education programmes that have clearly succeeded in linking the history of the Holocaust with the prevention of ethnic conflict and genocide in today's world.' After all, it is difficult to link an educational intervention to future behavioural changes. It is effectively impossible to document a chain of reactions that leads directly from educational interventions that change individual attitudes, which cause changes in citizens' behaviour, which in turn produces a change in international geopolitics, the effects of which can then be measured and attributed directly to the original

[5] The study has been published as a book and is publically available on IHRA's website as a free PDF file here: https://holocaustremembrance.com/sites/default/files/research_in_teaching_and_learning_about_the_holocaust_web.pdf .

educational intervention. Effective EH may make an important contribution, but it must be situated within sound models of education, seeking attitude change, and responsible political and geopolitical conduct. Clearly, preventing genocide is a noble purpose and motivation for advancing EH Holocaust, if not a realistic concrete outcome or goal for EH in isolation. The duty of the scholar is to help to clarify the relationship between the individual elements in the sequence, drawing links between knowledge and attitudes, attitudes and behaviours, and behaviours and effects when the empirical evidence justifies it. And those links must be adequately theorized, or to put the task less abstractly, research can help us to understand and to express the nature of the relationship between these separate elements.

Those relationships, such as that between knowledge and attitudes, can be complex, and often vary from culture to culture. For example, Jedwab (2015) analyzed survey data about levels of Holocaust knowledge among adults in Canada, the US, Germany and Spain to test the common-sense assumption that increased knowledge levels would likely correspond to higher levels of tolerance. He found that while those who asserted higher levels of knowledge about the Holocaust displayed greater levels of concern about anti-Semitism (and, notably, also about discrimination against Muslims), he found no discernible relationship between their knowledge levels and their attitudes about whether immigrants should have to abandon their homes, customs and traditions, a staple of multicultural acceptance. And those results might be quite different today: his research was conducted before the refugee crisis enveloped Europe. Even within a single city, the relationship can vary cross-culturally. Kavadias' (2004) study in Brussels was able to link, if weakly, higher levels of Holocaust knowledge to lower levels of anti-Semitism among twelfth grade students, but only among the Flemish speakers, and not among the French speakers. Three important conclusions follow. First, relationships will generally not be simple and straightforward. Second, we often lack sufficient data or research to assert strong models or theories. Together, these two dynamics illustrate the importance of building in careful adaptation, evaluation and experimentation to educational efforts.

As scholars develop a model of learning that conceptualizes the role and contribution of EH and GCED towards shared ends, we see at least two critical links that must be forged: those of dynamic knowledge and moral evaluation leading to action. First, knowledge cannot just be inert, abstract or academic. We must perceive problems before we can act on them, so our teaching must sensitize learners so that they are able to recognize problems. To do so, learning has to bridge historical understanding, which is particular to the original event, and use it to develop sociological or applied knowledge, dynamic knowledge that is transferable or applicable in other contexts, a process that requires students to develop their ability to make appropriate connections and distinctions between disparate events and societies. Boix-Mansilla (2000) reveals the limitations of thinking among students who are not specifically prepared to compare and contrast effectively in the light of evidence.

Second, knowledge must inspire students to act on the problems. Action requires a sense of civic self-efficacy, a belief that they can — and should — make a difference. Yet this belief is challenging to cultivate. Students may lack experiences or opportunities to be involved or be heard even locally. When they are confronted with global challenges of a massive scale, whether murderous dictatorships such as the Nazi regime or the challenges of climate change or world hunger today, there is a high risk that students may feel powerless or despair. Of course, civic action may result both from an instrumental belief in their own civic self-efficacy, or from moral compunction, the feeling that something must be done, even if it feels impossible. This point is not to be taken lightly: for students to take action to prevent an atrocity, they must believe that it is wrong! This outcome is not inevitable, particularly for countries with perceived enemies or a general climate of fear. For this reason, learning must encompass cognitive learning and the moral evaluation of events, together with an understanding of the kinds of civic action, individually and collectively, that can be taken to achieve positive global ends that are consistent with our universal values.

3. How the purposes of Education about the Holocaust and Global Citizenship Education align

The broad and variable conceptions of EH and GCED, and the challenges of clarifying and supporting the relationship between areas such as knowledge, attitudes, values, skills, behaviours and effects, point towards the importance of maintaining a close level of analysis of the phenomena in question. Fortunately, scholars in EH and GCED have put forward sophisticated and deeply complementary conceptions of learning that underscore their deep alignment. UNESCO's presentation of GCED distinguishes between domains, outcomes, learner attributes, topics, and objectives. The key domains articulated for GCED - cognitive, socio-emotional, and behavioural - are linked to specific knowledge, skills, moral development, experiences, commitments and actions that manifest them (UNESCO, 2015). These outcomes are intended to produce the key learner attributes, that students are informed and critically literate,

socially connected and respectful of diversity, and ethically responsible and engaged. The domains, outcomes and attributes are then linked to broad general topics that support these developments: it is in these general topics that the specific relevance of the Holocaust is most obvious. UNESCO then elaborates these general topics into specific learning objectives by age group. Across ages, these topics spiral up in complexity and in complementary ways.[6] This GCED framework does not specifically address pedagogy, didactics or teaching methods in depth. Research into EH can help to establish those links.

A great deal of research is available in the English language, and most literature reviews of EH draw upon this body of research. They therefore bypass research conducted and published in other languages, like Hebrew, German, Polish, French and Spanish. But research in these languages provides a more global perspective and enables the contributions of diverse scholars from many parts of the world and other language communities. In February, 2016, the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance (IHRA) held a conference in Lucerne, Switzerland to present the results of a multiyear research project in which a team of six scholars critically analyzed the empirical research on teaching and learning about the Holocaust that had been made available publically in 15 different languages (Eckmann, Stevick & Ambrosewicz-Jacobs, 2017). The report organized the results of the studies both by language, examining the different discourses surrounding EH in different language communities, and thematically, considering, in separate chapters, teachers and teaching, students and learning, the particular contexts of sites and museums, and the results of intergroup encounters that focus on the subject of the Holocaust. The study also illuminated some of the dynamics of Teaching and Learning about the Holocaust (TLH), the authors' term for deliberate efforts to educate about the Holocaust. This special report provided a much broader perspective on the impact of EH and how those results relate to the specific outcomes envisioned by GCED. Wherever possible, the specific and relevant outcomes discussed in the IHRA report were organized through the template of GCED learning outcomes and the specific learning domains — cognitive, socio-emotional, and behavioural — that comprise them.

For the purposes of this paper, we focus upon GCED's cognitive, socio-emotional, and behavioural domains, which align closely with the framework articulated in Cohen's (2013) investigation into EH in Israel. Cohen differentiated between affective, cognitive, and experiential learning, and, crucially, made the explicit link between these categories of learning and specific pedagogical approaches.

GCED understands the cognitive domain to consist of 'knowledge, understanding and critical thinking about global, regional, national and local issues and the interconnectedness and interdependency of different countries and populations' (UNESCO, 2015, p. 15). For Cohen (2013), this definition specifies scales that are clearly present in the history of the Holocaust, while Cohen makes the link between this kind of knowledge and specific pedagogical approaches:

> *'The cognitive domain spans a spectrum of categories, from simple and concrete through complex and abstract: knowledge, comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis and evaluation. Cognitive learning indicates 'knowing about' a subject…accumulating and processing information, primarily through classic classroom types of lessons (lectures, books, documentaries, etc.).'* (Cohen, 2013, pp. 120-121)

In GCED, socio-emotional knowledge means 'To have a sense of belonging to a common humanity, sharing values and responsibilities, empathy, solidarity and respect for differences and diversity' (UNESCO, 2015, p. 15). GCED's specific outcomes are often evoked within the framework of EH, while Cohen (2013) formulates the concern as the affective domain, which 'refers to education designed to impact students' feelings, values and attitudes. This domain spans a spectrum of awareness, response, valuation, prioritization, synthesis, and internationalization' (p.121).

Finally, GCED's behavioural domain seeks to lead students 'To act effectively and responsibly at local, national and global levels for a more peaceful and sustainable world' (UNESCO, 2015, p. 15) and finds its analogue in the kinds of learning experience that link to such behaviours, what Cohen (2013) calls '"experiential" learning, in which knowledge and abstract concepts are developed through overlapping processes of observing, reflecting, and experimenting. Learners apprehend the subject through direct experience' (p. 122).

The convergence of these sets of ideas is not coincidental, but reflective of their deep commonalities. In addition, though, GCED requires a 'transformative pedagogy' that has to be holistic, and 'encourages learners to critically

[6] The specific topic of the Holocaust is not recommended for lower primary students and only with great caution for the oldest higher primary students; however, students at those ages can be developing concepts and a vocabulary that prepares them for their later encounter with the Holocaust, which can be quite powerful for lower and upper secondary students. The Holocaust has the substance and depth to function effectively as a capstone study of Global Citizenship Education.

revisit assumptions, world views and power relations in mainstream discourses and to consider people/groups systematically underrepresented or marginalized; and focuses on engagement in action to bring about desired changes' (UNESCO, n.d.). These are areas in which the alignment of EH and GCED shows great promise.

4. Education about the Holocaust and the cognitive domain of Global Citizenship Education

In order to assess the compatibility of EH and the cognitive domain of GCED, we must consider the general conception, key learning outcomes, learner attributes and recommended topics of GCED. The cognitive domain of GCED consists of 'knowledge, understanding and critical thinking about global, regional, national and local issues and the interconnectedness and interdependency of different countries and populations' (UNESCO, 2015, p. 15). This domain of GCED includes two key learning outcomes:

1. Learners acquire knowledge and understanding of local, national and global issues and the interconnectedness and interdependency of different countries and populations
2. Learners develop skills for critical thinking and analysis. (UNESCO, 2015, p. 29)

These specific learning outcomes are linked to three attributes of the individual 'informed and critically literate' learner that school systems are seeking to cultivate. These pupils should:

1. Know about local, national and global issues, governance systems and structures.
2. Understand the interdependence and connections of global and local concerns.
3. Develop skills for critical inquiry and analysis. (UNESCO, 2015, p. 29)

UNESCO (2015, p. 29) recommends that these outcomes and attributes be attained by engaging the following areas:

1. Local, national and global systems and structures.
2. Issues affecting interaction and connectedness of communities at local, national and global levels.
3. Underlying assumptions and power dynamics.

4.1 Topical relevance of the Holocaust to the cognitive domain of Global Citizenship Education

It is clear that the subject of the Holocaust and its historical context of the Second World War address the three recommended topic areas quite directly. The Holocaust was an international event in the context of a global conflict. European Jews sought refuge all over the world, with quite limited success, and the atrocity and larger conflict claimed tens of millions of lives and affected billions. Further, this history not only reveals the inadequacy of the global systems in place to avert conflict, it provides students with the historical backdrop for how and why today's systems emerged and are designed as they are. So, the topical relevance of the Holocaust is clear, but what does the research about EH reveal about its impact on these learner attributes and learning outcomes?

4.2 Empirical research in Education about the Holocaust and cognitive domain outcomes

Empirical research in the field shows that EH can be an effective means to advance the key learning outcomes and learner attributes of GCED. In UNESCO's GCED framework, students achieve the learning outcomes and develop the learners' attributes by engaging with a broad range of recommended topics. These topics therefore function as both ends and means: they are ends because learners are intended to develop knowledge about these topics, but they are also the means to develop GCED skills and attributes. These learning outcomes must be connected in turn to teaching: students' learning is closely linked to teachers' professional development.

This GCED framework, which is focused on pupil outcomes, is situated within the overall teaching and learning process. The overall process encompasses teachers and their teaching approaches, and the GCED framework is compatible with a wide diversity of teaching approaches. These teaching approaches may be referred to as pedagogy, didactics or methods. Researchers of teaching and learning about the Holocaust have documented the impact of many such methods. Although these methods were studied within the context of EH, teachers who employ them often find they are transferable and may be utilized to teach other historical topics. The overall process of advancing GCED therefore involves the teacher, the student, and the specific topics, but also the methods by which those topics are taught.

Methods relate to outcomes, for example, when teachers identify students' misconceptions and help to counteract them, which is an important process in EH. Even in places deeply affected by the Holocaust, students and citizens more generally may hold a range of misconceptions, misunderstandings or stereotypical views. Much of the research on EH has occurred in countries directly linked to the Holocaust, including countries where it occurred, where governments functioned as leaders and perpetrators of the Holocaust, where they opposed the Nazis and liberated concentration and death camps, and where many survivors settled after the war. Even though the Holocaust is often familiar in these places, due to media representations or from direct personal connections to the events, students' understandings are often incomplete or otherwise problematic. In Israel, for example, students rely on the education system for a systematic and historically grounded understanding of the issue, even more than from family members or youth groups (Cohen, 2009). In Germany, Welzer, Moller and Tschuggnall (2002) demonstrated that families passed on very different impressions of the Nazi era than those provided by schools. In England, students tended to believe that Jews were persecuted for their religion rather than on the basis of the Nazis' racial ideology and the racial categorizations they applied to Jews and others with Jewish ancestry (Gray, 2014). In each case, the specific content can be adjusted to address local misconceptions.

These examples illustrate the fact that students often do not arrive into the classroom as blank slates, completely unaware of the topics under study, although knowledge gaps are certainly common. For this reason, instruction often must not only transmit new information, but also correct already established misconceptions and misunderstandings. In order to do so, teachers must be able to access students' preconceptions and address them effectively, a process that is the focus of the approach developed by the Centre for Holocaust Education at University College, London.[7]

The method of bringing preconceptions to the surface is broadly applicable because the particular history of the Holocaust (and the Second World War) is often misunderstood or misrepresented in textbooks and curricula all over the world (to see a global mapping of the problematic patterns, cf. Carrier *et al*., 2015). These specific confusions are compounded by problematic images of Jews that have circulated around the world: the Anti-Defamation League's study of anti-Semitism around the world concluded that 1.09 billion people harbour anti-Semitic attitudes, which it defined as people who believe at least six of eleven common stereotypes about Jews (ADL, 2014). Although the figures ranged from about three-quarters in the Middle East and North Africa (MENA), one-third in Central and Eastern Europe, and one fourth to one fifth in Asia, sub-Saharan African and the Americas, only in Oceania did the figure drop as low as one in seven. It is important to note that these figures would have been much higher if the threshold had been set at 4 or 5 of these anti-Semitic stereotypes.

A high-quality, large-scale experimental research project linked students' study of the Holocaust to advances in critical thinking and analysis (Barr *et al.*, 2015). The study involved the FHAO programme, which uses the Holocaust as a foundational case study and applies those insights to other genocides. The researchers recognize that 'historical understanding develops through a sequence of progressive differentiations and integrations, rather than simply as an aggregation of information' (Barr *et al*., 2015, p. 24). Basing their research on the latest findings and theory concerning historical learning, the team used a validated 'assessment measure for students' historical understanding…[that employed] a progression model rubric to assign levels of complexity to students' responses to questions that assess their historical understanding of evidence, causality, and agency' (Barr *et al*., 2015, p. 24). Among other tasks, students 'interpret and integrate information from seven documents, some primary source and other actual economic data' and 'analyze historical information and rate the adequacy of a number of different explanations provided for the historical interpretation of that information' (Barr *et al*., 2015, p. 24). The positive results for students' historical understanding of historical agency, evidence and cause and effect coincided with increases in a number of civic measures, which are discussed in more detail below.

[7] Website of the Centre for Holocaust Education at University College, http://www.holocausteducation.org.uk

The Holocaust is a large-scale, difficult and complex subject, and much of the research in the field concerns in-depth units of study that can extend for weeks. It is unsurprising that it is easier to document effects from programmes that are longer in duration. The FHAO study concerned a programme that was intended to last six weeks, although only about half of those who implemented the programme reached that target threshold, showing that more modest efforts can have meaningful results. The case studies of Schweber (2004), who researched exemplary teachers of the Holocaust in California, revealed a range of approaches, goals and outcomes. The study conducted by Jennings (2015, see the inserted box text) demonstrated that the Holocaust could be taught effectively in conjunction with other complementary materials and approaches, even to primary age students, and that one effective approach to EH for younger students is to spend time building up the concepts and ideas that can help them put words to the material they are encountering.

Bilingual youth in California speak up

Children's differences may seem divisive or threatening if they are not encountered within a broader understanding of our commonalities and shared humanity. When Irene Pattenaude's bilingual (English and Spanish) fifth-grade students in California began an extensive study of the Holocaust, they engaged the full range of learning experiences, encompassing their emotional reactions and citizenship behaviours. The Holocaust functioned as a capstone to a broader, year-long effort to understand rights, respect and responsibility. As in many other effective approaches, empathy development was a central concern, individual experience was emphasized, and there were many opportunities to establish personal connections.

Jennings' study demonstrates the potential of dedicating longer periods of time with younger students with 'long-term engagements, a layered curriculum that supports children in building understandings over time, and varied opportunities for making meaning together' (2010, p. 35). While older students may engage with more sophisticated concepts and deeper historical knowledge, justifying the exclusive use of historical cases, younger children can benefit from age-appropriate literature and approaches using the arts more generally.

While school systems around Europe, North America and Israel appear to be introducing the Holocaust at younger and younger ages, often defying expert guidance in doing so, Jennings' ethnographic case study illuminates the positive possibilities when the topic is introduced carefully and sensitively. Approaching their work together with a sophisticated conception of learning as 'expanding repertoires of meanings, language, and action' (Jennings, 2010, p. 37), the author and teacher were sensitive to the ways in which knowledge and behaviour intersect, and of the importance of being able to perceive and name problematic behaviours and act against them.

The educational programme was thus situated within a philosophy of critical citizenship, through which people 'participate conscientiously, compassionately, and actively in the day-to-day building of more equitable communities' (Jennings, 2010, p. 38). A four-phase approach was taken, through which first, general concepts of tolerance and intolerance were introduced, providing the students with vocabulary and a set of concepts to bring to their encounters with a broad range of materials about the Holocaust in phase 2.

Were they to stop at this point, the study of an event as massive and catastrophic as the Holocaust could be disempowering: what could a few individuals possibly do about a tragedy on that scale? But phases three and four built a bridge to action, by 'constructing personal and grade-wide action steps for promoting tolerance and justice' (Jennings, 2010, p. 39). In education, developing knowledge is relatively straightforward, while developing skills is more challenging, but still relatively well understood. Affecting attitudes and dispositions is considerably more challenging to accomplish and measure.

What makes the work of this fifth-grade class remarkable is the direct link between their learning and their subsequent behaviour, not just as future citizens, but in their contemporary school life. Students learned to distinguish reactions from responses. Their honest reactions were, in fact, often framed in terms of anger and a desire for retaliation. But retaliatory actions are clearly not a desirable outcome. Moral outrage must be guided into responsible and constructive action. And indeed, the children's embrace of responsibility was multi-faceted, ranging from monitoring and improving their own behaviours to taking action to address injustice. As they year ended, the Spanish-dominant students were pulled out to take a language test while the English-dominant students were to receive an informative middle school orientation tour. Sensitized to the dynamics of exclusion and advantage, they spoke up and objected to the problematic process. In doing so, they in turn sensitized their own teachers to issues in their own community. Students who feel empowered to act locally are taking the first steps towards responsible and active global citizenship.

Source:
Jennings, L. B. (2010). Challenges and possibilities of education about the Holocaust and critical citizenship: An ethnographic study of a fifth-grade bilingual class revisited. *Prospects*, *40*(1), 35-56.

The combination of bringing to the surface misconceptions and spending sufficient time on the subject can be important because deeper-level historical thinking can be difficult to engage and change. In Poland, for example, Gross (2014) found that students' interpretation of photos from WWII fell into a pre-established set of conventional patterns that were quite powerful: even when a photo provided evidence that directly contradicted the convention, students would often make the photo fit the conventions, rather than using the evidence to challenge the convention. These conventions, or schemas, are powerful and deep, but she did find some evidence that they could begin to shift. In a similar vein Zülsdorf-Kersting (2007), working with German students in the ninth and tenth grades, found little evidence that classroom instruction could dislodge or modify the ways of thinking and stock patterns of explanation they brought into the classroom.

In both cases, the students tended to explain away or to rationalize problematic conduct by the national majority, disproportionately emphasizing Polish heroism in saving Jews in Poland and holding that most Germans did not bear responsibility for the Holocaust. In these cases, the difficulty may be compounded by issues of guilt and responsibility and their potentially disruptive implications for the students' sense of identity, moral integrity, and feelings of belonging. In these situations, it seems reasonable to hypothesize that the more general intended learning outcomes of GCED might be achieved more effectively if other cases were included that did not involve the learners so directly, but rather enabled them to ascertain the principles in question and then apply them or recognize them in cases with a more personal dimension. In other words, could a comparative genocide approach facilitate students' learning about genocides from which they lack emotional distance?

Comparison is a basic tool of analytical thinking. It builds a bridge from traditional historical thinking — for example, learning about the Holocaust — to developing concepts and transferring insights, that is, learning from the Holocaust. Put another way, we might think of the relationship as building sociological knowledge from the foundation of historical knowledge. Although comparative genocide is just emerging as an approach, some research suggests that it has promise that merits further development. Abowitz (2002), a sociology professor whose approach is similar in some ways to FHAO, notes that students often struggle to understand why, in their perception, more Jews did not seem to offer (violent) resistance to the Nazis, a question that veers close to anti-Semitic tropes about Jews going to gas chambers 'like 'sheep to the slaughter' (p. 30). While studying examples of Jewish revolts quickly disabuses that problematic image, she hopes to develop a more general understanding of resistance. To do so, she embraces the GCED goal of identifying underlying assumptions by asking them to try to define resistance, which helps students to bring to the surface 'the implicit theoretical assumptions of their question' (p. 30). Once they see their assumptions, they can consider whether they are true, which turns the assumptions into hypotheses that can be tested against the data. The ability to recognize one's own assumptions thus contributes to the GCED cognitive domain goal of critical inquiry. Students' understanding of human behaviour expands, and their questions shift to the conditions that enhanced or limited further resistance, and the multiple forms such resistance could take. Critically, this process contributes to a shift in the deeper levels of thinking whose difficulty and elusiveness Zülsdorf-Kersting (2007) and Gross (2014) noted.

Abowitz extends the comparative aspect of her approach to resistance in the Holocaust by examining the resistance of other groups during the Holocaust or in other genocides. Doing so enables them to demonstrate their grasp of the issues and their ability to apply that learning to other cases: 'They progress from examining only the simpler problems of description and general knowledge (the who, where, when, and how many) to exploring those of analysis and application, and from passive memorization to critical reflection and theoretical integration' (p. 31). Boix-Mansilla (2000) similarly explored the issue of historical understanding through the use of comparison, but with younger students. She asked students who had studied the Holocaust to hypothesize about the case of Rwanda: what had their particular historical knowledge of the Holocaust prepared them to look for in other cases? She found that high school-age students' abilities to hypothesize meaningfully about the Rwanda case were quite inconsistent. In this case, the students had not been specifically prepared to compare cases. While some students are able to make reasonable comparisons, this case demonstrated that most students need explicit instruction and practice to compare appropriately and analytically.

Addressing the Holocaust in Rwanda

How do teachers in Rwanda respond to learning about the Holocaust? The work of the Facing History and Ourselves (FHAO) programme in Rwanda illustrates the potential benefits to educators of engaging the history of the Holocaust in post-conflict settings or societies grappling with the aftermath of genocide.

FHAO is the most extensively researched and documented programme for EH, by one estimate topping 100 studies (Foster, 2013, p. 143 footnote 2). But would its successes translate to a society dramatically different from the ones where most research was conducted? The work of Karen Murphy in Rwanda suggests that the potential is quite strong.

This approach puts 'the focus on the decisions made by individuals, communities and nations who contributed to that genocide or, in very exceptional cases, resisted it or protected victims. The program described provides opportunities for teachers and students in countries emerging from mass violence to make *connections* to their own lives and histories as well as to the history of the Holocaust itself' (Murphy, 2010, S71). The aim is to link this learning to the elusive goal of influencing behaviour through reflection and an understanding of human psychology.

FHAO seeks to '…make the essential connections between history and the moral choices [students] confront in their own lives;' and explore the '…steps that led to full-scale violence and destruction, as well as strategies for prevention and positive participation' (Murphy, 2010, S72).

This approach deliberately pursues the goals of active and engaged GCED. It also clearly and deliberately builds bridges from the specific history of the Holocaust to universal themes that resonate anywhere, such as the examination of the collapse of the Weimar Republic and the rise of the Nazis. This, in turn, allows participants to better understand the challenges of 'propaganda, conformity and obedience' while highlighting 'examples of courage, compassion and resistance' (Murphy 2010, S72), the civic virtues that can help to counter these dangers.

The teachers found that looking at Weimar helped bring clarity to their own country's path to genocide, including '…the economic crisis, historical racism, a culture of obedience and conformity, a judicial system which was anything but independent and an education system which reinforced propaganda and segregation' (Murphy 2010, S74).

The work of engaging the Holocaust requires us not just to translate but to reconceptualise. After all, though we may have universal values, they are often manifested differently in different languages and cultures. The example from Rwanda shows how international, cooperative efforts to understand the Holocaust can expand the moral imagination as we encounter different ways of understanding moral (and immoral) behaviour.

Murphy notes that studying accounts of rescuers required cross-cultural deliberation and exploration, and the English concept of risk-taker, without a clear parallel in Kinyarwanda, began to take hold. The teachers and their school director found this effort to study the Holocaust in Rwanda a powerful professional development tool, one that enabled them to discuss their own history and to understand that they were not alone in being afflicted by the scourge of genocide.

Source:
Murphy, K. (2010). Examples of best practice 1. Teaching a Holocaust case study in a post-conflict environment: education as part of violence, reconstruction and repair. *Intercultural Education, 21*(S1), S71-84.

5. Education about the Holocaust and the socio-emotional domain of Global Citizenship Education

In order to assess the compatibility of EH and the socio-emotional domain of GCED, we must consider the general conception, key learning outcomes, learner attributes and recommended topics of GCED. The socio-emotional domain of GCED seeks that students develop 'a sense of belonging to a common humanity, sharing values and responsibilities, empathy, solidarity and respect for differences and diversity' (UNESCO, 2015, p. 15). These 'values,

attitudes and social skills…enable learners to develop affectively, psychosocially, and physically and…enable them to live together with others respectfully and peacefully' (UNESCO, 2015, p. 22). This domain of GCED includes two key learning outcomes:

1. Learners experience a sense of belonging to a common humanity, sharing values and responsibilities, based on human rights.
2. Learners develop attitudes of empathy, solidarity and respect for differences and diversity. (UNESCO, 2015, p. 29)

These specific learning outcomes are linked to three attributes of the individual learner who is 'socially connected and respectful of diversity.' School systems are seeking to cultivate pupils who:

1. Share values and responsibilities based on human rights.
2. Develop attitudes to appreciate and respect differences and diversity. (UNESCO, 2015, p. 29)

UNESCO (2015, p. 29) recommends that these outcomes and attributes be attained by engaging with the following topics:

1. Different levels of identity.
2. Different communities people belong to and how these are connected.
3. Difference and respect for diversity. (UNESCO, 2015, p. 29).

5.1 Topical relevance of the Holocaust for the socio-emotional domain of Global Citizenship Education

Issues of identity, which are central to the history of the Holocaust, are complex and often poorly understood. The Jewish people were the central target of the Nazi regime, and the Nazis sought to eliminate the Jewish people completely. The Nazis' system of racial categorization, which had no scientific merit, focused upon the Jews but also arranged all people into categories in its hierarchy. Other groups that the Nazis decided were 'lesser', including the Roma/Sinti, people with disabilities, and homosexuals, were also targeted for persecution or killings.

In the Nazis' racial vision of the world, some identities were mutually exclusive. For example, the Nazis tried to insist that Jews could not also be German. However, many Jews living in Germany before the Nazi rise to power were highly assimilated in the dominant culture, felt themselves to be fully German and identified themselves as such. The issue at stake here involves different aspects of identity, and who has the power to assume or impose identities. Identity can include aspects of culture, citizenship, religion, nationality, gender, and more. In the case of many German Jews, by culture and citizenship, they were clearly German. The Nazis, on the basis of now discredited 'racial science', insisted that there was a biological basis for the races, which enabled them to determine objectively who was and who was not Jewish. In some cases, the Nazis imposed their racial category of 'Jew' on a German who was not a member of a Jewish faith community, did not feel or identify as Jewish, and did not follow any Jewish cultural practices solely because their biological grandparents included someone also identified as Jewish. Here, the individuals' lived experience of identity collided with the Nazi state's ability to impose categories of identity on others.

Clearly, the Holocaust encompasses the core issues of identity and the worst consequences of intolerance. These topics speak directly to the socio-emotional domain's key learning outcomes and learner attributes. Because attitudes are more difficult to influence and to measure, it is important to consider what empirical research has discovered about the impact and potential of EH to attain these outcomes.

5.2 Empirical research in Education about the Holocaust and socio-emotional domain outcomes

While educational researchers are able to assess students' knowledge of individual facts with a high degree of accuracy, and even more advanced conceptions of knowledge, it is much more difficult to precisely measure their

attitudes and feelings. Largely for this reason, there is much less research in this area and the findings that exist are often 'self-reported, i.e. based upon what students or other learners report about themselves. Self-reporting on non-controversial topics in anonymous settings can increase the likelihood that respondents will provide full and truthful answers. In areas that concern social prejudices, however, respondents are often aware that there can be a social stigma attached to certain answers and therefore deny them, even if they are truly felt and experienced. This is the problem of 'socially expected answers'. For these reasons, the social setting of the research can have a large impact on the nature of the answers provided. In the case of negative views or stereotypes, researchers can attempt to construct tests or activities through which such views, whether latent or explicit, can be revealed or detected. In the section above on Defining EH and GCED, and conceptualizing and measuring their effects, we documented that there is no straightforward link between knowledge levels and attitudes, but the relationship is complex and varies from place to place. Several studies documented by the IHRA study record this complexity.

Essays or interview responses often provide qualitative data that can be analyzed critically to determine whether anti-Semitic tropes or other problematic ways of thinking are present. Ivanova's (2004, 2008) 107 student essays from Ukraine, for example, revealed that nine students expressed openly anti-Semitic views while others used implicit anti-Semitism. At the same time, 18 per cent adopted an anti-racist and anti-nationalist stance. Gross's (2014) work in Poland, which asked students to discuss iconic photographs from the Holocaust, revealed that most students interpreted the photos through traditional historical tropes, even when they contradicted the content of the photos. These shared views were not universal, however: other students showed signs of a counter-narrative.

In Spain, studies conducted by Grupo Eleuterio Quintanilla (2005-2006) and Simó (2005) showed relatively low levels of historical knowledge about the Holocaust. In addition, however, the majority declared their opposition to National Socialism, even while many qualitative responses revealed traditional stereotypes of Jews, both camouflaged and overt anti-Semitism, and even some Holocaust denial. In France, Fijalkow and Jalaudin linked the 1300 surveyed students' widespread condemnation of racism and xenophobia to education about the Shoah (2009, 2012, 2014), though knowledge and attitude levels were somewhat less positive among vocational students. Ambrosewicz-Jacobs, who conducted a series of studies in Poland, concluded that teachers make a significant positive impact on students' attitudes (2000, 2004, 2011, 2014a, 2014b). Dahl (2008) documented an effort, which brought children in regular contact with four survivors and found them able to connect the survivors' experiences to other forms of discrimination. The children in this study used transformative language to describe the impact the experience had on them.

Any subject taught badly can have negative results. Poorly taught education about the Holocaust may leave unchallenged — or even reinforce — anti-Semitic stereotypes. An emphasis on the 6 million Jewish victims of the Holocaust, for example, may leave students believing that the Jews who perished in the Holocaust were a homogenous group. In fact, many were assimilated into the various national cultures of Europe and had no shared language, with the largest group of victims, the Yiddish-speaking orthodox Jews of Poland. Conveying the diversity of Jewish life and communities in Europe can thus help to undermine a single or stereotypical image of Jews. The timing can matter a great deal as well. Eser Davolio (2000, 2012) developed approaches to combat prejudice in Switzerland and found that prejudices towards Holocaust survivors increased despite encounters with a Holocaust victim! The increase may be explained by the contentious context at the time that involved discussions of Swiss banks and Jewish assets. Given this context, it seems likely that the programme may have kept the negative prejudice from rising more dramatically. While it did not succeed in preventing an increase in prejudice against Holocaust survivors, the programme documented a decrease in prejudice against asylum seekers.

While EH research often focuses upon the victims, and particularly anti-Semitism, it may be at risk of generating or contributing to negative stereotypes of Germans today. The Spanish students involved in research by Grupo Eleuterio Quintanilla (2005-2006) and Simó (2005) often identified Germans as evil or crazy. Some students in Jennings's research (2010) expressed a desire for revenge. Janina Bauman, a Holocaust survivor herself, noted that students expressed themselves as disgusted, sickened and revolted by Germans. Allowing students to adopt a simplistic and stereotypical view of Germans has risks, however. If students imagine Germans not as "ordinary people," but as especially prone to descend into hatred and violence, they may fail to recognize the general human susceptibility to the forces that influenced the views and behaviors of the perpetrators and bystanders of the time and enabled the Holocaust to take place. The strength of the impulse towards moral judgment and condemnation may thus obscure our shared human susceptibility to pernicious forces like fear, exclusion, and inaction.

Some of the most compelling evidence for the potential impact of EH in the socio-emotional domain comes from a large scale, randomized experimental study of the implementation of the FHAO programme in schools in the USA (Barr et al., 2015). In this study, a group of teachers received training in how to implement the programme. Their results were then compared with others who did not implement the study. The results showed many strong

outcomes even at one degree of removal: FHAO trained teachers, who taught students, and the second-hand impact on students was measured. A relatively intensive programme (a minimum duration of six weeks), the impact on civic variables was notable. There were gains in civic responsibility, tolerance, civic self-efficacy, civic participation, and classroom climate.

For the past to have meaning for today, students must responsibly and effectively relate something particular to the past with the present. Concepts often build that bridge. Wegner (1998) analysed 200 student essays in an area of Wisconsin, USA, that had a large population with German heritage, and found that students worked actively with such bridging concepts as discrimination, dehumanization, and prejudice. Wieviorka (2005) conducted research in French communities that have a large number of immigrants from Northern Africa. In these contexts, recognition matters a great deal (Gryglewski, 2013). Connections are made not only through concepts but in the context of a perceived competition of victimhood. The Holocaust as a topic in schools can become a flashpoint where anti-Semitism arises, and teachers attest to having success through a comparative genocide approach. Students may feel that the crimes against humanity in the histories of the communities that they identify with have not received the same level of recognition, just as their communities have not received the same level of societal acceptance as Jews.

6. Education about the Holocaust and the behavioural domain of Global Citizenship Education

In order to assess the compatibility of EH and the behavioural domain of GCED, we must consider the general conception, key learning outcomes, learner attributes and recommended topics of GCED. The behavioural domain of GCED seeks that students 'act effectively and responsibly at local, national and global levels for a more peaceful and sustainable world' (UNESCO, 2015, p. 15). This domain of GCED includes two key learning outcomes:

1. Learners act effectively and responsibly at local, national and global levels for a more peaceful and sustainable world.
2. Learners develop motivation and willingness to take necessary actions. (UNESCO, 2015, p. 29)

These specific behavioural outcomes are linked to three attributes of the individual learner who is 'ethically responsible and engaged.' School systems are seeking to cultivate pupils who:

1. Enact appropriate skills, values, beliefs and attitudes.
2. Demonstrate personal and social responsibility for a peaceful and sustainable world.
3. Develop motivation and willingness to care for the common good.

UNESCO (2015, p. 29) recommends that these outcomes and attributes are achieved through the following approaches:

1. Actions that can be taken individually and collectively.
2. Ethically responsible behaviour.
3. Getting engaged and taking action. (UNESCO, 2015, p. 29).

6.1 The relevance of the Holocaust to the behavioural domain of Global Citizenship Education

The Holocaust posed moral dilemmas for millions of people, producing a range of responses. Some perpetrators and collaborators enthusiastically participated in atrocities. Many, perhaps most, people were bystanders, whether from fear, indifference or feelings of impotence. Some looked away and others chose not to know. Others were rescuers and resisters, taking great risks in order to save others, to hinder or obstruct the perpetrators, or simply to act humanely to people who were suffering. And victims were often confronted with horrific conundrums, or 'choiceless choices' (Brown, 2010). Indeed, many people belonged to different categories at different times and in different situations.

The enormity of the Holocaust can create feelings of powerlessness. What could an individual do to stop a tyrannical regime with millions of soldiers? But the attention in EH to individual experiences reveals that a difference can be made locally, that individual actions add up, and that people working together can accomplish more.

However, the challenge of learning to act in threatening and difficult circumstances is a formidable one. Students must first be able to perceive that something problematic is occurring. Perception requires attentiveness and awareness. Then, students must make the moral judgment that what is happening is wrong. Societies struggle to develop and maintain such a moral consensus. Once students perceive a problem and judge it to be morally wrong, they must then believe that they themselves must act and that they have the capacity and ability to make a difference. The more advanced a problem is, the more obvious it is, and the more difficult it may be to counteract. So, the moral imperative must develop beyond reactions to obvious problems — though these are critical — and build towards proactive prevention of emerging problems.

These goals are difficult to accomplish, and difficult to document. Problems that are averted are counterfactual: we cannot know what might have happened. In addition, studying extreme cases may not necessarily draw attention to everyday issues. Students need assistance drawing appropriate connections and implications between situations. Finally, the civic and behavioural implications of schooling for children is often future-oriented, aimed at shaping the behaviour of adults with full citizenship. It is difficult at best to link behaviour in the distant future to specific school interventions. For these reasons, our empirical basis for demonstrating the future behavioural implications of any educational intervention is thin. But the interventions may be no less important for that reason. Our inability to document direct, causal links with long-term future behaviours does not allow us to conclude that there is no positive role for EH and its sibling areas of study like human rights education and comparative genocide studies. Instead of attempting to establish unambiguous cause-and-effect connections, we must consider the promise and potential that various approaches suggest.

South Africa

In South Africa, educators learn about the Holocaust and the genocide in Rwanda through the lens of their own knowledge and experience of colonialism and apartheid and the human rights abuses they entailed. Because many educators report that it is difficult to address their own painful history directly, teaching about the Holocaust enables them to broach difficult topics pertinent to their own history with some critical emotional distance. These insights and concepts can then be brought to bear on local history.

A traveling exhibit about Anne Frank toured South Africa and Namibia in 1993-1994 incorporating panels that addressed South Africa's own human rights abuses. South Africans learned about anti-Semitism, which showed that racism and bigotry were not rooted in skin colour alone. The exhibit's success led to the establishment of the Holocaust Centre in Cape Town in 1999, with others established in Durban and Johannesburg in 2008.

In 2007, South Africa adopted a new curriculum that focused upon human rights. It explicitly included the Holocaust in ninth and eleventh year social studies and history. This unit was strongly rooted in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which was formulated in the aftermath of WWII and the Holocaust. Students learn first about the Holocaust and then about apartheid, which enables them to make appropriate connections and distinctions between the two events.

Educators discovered that South Africa's rich oral history traditions meant that many powerful approaches to EH, such as hearing the testimonies of survivors, resonated particularly well there, and helped students and educators relate to different people from distant places. In fact, the curriculum specifically calls for the use of oral testimony.

Although there is a small number of Holocaust witnesses in South Africa, the centres provide educators with locally produced documentaries about survivors who settled there. Educators find that having students study the choices made by others during the Holocaust and the consequences enables them to 'respond more effectively to their present realities' (S20). Educators hope to address the elusive link between learning and future conduct by helping students understand the factors that restrain individuals from taking the kinds of actions that are necessary to protect and sustain human rights. Indeed, the categories of bystanders and upstanders are resonant wherever there has been injustice.

The pain and suffering of educators prompted many to apply the term 'genocide' to apartheid, often with passion. Rather than directly confronting an emotionally wrought debate, trainers had success with an exercise that applied historical evidence from the Holocaust and the genocide in Rwanda, which fostered a more sophisticated and nuanced understanding of the issues.

Source:
Nates, T. (2010). 'But, apartheid was also genocide… What about our suffering?' Teaching the Holocaust in South Africa–opportunities and challenges. *Intercultural Education, 21*(S1), S17-26.

6.2 Empirical research in Education about the Holocaust and behavioural domain outcomes

Building awareness is a critical step in fostering the willingness and motivation to take action, but it is not sufficient by itself. Still, evidence of budding awareness is important to document. Carrington and Short, for example, explored whether EH advanced the anti-racist attitudes of English children aged 14-15. They determined that the students did indeed gain a deeper awareness of racism and prejudice. Awareness and active concern are distinct qualities, however. In this case, the researchers found that some students remained complacent. Moving from awareness through motivation and willingness to act to action itself requires a fundamental change in orientation. Of Wegner's (1998) 200 students, 82 per cent identified the core motivation of not allowing the Holocaust to happen again. Motivation may be linked to a sense of responsibility, and Hommet's (2012, 2014) work with Project THIEC in France shows that students are more comfortable with notions of collective responsibility than with individual responsibility.

This task can be delicate because most learning in subjects like history where the Holocaust is traditionally taught is aimed more at cognitive understanding than at ethical formation and motivating behaviour. Teachers may find themselves in unfamiliar territory when they explicitly attempt to guide behaviour or engage emotions, and may not be trained for the task, nor effective at it. Corbel and Falaize (2003), for example, in their work with French teachers, document a risk of moralization. Meseth and Proske (2010) similarly document a process of over moralization in some German classrooms. The high sensitivity of the subject can also contribute to what Corbel and Falaize call sacralisation, which can hinder students from thinking critically and speaking openly about a subject. Together, these dynamics make the behavioural implications of students' learning fixed rather than open, dictated rather than established through dialogue, and acceptable responses enforced rather than inspired or motivated. These trends relate partly to the horrors of the Holocaust itself, and partly to the structural nature of schooling which often privileges cognitive pursuits over moral formation. When teachers approach the topic in a systematic way with support, as in the FHAO curriculum, researchers have identified student outcomes such as 'great restraint' and 'improved moral reasoning' (Schultz, Barr & Selman, 2001). The Barr et al. (2015) study discussed above also documented improvements in social and ethical competencies. Because these students also showed improved historical understanding, it is clear that cognitive and socio-emotional learning can occur together rather than at the expense of each other. The moral and emotional aspects of EH seem to go hand in hand. Kühner, Langer and Sigel (2008), for example, found that students and teachers build up high expectations around the subject and its role as moral education.

Inevitably learning is aimed at future behaviour, which is difficult to track and more difficult still to attribute to specific educational interventions, even if they are exceptional and memorable ones such as hearing Holocaust survivors speak or visiting Holocaust memory or memorial sites like Auschwitz. To address this difficulty, researchers sometimes ask learners to reflect on their intentions and whether they have shifted. Shamai, Yardeni and Klages (2004) conducted research with Israeli and German students and identified an important attitudinal orientation with clear behavioural implications: students with higher knowledge levels about the Holocaust, they found, demonstrated a higher level of willingness to resist the potential emergence of a dictatorship. Spalding, Savage and Garcia (2007) conducted case studies of three future educators who participated in the March of Remembrance and Hope, finding that the experience had a sustained impact on their attitudes towards diversity and their inclination to respond when confronted with social injustice.

While the idea of behavioural outcomes creates a large gap between the time when the learning takes place and when the desired behaviour takes place, making it difficult to document clear causal links, it is important also to note educators' and experts' perceptions of promise and potential. Notable in this category is the perspective of 83.7 per

cent of 10,000 surveyed Swedish teachers, who felt that the Holocaust was more effective than other topics for generating positive explorations of moral and ethical issues.

The Holocaust also holds a high level of interest for teachers and students. The vast majority of teachers surveyed in the United Kingdom, for example, were open to learning more (Foster, 2013), while American teachers who, on average had participated in more than three professional developments on the subject, continued to see value in further learning (Harbaugh, 2015). There seems to be a high level of interest expressed by students in many places. In France, Fijalkow and Jalaudin noted that students wanted to learn more about local dimensions of the Holocaust (2009, 2012, 2014). The UCL study of 10,000 secondary students found that 85 per cent felt that the subject was important.

Teachers also testify to a high level of engagement. Clements' (2006) research in the USA and UK found that the subject helped to produce a high level of emotional engagement. In addition, by engaging 'difficult knowledge', these teachers participated in a different kind of open-ended and dialogic process in the classroom, one characterized in Clements' view as empowerment. It seems that the subject of the Holocaust opens up the classroom to different kinds of socio-emotional and behavioural domain learning that are unusual in a system dominated by cognitive domain tasks.

7. Conclusion

EH displays a high degree of relevance for GCED. Its relevance comes in at least three forms: it is topical, historical, and compatible. Many topics of concern for GCED are present in the history of the Holocaust. And the Holocaust's historical significance, while sufficient to justify its instruction in its own right, also provides the backdrop to the formation and international adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Finally, the research into EH shows a variety of methods and outcomes that are complementary to the goals of GCED.

The three domains of GCED — cognitive, socio-emotional, and behavioural — are increasingly difficult to achieve and document. The research studies discussed here show the clear relevance of EH for the cognitive and socio-emotional domains, as well as promise and potential that can be explored with respect to the behavioural domain. It is notable that EH sometimes achieved ends associated with GCED, even when it was not explicitly intended to do so. The possibility of adopting or expanding EH in conjunction with the GCED domains and specifically oriented towards GCED goals seems likely to increase its positive results in this area. In addition, some innovations related to EH, such as comparative genocide pedagogy, have not yet been widely practised or researched. Such innovations cannot be directly rooted in prior, proven empirical results because they have not been tested. Instead, we must consider promise and potential as grounds for further experimentation and investigation. In many cases, teachers and experts perceive grounds for further exploration.

8. References

Abowitz, D. A. (2002). Bringing the Sociological into the Discussion: Teaching the Sociology of Genocide and the Holocaust. *Teaching sociology*, 26-38.

ADL (2014). ADL global 100: An index of anti-semitism. Washington, DC: First International Resources. http://global100.adl.org

Ambrosewicz-Jacobs, J. (2000). Attitudes of young Poles toward Jews in post-1989 Poland. *East European Politics and Societies 14*(3), 565–596.

Ambrosewicz-Jacobs, J. (2004). Opinie młodzieży na temat Żydów: Badania z Krakowa i Nowego Jorku [Young people's opinions about the Jews: Studies from Krakow and New York]. In J. Chrobaczyński, & P. Trojański (Eds.). *Zagłada Żydów w edukacji szkolnej* [*e Holocaust in school education*] (pp. 145–158). Krakow: Wydawnictwo Naukowe AP.

Ambrosewicz-Jacobs, J. (2011). Świadomość Holokaustu wśród mło- dzieży polskiej po zmianach systemowych 1989 roku [Holocaust consciousness among Polish youth after the 1989 collapse of Communism]. In F. Tych, & M. Adamczyk-Garbowska (Eds.). *Następstwa zagłady Żydów. Polska 1944–2010* (pp. 625–660). Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS w Lublinie, Żydowski Instytut Historyczny.

Ambrosewicz-Jacobs, J. (2014a). Młodzież wobec Żydów i Holokaustu [Youth attitudes towards Jews and the Holocaust]. Z komentarzami prof. dra hab. Antoniego Sułka, dr hab. Michała Bilewicza i Roberta Szuchty, *Nigdy Więcej, 21*, 36–39.

Ambrosewicz-Jacobs, J. (2014b). Holokaust w świadomości młodzieży polskiej [The Holocaust in the consciousness of young Poles]. In P. Żabickiego (Ed.). *Projektor Jagielloński*. (pp. 15–16). Krakow: Uniwersytet Jagielloński, CITTRU.

Annan, K. (2010, 17 June). The myth of never again. *The New York Times*. http://www.nytimes.com/2010/06/18/opinion/18iht-edannan.html

Barr, D., Boulay, B., Selman, R. L., McCormick, R., Lowenstein, E., Gamse, B., & Lesaux, N. (2015). A randomized controlled trial of professional development for interdisciplinary civic education: Impacts on humanities teachers and their students. *Teachers College Record*, *117*(4), 1-52.

Bauman, J. (2004). Entering the world of a Holocaust victim: Schoolchildren discuss a ghetto memoir. In R. Lentin (Ed.), *Re-presenting the Shoah for the twenty-first century* (pp. 77-85). New York: Berghahn Books. .

Bekerman, Z., & Zembylas, M. (2010). Fearful symmetry: Palestinian and Jewish teachers confront contested narratives in integrated bilingual education. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 26*(3), 507–515.

Boix-Mansilla, V. (2000). Can they use what they have learned to make sense of the present? Historical understanding beyond the past and into the present. In P. S. Seixas, P. & S. Wineburg (Eds.), *Knowing, learning and teaching history* (pp. 390-418). San Francisco: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Boschki, R., Reichmann, B., & Schwendemann, W. (2010). Education after and about Auschwitz in Germany: Towards a theory of remembrance in the European context. *Prospects*, *40*(1), 133-152.

Boyd, B. L. (2009). Using a case study to develop the transformational teaching theory. *Journal of Leadership Education, 7*(3), 50–59.

Brown, A. (2010). Confronting 'choiceless choices' in Holocaust video testimonies: Judgement, 'privileged' Jews, and the role of the interviewer. *Continuum: Journal of Media & Cultural Studies*, *24*(1), 79-90

Carlberg, C. (2008). *Making connections between transformative learning and teaching of the Holocaust in the high school classroom*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, St. Louis University.

Carrier, P., Fuchs, E., & Messinger, T. (2015). *The International status of education about the Holocaust: a global*

mapping of textbooks and curricula. UNESCO Publishing. http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0022/002287/228776e.pdf

Carrington, B., & Short, G. (1997). Holocaust education, anti-racism and citizenship. *Educational Review, 49*(3), 271–282.

Clements, J. (2006). A very neutral voice: teaching about the Holocaust. *Educate~*, *5*(1), 39-49. http://www.educatejournal.org/index.php/educate/article/view/60

Cohen, E. (2013). *Identity and pedagogy: Shoah education in Israeli state schools*. Boston: Academic Studies Press.

Corbel, L., & Falaize, B. (2003). Entre mémoire et savoir: L'enseignement de la Shoah et des guerres de décolonisation [Between memory and knowledge: Teaching the Shoah and the wars of decolonization]. Versailles/ Lyon: IUFM [teacher training institute] /INRP [National Institute for Education Research]. Retrieved from www.inrp.fr/philo/mem_hist/rapport/accueil.htm

Dahl, M. M. P. (2008). Middle school application of Holocaust studies. Catholic students adopt survivors: A case study [Doctoral Dissertation]. St. Paul, MN: University of St. Thomas.

Eser Davolio, M. (2000). *Fremdenfeindlichkeit, Rassismus und Gewalt: Festgefahrenes durch Projektunterricht bewegen* [*Xenophobia, racism and violence: How to break a deadlock through teaching projects*]. Bern: Haupt.

Eser Davolio, M. (2012). Einstellungen Jugendlicher zum Holocaust verändern – ein schwieriges Unterfangen [To change young people's attitudes to the Holocaust – a difficult undertaking]. In B. Ziegler, P. Gautschi, B. C. Schäer, & C. Schneider (Eds.). *Die Schweiz und die Shoa: Von Kontroversen zu neuen Fragen* [*Switzerland and the Shoah: From controversies to new questions*] (pp. 47-62). Zurich: Chronos.

Eckmann, M. (2010). Exploring the relevance of Holocaust education for human rights education. *Prospects*, *40*(1), 7-16.

Eckmann, M., Stevick, D., & Ambrosewicz-Jacobs, J. (2017). *Research in teaching and learning about the Holocaust: a dialogue beyond borders*. Berlin: Metropol Verlag. https://holocaustremembrance.com/sites/default/files/research_in_teaching_and_learning_about_the_holocaust_web.pdf

Fijalkow Y., & Jalaudin C. (2009). Savoirs et représentations liés à la Shoah chez les lycéens du Tarn: Influences du scolaire et de l'extrascolaire [Knowledge and representations regarding the Shoah among students in the Tarn: Influences of school and extracurricular activities]. In J. Fijalkow (Ed.). *Transmettre la Shoah dans la famille, à l'école, dans la cité* [*Transmitting the Shoah in family, school and extracurricular activities*] (pp. 13–27). Paris: Les Editions de Paris—Max Chaleil.

Fijalkow Y., & Jalaudin C. (2012). Connaissance de la Shoah: Une enquête auprès des lycéens du Tarn [Knowledge of the Shoah: A survey among students of the Tarn]. *La revue du Tarn*, *archives départementa- les du Tarn*, *225*, 83–90.

Fijalkow, Y., & Jalaudin, C. (2014). Les effets de l'enseignement de la Shoah au Lycée: Des bénéfices inégalement partagés [The impact of programs about the Shoah in secondary schools: Unequally shared benefits]. In C. Bordes Benayoun (Ed.). *Les judaïsmes: Une socio-anthropologie de la diversité religieuse et culturelle* [*Judaisms: A socio-anthropological study of religious and cultural diversity*] (pp. 201–219). Paris: Honoré Champion.

Foster, S. (2013). Teaching about the Holocaust in English schools: challenges and possibilities. *Intercultural Education*, *24*(1-2), 133-148.

Fracapane, K., & Haß, M. (2014). *Holocaust education in a global context*. Paris: UNESCO. http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0022/002259/225973e.pdf

Gordon, S. B., Simon, C. A., & Weinberg, L. (2004). The effects of Holocaust education on students' level of anti-

semitism. *Educational Research Quarterly, 27*(3), 58–71.

Gray, M. (2014a). The Boy in the Striped Pyjamas: A blessing or curse for Holocaust education? *Holocaust Studies*, *20*(3), 109-136.

Gray, M. (2014b). *Contemporary debates in Holocaust education*. London: Palgrave-MacMillan.

Gross, M. (2014). Struggling to deal with the difficult past: Polish students confront the Holocaust. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 46*(4), 441-463.

Gross, Z. & Stevick, E. D. (2015). (Eds.) *As the Witnesses Fall Silent: 21st Century Holocaust Education in Curriculum, Policy and Practice* (pp. 3-15). Dordrecht: UNESCO IBE/Springer International Publishing.

Gross, Z. (2016). Educating for Human Rights from the Jewish Perspective: Principles and Methods. In M. L. Pirner, J. Lähnemann, & H. Bielefeldt, (Eds.). (2016). *Human Rights and Religion in Educational Contexts* (Vol. 1). Switzerland: Springer International Publishing.

Grupo Eleuterio Quintanilla, (2007). *Estudio sobre conocimiento del Holocausto durante 2005–2006 en estudiantes de secundaria* [*Study of knowledge of the Holocaust among secondary school students*]. Donostia: Tercera Prensa.

Gryglewski, E. (2013). *Anerkennung und Erinnerung: Zugänge arabisch-palästinensicher und türkischer Jugendlicher zum Holocaust* [*Recognition and remembrance: Arab-Palestinian and Turkish young people's access to the Holocaust*]. Berlin: Metropol.

Hommet S. (2012), *Enseigner les passés douloureux en Europe: Entre oubli et hypermnésie, quelle place pour l'enseignement? Présentation d'un projet européen de recherche* [*Teaching Europe's painful pasts: Between amnesia and hypermnesia, what role for schools? Presentation of a European research project*], [Colloque "Histoires de l'oubli" ["Forgotten history" colloquium], Aix-Marseille, *E-rea*. Retrieved from http://erea.revues.org/2845

Hommet, S. (2014). Rencontrer les passés douloureux – une étude francaise [Encountering painful pasts – a French study]. In J. Löfström (Ed.), *Rencontrer les passés douloureux* [*Encountering painful pasts*] (pp. 17-42). Helsinki: Research Centre for Social Studies Education, University of Helsinki.

Ivanova, E. (2004). Ukrainian high school students' understanding of the Holocaust. *Holocaust and Genocide Studies*, *18*(3), 402–420.

Ivanova, E. (2008). Regionalnye osobennosti kollektivnoi pamiati studentov o Holokoste v sovremennoi Ukraine [Regional peculiarities of students' collective memory of the Holocaust in present-day Ukraine]. *Holokost i suchasnist. Studiï v Ukraïni i sviti, 2*(4), 9–28.

Jennings, L. B. (2010). Challenges and possibilities of Holocaust education and critical citizenship: An ethnographic study of a fifth-grade bilingual class revisited. *Prospects*, *40*(1), 35-56.

Kavadias, D. (2004). Past perfect tense? The link between knowledge of Nazi-genocide and democratic attitudes of adolescents in Brussels. *Res Publica, 46*(4), 535–554.

Kühner, A., Langer P. C., & Sigel R. (2008). Ausgewählte Studienergebnisse im Überblick [Overview of selected research results]. *Bayrische Zeitschri für Politik und Geschichte*, *1*(8), 76-82 [Einsichten Perspektiven]. Retrieved from http://www.blz.bayern.de/blz/eup/01_08_themenheft/EP1.08-Themenheft.pdf

Maitles, H. (2008). "Why are we learning this?": Does studying the Holocaust encourage better citizenship values? *Genocide Studies and Prevention: An International Journal*, *3*(3). http:// scholarcommons.usf.edu/gsp/vol3/iss3/7

Maitles, H., & Cowan, P. (2004, 25–27 November). *One country, many cultures!: Does Holocaust education have an impact on pupils' citizenship values and attitudes?* Paper presented at the Scottish Educational Research Association conference, Perth.

Meseth, W. & M. Proske (2010). Mind the gap: Holocaust education in Germany, between pedagogical intentions and classroom interactions. *Prospects: Quarterly Review of Comparative Education 40*(2), 201-222.

Mihr, A. (2015). Why Holocaust education is not always human rights education. *Journal of Human Rights*, *14*(4), 525-544.

Misco, T. J. (2006). *Breaking historical silences through cross-cultural curriculum deliberation: Teaching the Holocaust in Latvian schools*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Iowa, Iowa City, IA.

Murphy, K. (2010). Examples of best practice 1. Teaching a Holocaust case study in a post-conflict environment: education as part of violence, reconstruction and repair. *Intercultural Education, 21*(S1), S71-84.

Nates, T. (2010). 'But, apartheid was also genocide… What about our suffering?' Teaching the Holocaust in South Africa–opportunities and challenges. *Intercultural Education, 21*(S1), S17-26.

Schultz, L. H., Barr, D. J. & Selman, R. L. (2001). The value of a developmental approach to evaluating character development programmes: An outcome study of Facing History and Ourselves. *Journal of Moral Education 30*(1), 3-27.

Schweber, S. (2004). Making sense of the Holocaust: Lessons from classroom practice. New York: Teachers College Press.

Shamai, S., Yardeni, E., & Klages, B. (2004). Multicultural education: Israeli and German adolescents' knowledge and views regarding the Holocaust. *Adolescence, 39*(156), 765-78.

Simó, M. (2005). *Teaching about the Holocaust in Catalonia*. Krakow: University Jagellonska Krakow.

Spalding, E., Savage, T. A., & Garcia, J. (2007). The March of Remembrance and Hope: Teaching and learning about diversity and social justice through the Holocaust. *Teachers College Record*, *109*(6), 1423-1456.

Stevick, E. D., & Gross, Z. (2015). Holocaust Education in the 21st Century: Curriculum, Policy and Practice. In Z. Gross & E.D. Stevick (eds.), *As the Witnesses Fall Silent: 21st Century Holocaust Education in Curriculum, Policy and Practice* (pp. 3-15). Dordrecht: UNESCO IBE/Springer International Publishing.

Stevick, E. D., & Michaels, D. L. (2013). Empirical and normative foundations of Holocaust education: Bringing research and advocacy into dialogue. *Intercultural Education, 24*(1–2), 1–18.

Tinning, K. (2014). *Embodied responsiveness to the survivor: Museum exhibitions, traumatic life stories, and transformative learning experience*. Freeland, Oxfordshire: Interdisciplinary.net. http://www.inter-disciplinary.net/at-the-interface/wp-content/uploads/2014/02/Tinningtirpaper.pdf

UN [United Nations] (2005, 1 November). *Resolution adopted by the General Assembly on the Holocaust Remembrance*. A/RES/60/7. New York: UN. http://www.un.org/en/holocaustremembrance/docs/res607.shtml

UNESCO, (n.d.). The ABCs of Global Citizenship Education.

UNESCO (2014). Global citizenship education: Preparing learners for the challenges of the twenty-first century. http://www.unesco.ch/fileadmin/user_upload/3_Wie/bildung/Global_Citizenship_Education.pdf

UNESCO (2015). Global citizenship education: Topics and learning objectives. http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0023/002329/232993e.pdf

UNESCO (2017). Education about the Holocaust and preventing genocide: A policy guide. http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0024/002480/248071e.pdf

Urquhart, B. (2001, April 26). A world made new: Eleanor Roosevelt and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. *New York Review of Books 46*(7).

van Dijk, L. (2010). Examples of best practice 3. Holocaust education and sexual diversity: A positive link between teaching about the persecution of Jews and sexual minorities. *Intercultural Education, 21*(1467–5986, 1467–5986), 81–84.

van Driel, B. (2003). Some reflections on the connection between Holocaust education and intercultural education. *Intercultural Education, 14*(2), 125–137.

van Driel, B. (2016). Teaching about the Holocaust in less impacted countries. *Multicultural Education Review*, *8*(1), 14-26.

von der Dunk, H. (2002). The Holocaust: Remembrance and education. *European Review, 10*(1), 53–61.

Wegner, G. (1998). "What lessons are there from the Holocaust for my generation today?" Perspectives on civic virtue from middle school youth. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, *13*(2), 167-183.

Welzer, H., Moller, S., & Tschuggnall, K (2002*). "Opa war kein Nazi": Nationalsozialismus und Holocaust im Familiengedächtnis ["Grandpa was no Nazi": National Socialism and the Holocaust in family memory]*. Frankfurt am Main: Fischer Taschenbuch.

Wieviorka, M. (2005). *La tentation antisémite. Haine des Juifs dans la France d'aujourd'hui* [The antisemitic temptation. Hatred of Jews in France]. Paris: Robert Laffont.

Wogenstein, S. (2015). Holocaust Education and Human Rights Education Reconsidered: A Response to Anja Mihr. *Journal of Human Rights*, *14*(4), 545-553.

Zülsdorf-Kersting, M. (2007). *Sechzig Jahre danach Jugendliche und Holocaust. Eine Studie zur geschichtskulturellen Sozialisation* [*Sixty years later: Young people and the Holocaust. A study of historical-cultural socialization*]. Berlin & Munster: LIT.

United Nations
Educational, Scientific and
Cultural Organization

Education
Sector

How does education about the Holocaust advance global citizenship education?

Can education about past genocides shape our understanding of how violence occur in today's world? Can it foster a sense of belonging to a common humanity and empower young people to become active citizens who work globally for peace and human rights? How does learning about such crimes, which profoundly affect the core dignity of human beings, support the objectives of Global Citizenship Education (GCED), a priority of the 2030 Education Agenda?

This paper, commissioned by UNESCO, offers an overview of empirical research on teaching and learning about the Holocaust and how such education may impact leaners' cognitive, socio-emotional and behavioural skills and competencies. It provides insights for educators on how effective lessons about the Holocaust can meet some of the key expected outcomes of Global Citizenship Education (GCED), such as critical thinking skills, attitudes of empathy and solidarity, and motivation to take action to prevent human rights abuses.

Learn more

UNESCO's work on Global Citizenship Education

UNESCO's work on Education about the Holocaust and genocide

UNESCO's Policy Guide on Education about the Holocaust and preventing genocide

ED/PSD/GCP/2018/01

4 QUALITY EDUCATION

Sustainable Development Goals