'They were not as rational as we are today': Students' and teachers' ideas of historical empathy in Greek Cypriot Primary Education

Lukas Perikleous

UCL Institute of Education

A thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

February 2022

Declaration

I, Lukas Perikleous, confirm that the work presented in this thesis is my own. Where information has been derived from other sources, I confirm that this has been indicated in the thesis

Singed:

Date: 27 February 2022

Abstract

This thesis reports on a case study exploration of primary students' and teachers' ideas of historical empathy in terms of their explanations of the choice of practices made by people in the past. More specifically the study aimed to explore the explanations of choices of practices used by students' and teachers', differences to these explanations according to the participants' age and differences to explanations according to the temporal and cultural distance between the participants and the people who held the practices in question.

Sixty-three students aged 8 to 12 and five teachers, in a primary school in Nicosia, Cyprus, participated this study. Each participant completed two pen and paper tasks that asked them about the choice of a certain healing ceremonies (practices) that were held by groups in the past and the present. Twenty-six students and four teachers were also interviewed answering questions about the phenomenon of differences between past and present behaviour.

Data were analysed primarily qualitatively using an inductive coding process from which a typology of different types of explanation of the choice practices emerged. Based on this typology, a progression model of ideas of historical empathy is suggested. Data analysis also suggests that both the typology and the progression model have a heuristic value. As it demonstrated in this study the suggested progression model can also serve diagnostic and pedagogic purposes. Both the typology and the progression model confirm previous findings about the kind of ideas of historical empathy students' and teachers' use. The study also suggests that there is a progress by age in terms of the sophistication of ideas used by students and that teachers usually, but not always, express more sophisticated ideas than their students. Finally, the study suggests that while temporal distance affects students' explanations the same does not apply in the case of cultural distance when they explain the choice of practices in the past.

Impact Statement

This study contributes to research in the field of history education both at local and international level. At the local level this study contributes to the under-researched field of primary education students' and teachers' ideas of history in Greek Cypriot primary education. At the international level, this study contributes to history education research in terms of confirming previous findings (contributing to a cumulative effect in terms of the external validity of this and previous studies) and in terms of exploring aspects that were not investigated before (providing insights for further research). In the case of the former these are a) the identification of ideas of historical empathy similar to the ones identified in other educational contexts, b) the phenomenon of students' ideas of historical empathy progressing by age, c) the ability of even younger students to provide empathetic explanations at some level, d) the existence of problematic ideas of historical empathy even among teachers, and e) the phenomenon of differences between tasks and questions affecting students' and teachers' explanations of past behaviour. In the case of the latter, this study provides evidence for the first time for the phenomena of a) teachers using the same ideas of historical empathy to the ones used by students (usually, but not always, at a more sophisticated level), b) temporal distance between the students and the agents affecting their explanations of behaviour, c) cultural distance between the students and the historical agents not affecting their explanations of past behaviour and d) temporal distance suppressing cultural distance.

The findings of this study also have important implications for practice. The existence of similar ideas across educational contexts allows for cooperation between educational systems and educationalists in terms of practices and educational policies. Furthermore, the progression model suggested by the findings of this study can serve both diagnostic and pedagogic purposes. Also, findings related to the variety of factors that affect empathetic explanations point out the importance of using a variety of topics and activities in teaching and educational materials. Finally, findings warn us that teachers can also hold problematic ideas of historical empathy and stress the importance of pre- and in-service training that contributes to the development of their understanding of history.

Although these findings are expected to have an impact mainly through the publications that will follow, this study already has an impact in the sense that parts of its literature review, methodological design and some preliminary findings have been presented in conferences and seminars (see for example Perikleous, 2015; 2018a; 2018b; 2018c; 2020; 2022) and published in academic journals (Perikleous, 2014; 2019).

A research project always has an impact on the researcher too in terms of affecting the way they see their field and their particular topic of investigation. In my case this also had a further impact since my engagement with this study also informed my work as a teacher in primary schools, as a teacher trainer at the University of Cyprus and as a history education advisor for the Cyprus Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports and Youth.

Acknowledgments

Completing this study was a long journey. During this quest, a number of people were by my side, and for this I am grateful.

This journey would never have begun without my mother, Christina, and my late father, Nicolas. I am grateful to them for bringing me up and for allowing me to develop as a free person, by trying not to impose their own perspectives of the world on me.

My supervisor, Arthur Chapman, was the person guiding me through this research endeavour. For his insightful comments, constructive criticism, and useful suggestions, I will be eternally grateful. His help made this study possible. I hope that we will have many more opportunities for working together in the future.

To Katherine Burn, my first supervisor, I am also grateful. Her support during the first stages of this study was invaluable.

Denis Shemilt's and Peter Lee's work was the main reason behind my decision to do research on historical empathy. To them I am grateful for the inspiration and for being keen to provide their comments and suggestions on my work on a number of occasions at the beginning of my career in history education.

An empirical study such as this one cannot take place without its participants. To the teachers and children who participated in this study, I am also grateful. Their voicing of their ideas allowed me to explore my topic.

Despite not being part of this study, the ideas expressed by my students, both primary children and undergraduate university students, tested my assumptions about their ideas and the ideas I was seeing in my data. To them I am grateful for being enthusiastic and participating my history lessons at school and university lectures.

Doing a PhD is often an intense and exhausting experience. During such an experience, having people to laugh with and spend time away from the laptop screen is also quite important part. Besides my wife, these people were my mother, my brothers Stelios and Pericles, my sister-in-law Nicole and young Nicolas. I will always treasure our weekly diners at mom's, our trips to our home village and even their teasing about this PhD taking too long.

The most important person during my PhD journey and during my journey in life is my wife, Anna. She was the person who inspired me to pursue postgraduate studies and the one who is always by my side. To her, I am grateful for being there for me, making life fascinating and always keeping me on the move, not allowing me to become stagnant.

Table of Contents

List of tables

List of figures

Chapter 1: Introduction

Learning history is... a vital and vitalising process: everything has a history and our subject is endlessly intriguing, mind-opening and educative – to be bored with history, is, as it were, to be bored with life (Chapman, 2009a, p.1)

1.1 Introduction and rationale of the study

Much of what happened in the past was due to individual or collective human action. This was guided by certain ideas, beliefs, intentions, views and influenced by the historical context in which it happened. In this sense it can be argued that understanding why people in the past did what they did is an important part of historical understanding. David Sylvester, the first director of the School Council History Project, named this concept of understanding past behaviour, historical empathy (Sylvester and Sheldon, 2009). Despite the fact that, as discussed in Chapter 2 of this thesis, the term caused criticisms and confusion, it is probably the term more often used for the concept until today.

In a traditional approach of teaching history as a selected narrative – the 'best story', to be conveyed to students (Seixas, 2000) – ideas of historical empathy and their development are not essential. This is because in such an approach, explanations of past behaviour are part of the fixed narrative. Therefore, what students are asked to do is not to think about past behaviour in order to explain it, but to memorise the ready-made explanations presented to them by the narrative they are taught. As will be discussed in detail in the following sections of this chapter, Greek Cypriot history education is in many aspects an example of this phenomenon.

However, in an approach which aims for historical literacy in terms of developing both knowledge about the past (substantive knowledge) and an understanding of how we come to know about the past (disciplinary knowledge- Lee, 2004; Lee, 2011), ideas of historical empathy become important. In this context, explanations of past behaviour are not anymore part of a fixed narrative that students have to acquire, but interpretations that students are invited to construct. Therefore, ideas of historical empathy and of their development become important.

Students, at any age, bring their own ideas about the world and human behaviour (the present and the past ones) in history classrooms (Lee, 2005; Chapman, 2021a). These are ideas based on children's experiences of the world, inside and outside education, that develop from a very young age and have a powerful effect on the integration of new concepts and understandings (Bransford, Brown and Cocking, 2000; VanSledright and Maggioni, 2016; Lee 2005). These preconceptions 'can be helpful to history teachers but they can also create problems because ideas that work well in everyday world are not always applicable in the study of history' (Lee, 2005: 31; Chapman, 2011; Epstein, 2012). In this case, preconceptions become 'bottlenecks' (Middendorf and Pace, 2004 cited in Ní Cassaithe, 2020) that obstruct historical understanding (see for example Ní Cassaithe, 2020; Cercadillo, Chapman, and Lee, 2017; Lee and Ashby, 2000).

Despite the fact that students interact with other people in their everyday life, understanding past behaviour is different to their everyday experience of the world. When it comes to historical empathy students have to deal with people who lived in a distant temporal (and sometimes spatial) context and had very different, views, ideas, beliefs, and aspirations. Wilschut and Schiphorst (2019) argue that historical distance, the strangeness of the past, is an element that does not exist when we attempt to explain behaviour in the present. Furthermore, as Alfred Schütz (1967) points out, understanding others who are physically present (associates) is different in character from understanding those who have lived before us (predecessors). While in the case of those who live with us, we can both be observers and the object of observation, in the case of those who lived before us we can only be observers. In all cases understanding other people is also based on our knowledge of them (their character, ideas, and intentions) and not merely on our knowledge stemming from their immediately observed behaviour. What changes in each case is the way we acquire this knowledge. In the case of our 'associates' (people with whom we interact), new experiences can always enhance our understanding of them. In the case of our predecessors (those who lived before us), since the experience is over and done with, the only way to understand them is by acquiring as much information about them as we can (Schütz, 1967). Knight (1989a) echoes these views and argues that, for students, explaining the behaviour of people they meet in their

everyday life in the present differs from explaining the behaviour of people in the past in the sense that the latter do not have a reciprocal relationship with us.

The idea that historical thinking is often counter-intuitive led many authors in the field of history education to argue for the importance of the development of students' ideas about concepts related to disciplinary understanding (see for example Lee, 2005; Lee and Shemilt, 2003; Wineburg, 2001; Chapman and Perikleous, 2011) such as historical empathy. Such an endeavour should take into account students' preconceptions in order to be able to either build on them or overturn them, so we can help them to move to more powerful ideas. As Bransford et al., (2000) point out, failing to identify and understand students' preconceptions can harm our efforts since students 'may fail to grasp the new concepts and information that are taught, or they may learn them for the purposes of a test but revert to their preconceptions outside the classroom' (pp. 14-15). As Peter Lee and Denis Shemilt (2004) put it, teaching without taking into consideration students' preconceptions is similar to 'firing blindly into the dark: we may get lucky and hit one of our targets, but we are much more likely to damage our own side' (p. 31)

Despite the fact that teachers' ideas of history is an under-researched area and the fact that teachers' ideas of historical empathy is an almost unexplored one, research evidence suggests that teachers also hold different ideas of history (see for example Cunningham, 2003; Husbands, Kitson and Pendry, 2003; Evans, 1994), which in some cases can also be problematic (Shemilt, 1980). The latter does not refer to different ideas of history, which is a phenomenon that can be observed even among expert historians, but to ideas that do not seem to take into consideration basic aspects of the method and logic of the discipline. Research also suggests that teachers' ideas of the discipline influence their teaching (Evans, 1994; Husbands et. al., 2003; Maggioni, VanSledright and Alexander, 2009; Wineburg and Wilson, 1991), therefore understanding these preconceptions is also important for history education, since it can inform pre-service and in-service teachers' training.

The importance of historical empathy in education and the importance of exploring students' preconceptions were what motivated me to study students' idea of historical empathy for my MA dissertation (Perikleous, 2011). This was a case study

exploration of Greek Cypriot primary students' ideas of historical empathy. Thirty-two students from a primary school in Cyprus participated in this. Each one of them completed one of the study's two pen-and-paper tasks which asked questions about two practices in the past: child labour in early 20th-century Cyprus and boys' education in Ancient Sparta. Its findings suggested that its participants held similar ideas of historical empathy to those identified by international research. They also suggested a progression by age in the case of one task but not the other. As demonstrated in the following chapters of this thesis, this previous study informed my present study both in terms of research design (contributing to its internal validity) and in terms of discussing its findings (contributing to its external validity).

This previous study also motivated me to continue my work on historical empathy and the investigation of ideas of the concept in Greek Cypriot primary education in the sense that the present study is partly an attempt to overcome some of its limitations (i.e. very small sample size, use of a single type of data generation tools). Furthermore, my engagement with literature during my previous study allowed me to identify issues that were not explored by previous studies (i.e. teachers' ideas of historical empathy and differences in empathetic explanations according to cultural and temporal distance). These issues are explored in the present study.

In the context of Greek Cypriot education, the field of history is an under-researched one and research on students' ideas of second-order concepts is scarce. My MA study was the first time students' ideas of second-order concepts in history were explored in Greek Cypriot education. Besides my MA study, only two other small-scale studies explored such preconceptions, previously to the study reported in this thesis. These were a study about how augmented reality can improve empathetic explanations (Efstathiou, Kyza and Georgiou, 2018), and a study of secondary education students' ideas about account variations (Chapman and Georgiou, 2021). Another piece of research, by Skouros (1999), which explores conceptual understanding, is focused on students' knowledge of certain substantive concepts merely in terms of specific fixed content that students should know according to the subject's objectives. In the case of the teachers, there is only one study which among others explored teachers' ideas of history in terms of the degree to which they adopt relativist or constructivist views of history (Psaltis, Lytra and Costache,

2011). No research evidence exists about teachers' ideas of historical empathy in Greek Cypriot education.

In the light of the above, this study aims to explore primary students' and teachers' ideas of historical empathy in order to provide insights about these that can inform discussion and decisions related to history education in Cyprus both in terms of teaching the concept at schools and in terms of teachers' pre-service and in-service training. Furthermore, this study responds to the expressed need for 'more work across different cultures [which] may shed further light on the currency of similar sets of ideas [to those identified by other research projects], and their stability in different educational and social environments (Lee and Ashby, 2001, p. 45). In other words, the study also aims to contribute to research at international level by providing insights about possible similarities and differences between the Greek Cypriot context and other contexts. Finally, this study aims to provide insights about issues that have never been explored before (i.e., comparison between students' and teachers' ideas, the effect of temporal and cultural distance to empathetic explanations)

This first chapter introduces the reader to the present study. Towards this aim, it introduces the research questions of the study (section 1.2) and discusses my own positionality (section 1.3). Besides the fact that the researcher's positionality affects their research work, it is of particular importance in the case of this study since I was involved in a number of developments in Greek Cypriot history education, some of which are discussed here. Finally, it provides the context in which this study took place by discussing the place of history in general and historical empathy in particular in Greek Cypriot primary education (section 1.4).

1.2 Research questions

This study aims to explore primary students' and teachers' ideas in terms of providing answers to the following three research questions:

a) What kinds of ideas are used by Greek Cypriot primary students and teachers when asked to explain the choice of practices made by people in the past?

20

b) Do the ideas used by Greek Cypriot primary students and teachers when asked to explain the choice of practices made by people in the past differ according to their age?

c) Do the ideas used by Greek Cypriot primary students and teachers to explain the choice of practices differ according to their temporal and cultural distance from the people who made those choices?

The term practice refers to 'something that is usually or regularly done, often as a habit, tradition, or custom' (Cambridge Dictionary, n.d). In the particular context of this study, it refers to healing ceremonies used by specific groups in order to treat diseases.

The first research question refers to the exploration of the ideas that primary students and teachers use. More specifically, by responding to this question the study aims to identify different types of explanation of past behaviour used by students and teachers and in this sense to suggest a typology of these ideas. By responding to this question, the study also suggests a progression model which describes different degrees of sophistication between these types of explanation. Furthermore, it explores the heuristic, diagnostic and pedagogic value of the suggested typology and progression model.

The second research question refers to the exploration of differences according to participants' age in terms of their explanations of past behaviour. More specifically, by responding to this question the study aims to explore the existence of differences between different students' age groups and the teachers both in terms of the types of explanations they used and the sophistication of their responses. As discussed, in more detail, in Chapter 3 differences in ideas of historical empathy according to students' age is a relatively under-researched area, while in the case of the teachers' research evidence is scarce. In this sense, by answering this question the study aims to contribute to these under-researched aspects of research on ideas of historical empathy.

Finally, the third research question refers to the exploration of differences in ideas of historical empathy according to the temporal and cultural distance between the

participants and the groups that exhibit/exhibited that behaviour in question. More specifically, by responding to this question, this study, aims to explore a) differences between participants' explanations of behaviour in the past and their explanations of behaviour in the present (temporal distance) and b) differences between participants explanations of in-group behaviour in the past and explanations of out-group behaviour also in the past (cultural distance). The term *in-groups* is used to describe groups to which people belong or believe they belong. The term *out-groups* is used to describe groups to which people do not belong or they believe they do not belong (Tajfel, 1970). In this sense, an in-group in the past is a group one considers to be their ancestors, while an out-group in the past is a group with which one considers having no affiliation.   In both cases, differences are explored both in terms of the types of explanation used and the sophistication of participants' responses. Despite the fact that as discussed in Chapter 3, theoretical arguments and relevant findings suggest the existence of these differences, these were not investigated empirically until now. In this sense, by answering this research question, this study makes an original contribution in the field. Insights on these will contribute to discussions in relation to the transferability of ideas of historical empathy across contexts.

1.3 Researcher's positionality

In the introductory paragraphs of his discussion of the history of research in history education, in his book *Historical thinking and other unnatural acts,* Wineburg (2001) argues that the different meanings given to the term historical understanding and the studies based on these meanings 'tell us as much about the researchers who conducted them as about the children and teachers who participate in them' (p.29). With this phrase, Wineburg partly describes the phenomenon of researchers' positionality; the researcher's world view in terms of ontological and epistemological assumptions and also assumptions about human nature and knowledge (Sikes, 2004). Positionality is also the 'position that the researcher has chosen to adopt *within* a given research study' (Savin- Baden and Howell Major, 2013, p. 71). A researcher's positionality can be identified by reference to their location in relation to a) the subject of the study, b) the participants, and c) the research context and process (Savin-Baden and Howell Major, 2013). Aspects of my own positionality in terms of my assumptions about educational research and in terms of my location in relation to the

participants of the study are demonstrated in the discussion of methodology and methods in Chapter 4. My positionality in terms of my assumptions about history and history education and my location in relation to the subject of the study and the research context are discussed below.

Identifying my own positionality in this specific study is of particular importance. This is because a) part of the literature reviewed in this chapter is my own work on issues of history education within the Greek Cypriot educational system, and b) I was involved in many of the developments discussed or mentioned in the discussion of the Greek Cypriot primary education context. For the purpose of identifying my positionality as clearly as possible, I use first person, when I refer to my published work and also when discussing cases in which I was personally involved. These cases were the development of the Primary History Curriculum 2016 (as an academic advisor of the Primary History Group between 2012 and 2018; Primary History Education, n.a.a), the development of textbooks for the history of Cyprus in Year 3 (as a member of the Primary History Group between 2011 and 2012- Ministry of Education and Culture, 2012; Ministry of Education and Culture, 2013), and the development of the History Curriculum 2010 (as a member of the teachers' working group who worked with a committee of academic historians; Ministry of Education and Culture n.d.). During the development of Primary History Curriculum 2016, among others, I was responsible for the development of the Attainment and Adequacy Targets for disciplinary understanding. I was also the author of the Curriculum statement for the aims and purposes of history teaching and the main author of its methodology section.

In all cases, I supported a constructivist inquiry-based approach in history teaching. I consider my approach constructivist both in terms of history and history education. In the case of the former, I consider the past to be independent of the human mind but the knowledge about the past (history) to be a human and social construction (Ankersmit, 1994; Redfern, 2006). In terms of education, I consider learning as a process in which the learner is actively involved, interpreting and giving meaning to that which they encounter within and outside education and constructing their own view of the world (and, in the case of history education, the past one too). The constructions that students create are not simply a mirror image of what is taught in classrooms, since students actively make sense of, and thus help to filter and reshape,

what they are taught (Glasersfeld, 1989; Wertsch, 1997). Finally, my approach is an inquiry-based one since it maintains the idea that the development of historical literacy, in terms of substantive and disciplinary knowledge, takes place in situations where students are given the opportunity to work with their own historical inquiries as a way to a) construct factual knowledge which is relevant and meaningful, and b) develop an understanding of the methods and logic of the discipline of history (Lee, 2004; Lee, 2005; Shemilt, 1980; Shemilt, 2011).

This approach, which in the English-speaking context is known as a disciplinary approach, arose in the late 1960s and the early 1970s as an alternative to the traditional approaches (see section 1.1) which left teachers and students unsatisfied (Wilschut, 2010; Dickinson, 2000; Waldman, 2009) and as way to shield history from being undermined in curricula (Wilschut, 2010; Dawson, 1989).[1] In the English context, from which I was also mainly influenced as a history educationalist, this approach was popularised with the Schools Council History Project (Shemilt, 1983; Counsell, 2018; Dawson, 1989; Chapman and Perikleous, 2011). Through the Projects' (later known as SHP) work, the disciplinary approach became influential among teachers and examination boards (Chapman and Perikleous, 2011; Chapman, 2021a). The approach also corresponds, in a number of aspects, to Michael Young's (2014) idea of powerful knowledge, notably its emphasis on conceptual understanding, knowledge and skills (Chapman, 2021a).[2]

In terms of the purposes of history education, this is what Denis Shemilt (2011) calls a 'social education approach', an approach which a) 'inoculate[s] students against false representations of the past transmitted by tradition and popular culture (p. 105), b) 'seek[s] to provide students with knowledge and understanding of the past that will remain useful throughout adult life' (p.105) and helps them make informed decisions

---

[1] Today, the idea of developing disciplinary understanding in history is supported by many in different educational contexts; see for example Seixas (2000; 2002), Wineburg (2001), Barca (2006), Clark (2009). The idea of disciplinary literacy is also to be found in the literature and practice in other school subjects; see for example Shanahan and Shanahan (2008) and McConachie & Petrosky (2010).

[2] The issue of powerful knowledge in relation to history education is discussed extensively in the recently published volume *Knowing History in Schools: Powerful knowledge and the powers of knowledge* (Chapman, 2021b).

that cannot be predicted from our present point of view, and c) 'aim[s] to equip students to make disciplined and valid use of historical knowledge when analysing and evaluating present realities and future possibilities' (p. 105). In such an approach, the teaching of history aims to transform the way students view the world (Lee, 1992; Lee, 2011; Shemilt, 2011), by helping them to understand how historical knowledge is constructed and by providing them with opportunities to construct their own interpretations of the past through methods of historical inquiry (Seixas, 2000; Wineburg, 2001).

This approach is radically different from traditional ones aiming to convey a single definite narrative of the past, the 'best story' of the past, as a means to promote social aims (Seixas, 2000). Such approaches serve 'social engineering purposes [that] require students to use knowledge of the past to define group identities, to validate socially desirable attitudes and to predispose them towards socially productive patterns of behaviour' (Perikleous and Shemilt, 2011, p.16). In this 'social engineering' approaches, students experience of disciplinary understanding is either non-essential or tokenistic and sources are just another way to transmit and/or confirm desirable knowledge rather than sources of evidence (Shemilt, 2011). Although the implementation of 'social engineering' approaches is traditionally connected with efforts of pursuing traditional ethnocentric aims, such as cultural homogenization and nation-building through the promotion of predefined national identities, it is also employed in cases where the desired outcome relates to internationalist aspirations such as the reconciliation of groups in conflict or raising consciousness for global issues (Shemilt, 2011) or the cultivation of supra-national identities (e.g. the European identity).

The disciplinary approach was also used as a means of deconstructing divisive narratives in conflict or post-conflict contexts, and to promote understanding between groups in conflict (McCully, 2012; Waldron and McCully, 2016; Perikleous, Onurkan-Samani and Onurkan-Aliusta, 2021). This take on the disciplinary approach arguably relates to the idea that history should primarily aim to develop positive attitudes towards striving for the common good (Barton and Levstik, 2004). Barton and Levstik go as far as to argue that 'as a rationale for teaching, the focus on disciplinary history seems unlikely to inspire the intellectual and emotional commitment necessary to

reform practice' (2004, p.259). One could argue that this approach aligns with the social engineering approaches discussed in the previous paragraph. However, what Barton and Levstik (2004) suggest is arguably closer to the disciplinary social education approach (Shemilt, 2011) since, as they argue, preparing students to contribute to the effort for the common good cannot happen by teaching a fixed version of the past. On the contrary, this can only happen if 'students take part in meaningful and relevant historical inquiries, examine a variety of evidence, consider multiple viewpoints, and develop conclusions that are defended and negotiated with others' (Barton and Levstik, 2004, p. 260). In fact, the closing argument by Barton and Levstik in their seminal publication *Teaching History for the Common Good* (2004) is that preparing students for actively participating in democratic processes demands a history teaching that engages students with historical enquiries, evidential thinking, and different perspectives about the past. A similar argument is voiced by advocates of social education approaches, who, from an opposite starting point of prioritizing disciplinary understanding over any social aims, argue that disciplinary approaches share similar values with participatory liberal democracy (Shemilt, 2011; Chapman and Perikleous, 2011). This argument is based on the idea that 'thinking historically involves a commitment to open argument, to the public examination of evidence, and also a commitment to debate (Chapman and Perikleous, 2011, p. 9).

My ideas of history education were influenced both by my studies at the Institute of Education, which has a tradition in disciplinary approaches in history education, and my work with history educationalists who work within the same teaching and research tradition. These are mainly my supervisor Arthur Chapman, with whom I have also co-authored, *Thinking Historically about Missing Persons : A Guide for Teachers,* a teaching material on the issue of missing persons in Cyprus (Chapman, Perikleous, Yakinthou and Zincir-Celal, 2011), Denis Shemilt, with whom I edited the publication *The Future of the Past: Why history education matters* (Perikleous and Shemilt, 2011) and Peter Lee. Arthur, Denis and also Peter contributed to my work especially with the Primary History Curriculum 2010 (and its implementation) and the Primary History Curriculum 2016 through the provision of comments and suggestions in different occasions.

In the light of the above, the reader should obviously take into consideration the point of view from which I am writing. However, they should also keep in mind that positionality is not a phenomenon only present when an author is directly involved in what they report about, but one that exists in a variety of degrees in every account. Regardless of the nature of an authors' involvement, every account will always be influenced by its author's own contextuality, views and biases.

1.4 History education in the Greek Cypriot context

1.4.1 Introduction

This section discusses the educational context within which this study took place; the context of Greek Cypriot education. Although ideas of history (and in the case of this study, ideas of historical empathy) are not formed only by the educational context, the latter is obviously an important factor.

Any discussion of history education in Cyprus, cannot be fully understood without key information about the past of the island. A former part of the Byzantine Empire and later the Ottoman one, Cyprus became a British protectorate (1878) and later a Crown Colony (1925). In 1960, with the establishment of the Republic of Cyprus, the island became an independent state. At the time the majority of its population was self-identified as either Greek Cypriots (77,1%) or Turkish Cypriots (18,2%- Republic of Cyprus, n.d., p. 1). Accordingly, the constitution of the newly founded republic recognised the political existence of two communities on the island; the Greek Cypriot and the Turkish Cypriot. After inter-communal conflicts, which broke out in 1963 and continued sporadically until 1967, Turkish Cypriots left the public administration (Republic of Cyprus, n.d.). In 1974 a military coup staged by Greek Cypriot right-wing extremists was followed by a military intervention by Turkey which divided the island and caused population displacements (United Nations Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus, 2022a.).

According, on the one hand, to the officially expressed Greek Cypriot narrative, this was an invasion that served Turkey's ambition to control the island (Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 2022). On the other hand, according to the official Turkish Cypriot perspective, Turkey's interference was an effort to settle the situation caused by the military coup

and prevent further violence (Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 2011).[3] In 1983, Turkish Cypriots declared the establishment of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (TRNC), which has since remained internationally unrecognized except by Turkey (United Nations Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus, 2022b).

Different views of the island's past and future also lead to different views about the teaching of history. This is because, traditionally, history education has been associated with the promotion of political purposes and social aims such as identity formation and social cohesion (Carretero, Asensio and Rodríguez-Moneo, 2013; Seixas, Streams and Wineburg, 2000). As a result, the debates over history education are often disputes between different views on the kind of identities that the subject should promote. On the one hand, there are those who support close relations with Greece, which they consider to be the motherland for Greek Cypriots. The advocates of this Hellenocentric/ethnocentric approach argue that history should tell the story of Cyprus as part of the Greek nation since antiquity and their struggles for freedom against their enemies and especially the Turks (Chrysostomos II, 2009; Iakovides, 2008; Pastelas, 2009; Aggelidou, 2009). Although these are usually the Church of Cyprus and right- wing groups and individuals, in many cases similar ideas are also expressed by the centre-right and centre-left parties in Cyprus (Perikleous et. al., 2021; Perikleous, 2013; Klerides and Zembylas, 2017; Klerides, 2019). On the other hand, the supporters of a Cyprocentric approach are usually left-wing groups and individuals who favour a loose relationship with Greece and reconciliation with the Turkish Cypriot community on the island (Perikleous et. al., 2021; Perikleous, 2013; Klerides and Zembylas, 2017; Klerides, 2019). According to them, the version of the past that should be taught is one about Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots coexisting on the island, living peacefully for centuries and creating a shared culture (Achniotis, 2009; Educational Reform Committee, 2008; Ioannou, 2010). [4]

---

[3] For examples of how the Greek Cypriot and the Turkish Cypriot official narratives tell the story of the island see the 'Historical Background' information provided by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Cyprus (Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 2022) and by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the unrecognised Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 2011).

[4] For a detailed discussion of debates over education in general and history education within the Greek Cypriot context and the main arguments voiced by different groups, see Persianis (2010), Perikleous (2013), Polydorou (1995), Myrianthopoulos (1946), Klerides (2019).

This section provides insights about history education in the context in which the study takes place and a background that allows comparisons with other educational contexts. More specifically, it discusses history in Greek Cypriot primary education in terms of curricular text, teaching materials, educational policies related to history, and teachers' practices (1.4.2). It also discusses the place of historical empathy in Greek Cypriot primary education in terms of the same aspects (1.4.3).

1.4.2 History in primary education in the Greek Cypriot context

In the Greek Cypriot context, history in public primary schools is taught in Years 3 to 6. The current Primary History Curriculum 2016 (PHC 2016) has substantial differences and also substantial similarities to the previous Primary History Curriculum 2010. Differences have to do with the Curriculum's statements about the aims and purposes of history education and suggestions about methodology. Similarities have to do with the prescribed substantive knowledge to be taught.

Primary History Curriculum 2016 was the result of a 'reconstruction process' (Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports and Youth, n.d.a) initiated by the right-wing government that came to power in 2013. This process was undertaken by the Primary History Group, which was consisted by three academic advisors (me and two academic historians) and a small group of primary teachers. The academic historians' involvement was minimal, therefore PHC 2016 was essentially the result of the work of this small group of teachers and myself.

Unlike Primary History Curriculum 2010, which was essentially a traditional one focused on conveying a single official narrative that aimed to cultivate a Greek national identity (Perikleous, 2010; 2013; Perikleous et. al., 2021; Ioannou, 2010), PHC 2016 is much closer to a disciplinary approach (Philippou, 2020; Perikleous et. al., 2021). [5] According to this the main purpose of the teaching of history is the

> cultivation of historical thinking and historical consciousness… through the
> development of historical literacy…the parallel development of a) coherent and

---

[5] For the process of the development and the implementation of the Primary History Curriculum 2010 see Perikleous (2013; 2015).

sufficient substantive knowledge of the past (periods, events, phenomena and people in the past) and b) disciplinary understanding of history (methods of the discipline of history, understanding the interpretative nature, the different forms and the limits of historical knowledge (Primary History Education, n.d.b).

Furthermore, the PHC 2016 contains Attainment and Adequacy Targets for disciplinary understanding that describe in detail learning outcomes and levels in term of students' understanding of second-order concepts (time, historical empathy, change and continuity, accounts, evidence, cause and consequence and significance) and abilities of organisation and communication of historical inquiries (Primary History Education, n.d.c). A disciplinary approach is also described in detail in the methodology section of the HC 2016 (Primary History Education, n.d.d). According to this, substantive knowledge allows students to orientate in time, using their knowledge of the past to make sense of the present and make them aware of the potentials and limitations of the future. Apropos disciplinary knowledge, it is argued that understanding how knowledge of the past is constructed is essential in order for this to become meaningful and usable; hence also worthy to be remembered. Furthermore, it is argued that developing disciplinary understanding provides students with a mental apparatus which will allow them to deal with the different (and in many cases conflicting) views of the past that they will encounter in their everyday life during and after the end of their school career. As mentioned earlier, I was the author of the aims and purposes statement of the PHC 2016 and also the Attainment and Adequacy Targets, and the main author of the methodology section. This explains the similarities of these texts with my approach to history education discussed in section 1.3. These were of course views shared by the rest of the members of the Primary History Group.

Despite these substantial changes in terms of methodology, the PHC 2016 prescribes a body of substantive knowledge which remains Hellenocentric as in the case of its 2010 version, which is in turn very similar to the one prescribed by previous history curricula. For example, in Year 6, according to the PHC 2016, only 20% of the teaching time is allocated in Cyprus history. Another 12% is allocated to world history. The rest of the time (68%) is allocated to the teaching of Greek history (Primary History Education, n.d.e). This was because, despite our suggestions for

changes, we were not allowed to make substantial ones to this part of the curriculum.

In each Year, both in primary and secondary education, history is taught with two textbooks. One for the history of Cyprus, published in Cyprus by the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports and Youth and one for Greek history, published in Greece by the Greek Ministry of Education (Primary History Education, n.d.f). The latter are the textbooks also used for the teaching of the subject in Greece. The only exception are Years 5 and 6 (in primary education) for which only a textbook for Greek history is available. Despite the fact that no research evidence exists on how teachers deal with the absence of a history textbook for the teaching of Cyprus history in these Years, my personal experience is one of a variety of approaches (e.g., development of teaching material by teachers mostly in terms of using texts from variety of sources as merely informational texts, using the history textbooks for secondary education and even avoidance of teaching topics from Cyprus history).

Both the Greek and the Greek Cypriot textbooks have the status of official textbooks and are provided to all public schools by the Cyprus Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports and Youth. A common claim among those who comment on history textbooks used in Greek Cypriot education, is that the vast majority of them provide a narrative which aims to reinforce Greek national identity (Association for Historical Dialogue and Research, 2009; Karayianni, 2005; Klerides and Zembylas, 2017; Perikleous et. al., 2021, Perikleous, 2010; Educational Reform Committee, 2008; Papadakis, 2008). Some authors also claim that at least some of these textbooks are essentially expressions of nationalism the promote an essentialist view of national identity (Papadakis, 2008). Although, there are those who reject claims about the latter (Papapoliviou, 2008), it is hard to reject the former.

In terms of pedagogy, most of the history textbooks used in Greek Cypriot primary education are based on a model of substantive knowledge transmission. Historical knowledge is approached as the 'true' and definite story of what happened, and students are merely asked to comprehend the text and/or teachers' narration and repeat it in the form of completing tasks (verbally or in writing). Although primary and secondary sources (texts, art works, maps etc.) are more or less present in all

textbooks, their role is mainly supportive of the textbooks' main narrative and in some cases unclear in terms of their connections with it. Below, the example of a unit from one of these textbooks demonstrates this situation.

In the Year 6 textbook for Greek history, the passage about Klephts, a military group that fought against the Ottomans during the Greek revolution (1821- 1829), reads as follows:

> The Klephts lived in the countryside and had their hideouts in areas hard to access. They were organized in small groups, each with its own captain and its own flag. A key characteristic of the Klephts was the hostility they felt towards the Turks and authority in general, an element that made them dear to the [Greek] people. Thus, the Klephts became a symbol of the resistance of the enslaved Greek people against their conquerors (Koliopoulos, Michaelides, Kallianiotis, Minaoglou, n.d.).

Additional sources about the Klephts in this unit consist of a folk song that praises their bravery, an excerpt from the memoirs of Theodoros Kolokotronis (a prominent figure of the Greek revolution) in which he emphasises the love of the Greek people for Klephts before the revolution, and paintings that portray Klephts. These are followed by two questions which ask about a) the differences between the Klephts and another military group of the time (Armatoli) and b) how Greek people viewed the Klephts (according to Kolokotronis' memoirs).

Despite the fact that the way the Klephts lived, and their organisation are a matter of general consensus, their motives are a matter of interpretation among historians. In fact, even Koliopoulos, the head author of the Year 6 history textbook, in his scientific work argues that the Klephts' primary goal was not to resist against the Ottomans or to support the Greek people, but to serve their own interests (Koliopoulos and Veremis, 2004).

The only exception to the above is the Cyprus history textbooks for Year 3 (Ministry of Education and Culture, 2012) and a limited number of teaching material for other Years (mainly in the form of teaching proposals for certain topics) that are available online (History in Primary Education, n.d.g). The fact that these materials were

developed by the Primary History Group explains their different approach. In these a disciplinary approach is adopted which is in line with the aims and purposes and the methodology prescribed by the HC 2016. The history textbook for Year 3 was developed during the implementation phase of the previous Primary History Curriculum 2010, and as I argue elsewhere deviated from the Curriculums traditional approach by providing practical examples of a disciplinary approach (Perikleous, 2015; Perikleous et. al., 2021).

The same disciplinary approach is also the one adopted in the in-service training provided by the Primary History Group (History in Primary Education, n.d.h). However, this, is mainly due to the inadequate time allocate to this, which is limited to a small number of school-based seminars. These are essentially seminars for 4 to 6 schools each year out of the 330 primary schools in Cyprus (Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports and Youth, n.d.b).

Here, it should be pointed out that this group of teachers (Primary History Group) is not a typical one in the sense that it cannot be considered as representative of the primary teachers' population. Besides myself, all teachers in this group had a special interest in history teaching, and some of them qualifications related to history and history education. In other words, the fact that this specific group of teachers adopted such an approach does not say much about how the rest of the primary teachers teach or perceive the changes brought by PHC 2016 or the materials developed by the group. As discussed later in this chapter, at the moment we do not have a clear picture of how teachers in general teach history in the Greek Cypriot context.

As one can observe from the above description, in Greek Cypriot primary education there is a tension between an officially expressed policy of developing disciplinary understanding (aims and purposes and methodology described in PHC 2016 and some of the teaching materials) and an also officially expressed policy of traditional teaching which conveys an official narrative that aims to reinforce a Greek national identity (substantive knowledge by prescribed PHC 2016 and the majority of the official history textbooks). The latter is also reinforced by the way in which the past is approached by education outside the teaching of history. An example of this is the celebration of Greek national commemorations in Greek Cypriot schools. All public

schools in the Republic of Cyprus are obligated by law to commemorate the beginning of the Greek Revolution (March 25th) and Greece's involvement in World War II (October 28th- Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports and Youth, n.d.c). Another example of this is the topic of 'I learn, I don't forget and I struggle'. Since its introduction in the 1980s, this is a topic that teachers are also obligated to teach (through various subject) and aims to preserve the memories of the occupied areas of Cyprus (due to the 1974 Turkish invasion) by focusing on a single narrative that is focused on the collective trauma and suffering of the Greek Cypriots (Zembylas and Loukaides, 2019).

This tension can be explained partly by the fact that the aspects of the PHC 2016 that are close to a disciplinary approach were the work of the Primary History Group. As already mentioned, all members of the group shared a similar view on the benefits of such an approach in history education. The fact that these changes (expressed aims and purposes and methodology) were allowed while others were not (substantive knowledge, textbooks) can be explained in terms of visibility and specificity. As we argue elsewhere,

> Due to their higher visibility and specificity and also the key role of textbooks in history teaching, public opinion, the media, politicians and even educators are more sensitive to changes to the school narratives (in textbooks and curricula) than changes related to methodological suggestions. Unlike the latter, the school narratives… tell stories about the past which do more than to inform students about the past. They tell students the story of who they are (Perikleous, et. al., 2021, p. 132).

Klerides and Zembylas (2017) view this resistance to changes as a form of immunology where narratives that might challenge the established one (in this case the Hellenocentric one) are prevented from passing the border of history textbooks. One could argue that the case of the history textbook for Year 3, which adopts a disciplinary approach, challenges this assumption. This however is not the case. As I argue elsewhere, the lack of reactions to the Year 3 textbook was more likely due to the fact that in this, students studied prehistory which

> is not part of the ethnocentric narrative that is being used to promote the Greek national identity and pride. Also the 'enemies' of the Greek nation are not 'here'

yet. In other words, the tentative nature of historical knowledge, the freedom to reach out to different interpretations of the past and the inclusion of accounts that challenge the established narratives are manifest in terms of exploring 'harmless' issues that do not threat anyone's view of the present (Perikleous, 2013, p.52).

In our work, we suggest that this phenomenon, as demonstrated by the current situation in Greek Cypriot education, 'goes beyond textbooks and that this imaginary border includes the narratives prescribed by curricular texts and educational policies too' (Perikleous, et. al., 2021, p.132). This is also the reason why efforts by NGOs to use the teaching of history for the promotion of peace in Cyprus between its two communities, often employing disciplinary approaches, faced resistance and did not manage to have a substantial impact on Greek Cypriot education (Klerides and Zempylas, 2017; Perikleous et. al., 2021).

This phenomenon of differences in expressed educational policy is not restricted to the Greek Cypriot educational context. A similar tension between curricular goals on one hand and history textbooks and educational policies on the other also exists in the Turkish Cypriot educational system (Perikleous, et. al., 2021; Onurkan-Samani and Tarhan, 2017). A similar phenomenon is also identified by Waldron (2015) in Ireland, where despite the focus of the Irish Primary History Curriculum on developing disciplinary understanding the Department's of Education and Science program for the commemoration of the 1916 Rising put an emphasis on conveying traditional narratives and celebrating the nation.

At the moment, limited research evidence exists regarding teaching practices in history in Greek Cypriot primary education, or for that matter in secondary education either. Despite the fact that in a quantitative study with a representative sample of 400 Greek Cypriot participants, the majority of teachers, in both primary and secondary education, reported that they use teaching methods that promote historical thinking (Psaltis, Lytras and Costache, 2011), other studies with non-representative samples, but ones that collected qualitative data from in-depth interviews suggest different findings. For example, in their study of 18 elementary teachers, Zembylas and Kambani (2012) report that most of them were either negative about the teaching of

controversial issues in Greek Cypriot schools or considered this a complicated process that can only be applied under certain circumstances. Also, a study by Christou (2007) with 10 primary teachers, reports that most of them viewed history teaching in traditional terms of teaching only an objective truth. For some, this is contained in school textbooks while for others it does not exist, at least for recent events, therefore these events cannot be taught. Finally, a study by Philippou (2020) with two primary teachers describe two different approaches. One of the participants followed a traditional approach of conveying the single official narrative, while the other adopted the disciplinary approach proposed by the PHC 2016.

A possible explanation for this disparity in research findings is that when teachers self-report practices, it is not clear what their conceptualization of historical thinking is. It is therefore possible that the large number of teachers, who reported that they teach in ways that develop historical thinking in Psaltis et al., (2011) study, were reporting different approaches, some of which would not fit the description of approaches that aim to develop historical thinking in terms of disciplinary understanding.

The view that the majority of Greek Cypriot primary teachers adopt rather traditional approaches in their teaching in history, which do not pay much attention to the development of disciplinary understanding, is also supported by my own extensive experience of teachers' practices both as a teacher and as teacher trainer in pre-service and in-service training. During the last decade, I met very few teachers whose teaching of history deviated considerably from the traditional approach of knowledge transmission in terms of conveying a single narrative. Also, as pointed out in Chapter 4 (pp. 134-135), teachers in the present study also described their own teaching in terms of focusing on the acquisition of substantive knowledge expressed concerns about their teaching of history and the lack of any substantial training. Of course, this assumption is largely based on anecdotal evidence. However, it is also supported by a number of other characteristics of the Greek Cypriot educational system. These are the fact that the majority of teachers report a) that they have not receive any training in history teaching in their initial training, b) the need for more training in history (Psaltis et. al. 2011), c) the existence of official history textbooks that follow traditional approaches, and d) the lack of substantial opportunities for training in history teaching

in Cyprus at the moment.[6] This last claim is based on the fact that at the moment besides the limited in-service training provided by the Primary History Group (see above), no other kind of in-service training is available for primary teachers. In the light of these, it is hard to think how teaching practices that promote disciplinary understanding could have been employed by a substantial number of teachers in Greek Cypriot primary schools. The phenomenon of teachers' lacking the expertise to implement disciplinary approaches is an international one (Stoel, van Drie, and van Boxtel, 2017) and the prevalence of traditional approaches in teachers' practice despite the existence of curricula that adopt disciplinary approaches is identified in other educational systems too (Ní Cassaithe, 2020; Rantala, 2012).

1.4.3 The place of historical empathy in Greek Cypriot primary education

The place of historical empathy in Greek Cypriot primary education is similar to the place of the disciplinary approach, in general. On one hand, the Primary History Curriculum (HPC) 2016 contains explicit and detailed references to the development of the concept. On the other hand, the majority of history textbooks approach the concept only rarely and when they do, it is in terms that can be problematic.

As already mentioned in section 1.4.2, the HPC 2016 includes Attainment and Adequacy Targets for historical empathy (among other concepts- Primary History Education, n.d.c). These describe different levels of understanding of the concept which are based on the findings of international research. Furthermore, the methodology section of the PHC 2016 explicitly refers to historical empathy and argues that

> [s]tudents need to understand that in order to be able to explain the behaviour of people in the past we need to take into consideration their different ideas and beliefs about the world and the different historical context in which they lived. We also need to realize that the ideas of people in the past and their context are radically different from our own ones; and, also, that the only way to understand their actions is to understand their aims and intentions. Finally, they need to appreciate that the knowledge of the historical context is necessary in

---

[6] For the impact of history textbooks on teaching see Foster (2006) and Foster and Crawford (2006).

order to be able to understand the different views of people in the past. (Primary History Education, n.d.d, p.8)

The history textbook for Year 3, which as mentioned earlier was developed by the Primary History Group, approaches explanations of past behaviour in a similar way. In this sense, students are asked to provide explanations for human behaviour through the study of sources that provide information about the views and ideas of people in the past and also the historical context and their way of living. For example, when students are asked to explain why people in the Paleolithic Era did not live in permanent settlements, they are encouraged to explore this question through the study of their situation in terms of how they obtained their food, how they dealt with weather conditions, and the relations between different groups of people (Ministry of Education and Culture, 2013; pp. 102-106). Furthermore, teaching proposals are careful not to cultivate ideas of present's superiority over the past. Instead, there is a constant effort to encourage students to think about the differences between the way of living and ideas of people in the past and now. For example, when students study the use of abacus in the past, they are reminded that people used it 'not because they did not have calculators or computers, but because this was the way in which people represented numbers and calculations at the time' (Ministry of Education and Culture, 2013; p. 72).

Unlike the textbook for Cyprus history in Year 3, the majority of history textbooks in Greek Cypriot primary education have a different approach to historical empathy which is arguably superficial and narrow. This often takes the form of activities that ask students to pretend that they are people in the past and share their thoughts and/or feelings. For example, the history textbook for Greek History in Year 4, in what is described in the teacher's guide as an exercise of historical empathy (Katsoulakos, Karioti, Lena and Katsarou, n.d.a, p.21), asks students to imagine that they are a child in the Geometric Era who travels with their family on a ship to another place and share their positive and negative thoughts (Katsoulakos, Karioti, Lena and Katsarou, n.d.b, p.6). Taking into consideration that no information about the ideas of people at the time or the historical context are available to the students, such an approach is superficial in the sense that empathy is perceived merely as an imaginative exercise of role playing. It is narrow in the sense that students are asked to describe what they

would think if they were in the place of these people, but not to explain why people in the past behaved the way they did. As Knight (1989a) puts it

> [u]sing empathy as a convenient abbreviation for understanding people in the past or for attempting to reconstruct their practical inferences is unacceptable if it simply means that understanding or reconstruction are tantamount to describing merely the *situations* of people in the past (p. 45).

A second characteristic of the way understanding people in the past is presented by the history textbooks used in Greek Cypriot primary education, is that explaining collective or individual behaviour in the past is usually approached in terms of reading comprehension. In this kind of activities students are expected to provide answers which can be directly inferred from a specific paragraph in the textbooks' narrative (or a written source) or even identified in it. In this case the effort to make sense of people in the past is not approached as a cognitive act of understanding people in the past, but as a skill of inferring or identifying information in texts. In other words, students are not asked to think why people in the past did what they did, but to find out what the authors of the textbook say about this. For example, when the textbook for Greek history in Year 5 asks students to explain Constantine's I decision to establish a new capital of the Roman Empire in Byzantium, children can simply refer to the textbook's narrative and find the reasons for this decision that are explicitly stated in it (Glentis, Maragkoudakis, Nikolopoulos and Nikolopoulou, n.d.a, p. 24). This arguably promotes an idea of this kind of knowledge as a definite one which is not constructed but given. This is in line with the approach of the majority of history textbooks in Greek Cypriot primary education which, as described earlier in this chapter, is a traditional one based on a model of substantive knowledge transmission, namely, a model where knowledge of the past is final and definite and questions about how it is constructed do not rise.

Interestingly, the above activity is not described as one of historical empathy in the teacher's guide (Glentis, Maragkoudakis, Nikolopoulos and Nikolopoulou, n.d.b, pp. 42-44). What is described as an empathy activity, in the same unit, is one that asks students to imagine that they are a Roman citizen and write down their thoughts about the consequences of this decision on them and their family (Glentis, Maragkoudakis, Nikolopoulos and Nikolopoulou, n.d.c, p.9). This is another example of the superficial

and narrow approach of historical empathy by the majority of history textbooks used in Greek Cypriot primary education.

It could be also claimed that history textbooks used in Greek Cypriot primary education promote ideas of understanding behaviour in the past which are problematic. More specifically, on some occasions, textbooks essentially promote an idea of a deficit past, which, as discussed in Chapter 3, is one of the most prominent problems that distorts students understanding of past behaviour. For example, in the textbook for Greek History in Year 3, when students are asked to provide reasons for the creation of myths in the ancient Greek world, the teacher's guide points out that students 'should begin to realize that myths were the result of ignorance and fear of people in the past' (Maistellis, Kalivi and Michael, n.d.a, p.23). Also, on another occasion in the same textbook, students are asked to imagine what they would miss if they lived in a Neolithic settlement (Maistellis, Kalivi and Michael, n.d.b, p.42). These examples suggest an unhistorical view of the past; a past that is another version of the present only worse.

As in the case of teaching history in general, research evidence on how primary teachers approach historical empathy in their everyday practice in the Greek Cypriot context are scarce. In a study of one Year 5 teacher Zembylas (2013) describes an approach of teaching empathy in terms of affective engagement and discusses the complexities of this process. In another study of 30 secondary teachers by Zembylas, Loukaides, and Antoniou (2020), empathy was also approached as a way to affectively connect with people in the past. Despite the fact that these findings cannot be generalized, the fact that, as mentioned in the previous section, the majority of Greek Cypriot teachers do not have any training in history education, suggest that teachers possibly approach empathy in terms of its everyday meaning. As discussed in Chapter 2 (pp. 65-66) this is mostly about empathy as a way to connect affectively with others and share their feelings. As in the case of history textbooks, it is possible that many teachers do not even view questions about why people in the past did what they did as historical empathy activities, but as activities of finding information in texts. Finally, as reported in Chapter 4, teachers in the present study also described their efforts to develop students understanding of past behaviour mainly in terms of providing them

with substantive knowledge (e.g., providing them with texts that describe the reasons for a specific action in the past).

1.4.5 Conclusion

This section discussed history education in general and historical empathy in particular in the context of Greek Cypriot public primary education. In both cases the coexistence of different views of history education and historical empathy in expressions of official policy (i.e., curricular texts, teaching materials and educational policies) was demonstrated. This tension was explained in terms of what causes reactions and therefore does not change (history textbooks, educational policies, prescribed content to be taught) and what does not (curricular statements about aims and methodology) and therefore changes.

Apropos historical empathy, which is the focus of the present study, this section demonstrated that despite the fact that the Primary History Curriculum 2016 and some of the teaching materials approach historical empathy in terms of a cognitive act of understanding people in the past based on the knowledge of their views and ideas and also of the historical context, the majority of the available history textbooks approach the concept narrowly and simplistically reducing it to merely an act of imaginative roleplaying, description rather than understanding and reading comprehension.

The section also pointed out the lack of substantial research evidence about the way primary teachers teach history and how the approach understanding of past behaviour (historical empathy). Despite the lack of evidence, this section argues that there are indications that the teaching of history in Greek Cypriot primary education is predominantly traditional focused on the transmission of knowledge and that historical empathy is approached in terms of an either an affective connection of people in the past or in terms of an activity in imaginative roleplaying, description and reading comprehension as textbooks do. In the light of the above, more research in teachers' practices in history in general and historical empathy in particular is imperative.

1.5 Conclusion

This introductory chapter discussed the study's rationale and research questions. In this I also discussed my own positionality both in terms of my views of history and history education and also my involvement in developments in history education in Cyprus. Finally, this chapter provided insights about the place of history and historical empathy within Greek Cypriot primary education.

Chapter 2 discusses the debates that the concept's introduction in the English educational system caused and the key objection against its implementation in history teaching. It also provides counter arguments against some of these objections by discussing the idea of empathy in the philosophy of mind and the philosophy of history and by providing a definition of the concept in terms of distinguishing between problematic and helpful notions related to the concept. Chapter 3 discusses research findings related to the issues explored in the present study. More specifically it discusses findings about students' and teachers' ideas of historical empathy and about the issue of the effect of temporal and cultural distance in empathetic explanations. Chapter 4 discusses the methodology and provide a detailed account of the methods of this study. Chapters 5 to 8 present and discuss the empirical findings of the study. Finally, Chapter 9 summarizes the findings the study. It also discusses the study's contribution to research and the implications of its findings for different aspects of history education. The study's limitations and their effect on its findings are also discussed. Finally, this chapter provides suggestions for future research based on the findings reported in this thesis.

Chapter 2: The concept of historical empathy

> the theory of 'empathetic reconstruction' excites the devotion of some and the censure of others (Shemilt, 1984, p. 39)

2.1 Introduction

This chapter discusses the concept of historical empathy and its place in history education. More specifically, it discusses the debates that the concept's introduction in the English educational system caused and the key objection against its implementation in history teaching (section 2.2). It also provides counter arguments against some of these objections by discussing the idea of empathy in the philosophy of mind and the philosophy of history (section 2.3) and by providing a definition of the concept in ways that distinguish between problematic and helpful notions related to the concept (section 2.4).

2.2 Historical empathy: a highly contested concept in history education

'A word I brought into history teaching which caused me a lot of trouble, but nevertheless. It came into the words and it's been around in history teaching for a while' (Sylvester and Sheldon, 2009). This is how David Sylvester, the first director of the School Council History 13-16 Project in England, refers to historical empathy. As it will be demonstrated in this section, this is a very accurate description of historical empathy's journey in the field of history education. A concept that, as I argued elsewhere, 'instigated much controversy, and still does, but also a concept important enough to remain central in history education until today' (Perikleous, 2019). The controversy around historical empathy is best described in Denis Shemilt's words:

> Many teachers see in 'empathy' the essence of the historian's craft, the divine wind that the breathes life into the dry bones of the past, turns dust to flesh, and inspires pupils to commune with their predecessors. More sceptical teachers scorn the currently fashionable projective approaches to empathy as unhistorical at best and fraudulent at worst. (1984, p. 39)

As already mentioned in Chapter 1, *historical empathy* was the term introduced in history education, originally in England in the early 1970s, by the Schools Council

History 13- 16 Project (later School History Project- SHP) to describe historians'
attempt to understand past behaviour, practices and institutions (Lee and Shemilt,
2011; Lee and Ashby, 2001). It was chosen by Sylvester in his effort to use a term
that captures Robin George Collingwood's idea of re-thinking past thoughts
(Sylvester and Sheldon, 2009; Shemilt and Shelton, 2009). Since its popularization
by the SHP, the concept became a highly contested one (Lee and Shemilt, 2011;
Sylvester and Sheldon, 2009; Shemilt and Shelton, 2009). Although the context of
this study is the one of the Greek Cypriot education, the discussion of the case of
England is useful. This is because it is an educational context in which teaching
historical empathy has been the issue of an intensive debate which illuminates the
controversial nature of the concept's place in history education.

Certain aspects of the debate over historical empathy were part of the wider collision
between the Great Tradition and the New History in history education, in the late
1980's, during the discussions over the first National Curriculum in England and
Wales (Dunn, 2000; Foster and Yeager, 1998; Lee and Shemilt, 2011).[7] As Lee and
Shemilt (2011) note, at that time, 'historical empathy became a focus for opposition
to radical developments in history education' (p. 39). During that period, historical
empathy was accused of promoting leftist ideology (Cunningham, 2003; Skidelsky,
1988; Foster, 2001) and, along with the rest of the new concepts and methodologies
introduced by New History, was regarded as unable to help students to learn history
in the way that the teaching of an uncontroversial account of the past does (Beattie,
1987; Thatcher, 1993; Foster, 2001).

In her memoir, Margaret Thatcher, the Conservative UK prime minister at the time,
explicitly refers to historical empathy. She claims that the emphasis of New History
on 'concepts rather than chronology and empathy rather than facts was at the root of

---

[7] The term New History in history education, which is not identical to the New History
approach in academic history, was used at the time to describe the disciplinary
approaches in the teaching of the subject. In contrast with the focus of the Great
Tradition on transmitting a single definite narrative of 'our' past which promoted
national identity and loyalty to the nation, New History, without denying the
importance of developing substantive knowledge, aimed to develop students'
understanding of the discipline of history in terms of its logic and methods. For a
more detailed comparison of the New History and the Great Tradition, see Dickinson
(2000).

much that was going wrong' (1993, p. 596). Thatcher also admits that she intervened personally in the curriculum design process by asking 'for major, not just minor changes' (p. 596) to the interim report of the History Working Group in 1989, in order for British history to be reinforced. This shows that the collision between the Great Tradition and New History also existed beyond educational circles. Politicians also took part in that debate. More recently, Michael Gove (2008), the Secretary of State for Education at the UK for the Conservative/ Liberal Democrat coalition government between 2010-2014, argued for the need to return to the 'proper' teaching of history, which will promote Britishness and national pride through the learning of the 'right' facts (cited in Ashby and Edwards, 2010, p. 28). This bears a striking resemblance to the conservatives' rhetoric in the late 1980s.[8] This is not a phenomenon located only in England or Cyprus (discussed in Chapter 1, pp. 27-28). The involvement of external forces that seek to use history education as a means to social engineering is common around the world and, as Foster (1998) points out, 'the most unfortunate and chilling curriculum lesson to be learned' (p. 162) from debates over history education.[9]

The idea that historical empathy is a trivial concept to be taught and that students are essentially not ready to empathise is also a part of a wider neoconservative critique (Trimbur, 1987) according to which constructivist approaches which aim to develop disciplinary understanding over substantive knowledge fail students. According to this point of view, despite their popularity among academics these approaches are less effective than ones based on direct instruction (Kirschner, Sweller and Clark, 2006). It is also claimed that asking students to solve complicated problems with little guidance is problematic since it does not take into consideration the limits of working/ short- term memory and does not contribute to changes to long term memory, therefore does not contribute to learning (Kirschner, Sweller and Clark, 2006). Finally, constructivists' perceived emphasis on developing skills and

---

[8] Michael Gove was the Secretary of State for Education at the UK for the Conservative/ Liberal Democrat coalition government between 2010-2014.
[9] For more examples of ideological interference in history education, see Nakou and Barca (2010), Taylor and Guyver (2011), Lakshmi (2000), Ogawa and Field (2006), Taylor (2004), Perikleous (2010; 2013) and Perikleous et. al. (2021).

conceptual understanding, instead of specific factual knowledge has been accused of leaving students without the cultural background (Hirsch, 1988).

A number of assumptions upon which this critique is based, at least in the case of history teaching, do not take into consideration a) the history of history education and b) existing literature in the field if history education. Apropos the claim that disciplinary approaches which are, according to this criticism, based on minimum instruction are not effective as ones of direct instruction, such criticism does not take into consideration that, as discussed in Chapter 1 (p. 23) the emergence of disciplinary approaches in history education was, at least partly, due to the failure of traditional ones which were based on direct instruction. It also does not take into consideration the literature in history education that describe elaborate strategies of helping students to improve their understanding of history (see for example Shemilt, 1984; Barton and Levstik, 2004; VanSledright, 2010 and also the whole series of the *Teaching History* and *Primary History* practitioners' journals published by the UK Historical Association). In other words, the claim that disciplinary approaches fail because they offer minimal guidance is arguably a strawman argument. The argument that disciplinary approaches prioritizing skills and concepts over factual knowledge is also a strawman argument. Despite the fact that this was originally neglected by some (Lee, 2005), the importance of substantive knowledge has been pointed out by advocates of the disciplinary approaches repeatedly (see for example Shemilt, 1980; Lee, 2005; Chapman, 2021a) and ways of constructing coherent and usable substantive knowledge within this approach have been proposed (see for example Lee, 2004; Shemilt, 2000; Lee and Howson, 2009; Shemilt, 2009; Shemilt, 2011; Hammond, 2014).

The above does not mean that we know everything we need to know about teaching history within the disciplinary approach. It means that there is substantial work in the field that challenges the assumption that the disciplinary approaches do not provide guidance for students and do not pay attention to substantive knowledge. There are also examples of occasions that the disciplinary approaches were implemented in problematic ways (see below the description by Lee and Shemilt of problematic ways in which historical empathy was introduced in schools). This however is not a problem of the approach itself, but a problem of the ways in which it is implemented

in some cases. This points towards the importance of clarifications of what such an approach entails (see for example discussion below about the importance of clarifying the meaning of historical empathy), but it does not constitute a viable argument for its rejection.

Historical empathy was also particularly attacked as being a complex and vague concept which promoted 'generalised sentimentality' (Deuchar, 1987, p. 15 cited in Harris and Foreman-Peck, 2004). Similarly, teaching methods related to historical empathy (such as role play and simulation) were accused of being of low quality and promoting an unhistorical approach by letting students imagine themselves in the past (Harris and Foreman-Peck, 2004; Lee, 1983).

In this climate, historical empathy did not make it into the first National Curriculum which was essentially a compromise between the Great Tradition and New History. Its central ideas, though, were smuggled into schools through the *Knowledge and Understanding* attainment target (Cunningham, 2003; Lee and Ashby, 2001). Also, ideas related to empathy are to be found in GCSE exams specifications, in the updated National Curriculum 2000, the 1999 National Curriculum Programme of Study for Citizenship (Cunningham, 2003) and the National Curriculum 2007 both for primary and secondary history education (Qualifications and Curriculum Authority, 2007). Despite the fact that ideas related to historical empathy exist in these, and other, documents, and despite the fact that it attracts interest from researchers, historical empathy, unlike other second-order concepts in history education, remained, in some ways, 'hidden' in the English educational context. In a recent Ofsted review (Ofsted, 2021), historical empathy is not included among the second-order concepts commonly used by English teachers, while claims for the introduction of 'historical perspective' (which is connected to historical empathy) is presented as a recent development. These indicate that the objections against historical empathy go beyond the general criticism of 'New History' by the advocates of traditional approaches.

As Lee and Shemilt (2011) suggest, '[i]n many ways empathy was a soft target and therefore, for polemical purposes, a well-chosen target' (p. 39). By this Lee and Shemilt refer to issues related to the concept's treatment by many teachers and

more specifically to the fact that during the 1970s and 1980s the concept was often wrongly associated with imagination, sympathy, and identification. As a result,

> much [of the teaching of empathy] ranged from the weak to the execrable... [T]he line separating *historical imagination* from *literary invention* was all too easily eroded in the classroom, in coursework and in public examinations. Once this occurred, *empathy* lost all conceptual substance and, indeed, was often regarded as a skill which students could develop through practice and teachers coach by sparking excitement and fanning the embers of youthful creativity... [Also] *empathetic* imaginings tended to be seen as a warm and affective counterbalance to more cerebral, and hence less accessible, exercises dealing with sources of evidence, change and development, cause and consequence. One symptom of the affective view of *empathy* was an inevitable partiality in the sort of people with whom students could be permitted to empathise, and hence sympathise and identify...Denied opportunities to explore the reasons and perspectives of unsympathetic predecessors, less worldly wise students tended to slide into 'us and them' conceptions of the past. (pp. 39-40)

In the light of these observations, Lee and Shemilt (2011) argue that it is imperative to clarify the term in order to avoid confusion and misuse in classrooms.[10]

These concerns are related in many cases with terminological issues which are the source of serious problems in the teaching of historical empathy. The great variety of meanings given to the term empathy has caused (and still does) a great amount of confusion among educators which leads to problematic teaching approaches. As demonstrated in Chapter 1 (pp. 38-39), this is also the case with some of the educational materials used in the Greek Cypriot context.

The lack of consensus regarding the meaning of the term and its association with notions of sympathy and sharing feelings leads other authors to question the place of historical empathy in education (Knight, 1989a; Low-Beer, 1989). Knight (1989a) for example, warn us about the danger of associating empathy with affect and emotions

---

[10] See also Boddington (1980), Foster (2001), Lee and Ashby (2001) and Perikleous (2011) for similar claims about the need to clarify the meaning of historical empathy.

leading to approaches which encourage students to sympathise rather than to understand people in the past. He also argues that empathy can be misunderstood as a means to provide descriptions instead of explanations. Low-Beer (1989) also questions the place of historical empathy in education claiming that the concept 'belongs within the affective rather than the cognitive domain of knowledge' (p. 8) and is therefore problematic in terms of teaching and assessment. Furthermore, Knight (1989a) argues that a unitary view of empathy is problematic since it overshadows the different components involved in making sense of people in the past and also because of the lack of sufficient research evidence regarding students ideas of the concept. Both Knight and Low-Beer acknowledge the importance of understanding past behaviour in history education. What they object to is the use of the specific term and more specifically the way that the term was approached in history education in the 1970s and 1980s. In this aspect, many of their concerns are similar to the ones voiced by Lee and Shemilt (2011). Furthermore, Knight's suggestion, for replacing the unitary concept of empathy (both in terms of teaching and research) with its components, is based on the assumption that a) teaching practices were based on a simplistic approach of empathy as a vague concept to be developed in terms of a skill and b) little research evidence about children's ideas of empathy in different ages were available at the time. However, today this is not the case. As it will be demonstrated in the next sections of this chapter and also in Chapter 3, today there is a significant amount of literature which has contributed to the development of a better understanding of historical empathy in education in terms of both teaching and research.

The problem of terminology has also led to the suggestion of other terms to describe the idea of making sense of people in the past in history education. *Perspective taking* and *rational understanding*, for example, are suggested by some authors as a way to avoid the misuses and misunderstandings which *empathy* carries and to stress the concept's rational and intellectual nature as opposed to the affective one. Downey (1995) justifies the selection of *perspective taking* instead of *empathy* by the *Writing to Learn History Project* as an effort to define the notion 'in its most limited, non-affective sense' (p. 5) and to emphasise the idea of understanding 'a historical character's frame of reference, without assuming that one can or need identify with his or her feelings' (p.6). According to Downey (1990) this is very close to what

Boddington (1980) describes as a 'weak sense of empathy' (p. 15), which 'enables us to devise a discrete use for empathy which is distinguishable from contiguous meanings such as identification, involvement, sympathy and portrayal.' (p. 18).   In a similar vein, Seixas, Gibson and Ercikan (2015) argue that *perspective taking* should be used in order to avoid *empathy's* 'connotations to emotional involvement' (p.105). Davis (2001) claims that *perspective taking* can be a 'fruitful assist' (p. 3) in order to avoid the misunderstandings of *empathy*. However, he points out that *empathy* cannot be abandoned since 'it is too valuable' (p. 3).

Suggestions for the replacement of *empathy* with *perspective taking* are based on the idea that the latter is a term for which there is a consensus about its meaning and especially its cognitive nature. This assumption however is not accurate. For example, in the field of psychology, *perspective taking* is considered to be a multidimensional notion with *cognitive* and *affective perspective* taking being the most commonly recognised of its dimensions (see for example Oswald, 1996; Harwood and Farrar, 2006; Bierhoff, 2002; Bergin and Bergin, 2015). Although some authors describe *affective perspective taking* as the notion of identifying and understanding the feeling of others without sharing them (Oswald, 1996; Harwood and Farrar, 2006), others explicitly refer to *affective perspective taking* as sharing feelings (Bierhoff, 2002) or consider *affective perspective taking* as such at least in some occasions (Bergin and Bergin, 2015). Even in the case of history education, *perspective taking* is not a commonly understood term. For example, while Seixas et al. (2015) and Downey (1995) consider *perspective taking* as a version of *empathy* in which affective engagement is excluded, others refer to historical empathy as a cognitive act which is a component of perspective taking (Huijgen, van Boxtel, van de Grift and Holthuis, 2014) or use the two terms interchangeably (Hartmann and Hasselhorn, 2008). Finally, another kind of confusion that can arise from the use of *perspective taking* is the one related to the meaning of 'taking'. Downey (1995) points out that this the term is not immune to confusion either, since

> '[h]istorical perspectives are not "taken," in the sense that photographic images are taken. That is, they are not out there waiting to be discovered and recorded. Rather, the perspectives of people who lived in the past must be constructed on the basis of historical information and evidence. (p.6)

Barton and Levstik (2004) also warn us for the danger of misunderstanding *perspective taking* as implying that 'we can "take on" the perspective of others' (p. 207).

Rational understanding is the term used by Peter Lee and Alaric Dickinson in their early work in the 1970s (Lee, Ashby and Sheldon, 2009) and it was also used in CHATA project (Lee, Dickinson and Ashby, 1996; 2001) to describe albeit, in a narrower way, what was called *historical empathy* by the SHP at the time (Lee and Ashby, 2009). According to Lee (Lee, Ashby and Sheldon, 2009), he and Dickinson avoided the use of *empathy* exactly because of the misconceptions that its use could create and instead used *rational understanding* as a term that was often employed by philosophy at the time. However, he also acknowledges that *rational understanding* can create misconceptions since it 'employs much too desiccated a notion of rationality for most people' (p. 17).

Despite the choice of term, it can be claimed that most of the authors mentioned above share a similar understanding of what is involved in understanding people in the past. *Historical empathy, rational understanding and perspective taking* are used in history education to describe essentially the same notion of a cognitive act of understanding past behaviour which must be distinguished from sympathy, sharing feelings and affective involvement. In some occasions, this is explicitly stated. For example, Seixas et. al (2015) acknowledge that 'the concept of perspective taking evolved from the term that was at one point ubiquitous in British history education: historical empathy' (p.105), while Lee (Lee, Ashby and Sheldon, 2001) describes his early work with Dickinson, saying 'everything we did implied empathy in their [SHP] sense, but we never called it empathy' (p. 17). This is also evident by the fact that both Seixas and Lee seem to have changed their term of choice through time. Originally, Seixas (1998), influenced by the work of Peter Lee, used *empathy* to move later to *perspective taking*. Following an opposite route, although Seixas never renounced *rational understanding* completely, in recent years Lee and Ashby prefer to use empathy (Lee and Ashby, 2001; Lee and Shemilt, 2011).

As demonstrated in the above paragraphs, the suggested alternatives to empathy are also susceptible to confusion and therefore misused. In the mid- 1970s Sylvester

himself, acknowledging that the use of empathy could be problematic, was seriously considering a change in terminology. However, he could not come up with an alternative immune to misconceptions (D. Shemilt, personal communication, April 13, 2016). Lee, who at some point wrote to Shemilt saying 'for God's sake, don't use that word [empathy]' (Lee, Ashby and Sheldon, 2016, p.17), also admits that 'any word we could have used would have brought misunderstandings, so in the end I'm not too worried about the fact that it was empathy that got used because anything else would almost certainly have been equally bad' (Lee, Ashby and Sheldon, 2016, p.17). An advantage of *historical empathy* over the rest of the suggested terms is that today is the most commonly used one in history education.[11] Even when authors prefer other terms, they still refer to historical empathy. This is mainly due to the prominent place of the work of Denis Shemilt, Peter Lee, Alarick Dickinson and Rosallyn Ashby in history education literature. In the light of the above discussion, it can be claimed that an undisputed term cannot exist or at least is not available at the moment. What is important however is to clarify what understanding people in the past entails.

Beyond issues of terminology, there are criticisms of historical empathy which have to do with the concept of understanding people in the past being epistemologically impossible. This is based on the idea that it is impossible to access other minds since these are private and different from our own (Cunningham, 2003; Husbands, 1996). It is also expressed in the postmodern criticism according to which there is no way to empathetically understand the people in past since we cannot have valid interpretations of our sources. The latter is, according to Jenkins and Brickley (1989), the effect of the everlasting process of linguistic change, not just in terms of vocabulary and syntax but also in terms of meaning. Furthermore, since the past is essentially the construct of historians, historical empathy is an effort to understand the historians rather than the people in the past (Jenkins and Brickley, 1989; Jenkins, 1991). In other words, the past, according to this critique, is not

---

[11] A Google Scholar search for titles that include "*historical empathy*" (exact phrase) on the 30th of December 2021 would return 235 results, while a search for "*historical perspective taking*" (the other popular term used for the concept) would return 35 results. Also, a title search for *historical empathy* (in this case the search looks for the words in any place in the title) would return 310 results, while in the case of *historical perspective taking* would return 102 results.

empathetically retrievable. VanSledright (2001) emphasises the historians' (and in the case of education students') contextuality and claims that since it is impossible to escape from 'the standpoint and deportment of where we are now.. [the] historicized positions we presently hold' (p.63) historical empathy might not be possible to achieve. Based on this assumption, he suggests that a more worthwhile aim for history education should be the development of ideas related to the construction of historical context (*historical contextualisation).* He admits that as in the case of historical empathy, historical contextualisation might not be possible to be fully achieved, he claims however that through this process we become aware of our own contextuality and therefore increase self-understanding.

A third category of objections against the teaching of historical empathy has to do with students' ability to empathize with people in the past and, at a more general level, the effectiveness of approaches aiming to develop this kind of disciplinary understanding. Harris and Foreman Peck (2004) claim that empathy was removed from the GCSE History syllabuses partly because of a belief that students' lacked the contextual knowledge, historical evidence and life experience needed to make sense of people in the past. It also had to do with an associated belief that empathy was too difficult to teach. As mentioned earlier in this section, a similar argument is voiced in the case of the critique against constructivist approaches that seek to develop disciplinary understanding in general. According to this critique constructivist approaches' emphasis on developing disciplinary understanding in different school subjects is problematic, since a) students do not possess the factual knowledge and expertise of professionals within disciplines (Kirschner et. al., 2006; Kirschner, 2009 in Taber, 2010, Willingham, 2009), and b) the process of constructing knowledge within a discipline is different from learning about a discipline (Kirschner et. al., 2006). In fact, even the advocates of historical empathy in history education stress that the concept is a difficult one to be taught and developed, and that students' empathetic explanations will always be restricted by the limitations mentioned above (Harris and Foreman- Peck, 2004; Lee and Ashby, 2001; Portal, 1983; Shemilt, 1984).

The issues of a) theoretical objections to the possibility of understanding people in the past, b) the meaning confusion, and c) the issue of whether developing this kind

of understanding is possible in education pose some serious questions in relation to historical empathy's place in education. The following sections discuss the issue of the possibility of understanding other people and especially the ones in the past (section 2.3) and the issue of meaning confusion (section 2.4). Objections related to students' capacity to empathise with people in the past will be addressed in Chapter 3.

2.3 Empathy as a topic of philosophical discussion

2.2.1 Empathy in the philosophy of mind: understanding other minds

The problem of how we perceive and understand other minds became a major issue in western philosophy during the 19th century (Stueber, 2008). John Stuart Mill (1867) provided what is regarded as a classic version of inference from analogy, suggesting that we perceive other minds by making inferences about the mental states of the Other. According to Mill, we do this based on their bodily expression, using analogies from our own experience of how our mental states are expressed by our body. A central assumption in this argument is the notion of different minds being psychologically similar.

Theodore Lipps' critique of inference from analogy, advanced at the beginning of the 20th century, is focused on the above assumption. Lipps argues that inference from analogy is a contradictory act because it entails that we make sense of the Other's mental states based on the experience of our own, while at the same time accepts that the mental states of the Other are completely different (Lipps, 2007 cited in Stueber, 2008). For Lipps 'our knowledge of others is a modality of knowledge *sui generis*, something as irreducible and original as our perceptual experience of objects or our memory of our past experiences. It is a novum that in no way can be explained by or reduced to some kind of analogical inference' (Lipps, 1907 cited in Zahavi, 2010, p. 288).

Lipps (1903) introduced a new notion using the German word *einfühlung* 'to denote the relationship between an artwork and the observer, who imaginatively projects

himself/herself into the contemplated object' (cited in Gallese, 2003, p. 175).[12] The first person using the term was Robert Visher in his *On the Optical Sense of Form: A contribution to Aesthetics* in 1873 to 'account for our capacity to symbolize the inanimate objects of nature and art' (cited in Gallese, 2003, p. 175).[13] Lipps was the one, though, who discussed the term thoroughly and, more importantly, extended the idea of *einfühlung* from a concept about aesthetic experience to the primary way in which we perceive other minds (Stueber, 2008). In this case, he suggests a notion of 'inner imitation' where our mind mirrors the mental activities of others based on their facial expressions and bodily movement. For Lipps, since we only experience our own mental states, and this is the only way to know of mental states, we perceive the mental states of others by projecting our own onto them (Stueber, 2008; Zahavi, 2010). Even though Lipps uses primarily examples related to the recognition of emotions, he explicitly refers to empathy's cognitive aspects which he describes as intellectual empathy (1903b/05 cited in Stueber, 2008). This original notion of *einfühlung* is what was translated as empathy by Edward Titchener.[14]

---

[12] In contrast to the 19th century's dominant positivistic and empiricist ideas of aesthetic appreciation being based only on external sensory data and as direct as the perception of the physical characteristics of objects (e.g. an object is red), Lipps' notion of *einfühlung* is a psychological phenomenon during which the person who encounters a physical object 'relives' experiences related to movements of the body (Stueber, 2008). In other words, while engaged perceptually with a physical object, the observer's experience is one of being in the object. Depending on how 'life-affirming' and positive these experiences are we perceive an object as beautiful or not (ibid.). For Lipps our experience of beauty is an 'objectified self-enjoyment' since what impresses us is the 'vitality' and 'life potentiality' of a perceived object (1903, 1906 a,b, cited in Stueber, 2008).

[13] Vischer was influenced by Lotze who in 1858 suggested a mechanism by which people are able to make sense of inanimate objects and animals by 'placing ourselves into them' (Gallese, 2003).

[14] Although he uses the term for the first time in 1909, in *Lectures on the Experimental Psychology of Thought-Processes*, Titchener does not provide any explanation about his creation of this new term. According to Wispé (1987), Titchener was highly competent in modern languages and also Ancient Greek and Latin. In addition, he was interested in etymology and this led him to coin the term empathy using the Ancient Greek word *εμπάθεια [empathia]* which, according to Wispé, means literally 'in' (en) 'suffering or passion' (pathos). Although the etymology provided by Wispé is correct, the word has a very different meaning in Modern Greek which denotes a disposition of hostility and prejudice towards someone. In Modern Greek *empathy* translates to *ενσυναίσθηση [ensinesthisi]* which is usually used with a completely opposite meaning to *εμπάθεια [empathia]* that stands for hatred.

One can rightly argue that this original idea of empathy is problematic especially in the case of history since it cannot provide us with a viable answer to the question of how we can access the mind of people in the past. Even if we accept Lipps' idea of empathy, this cannot be applied in the case of people in the past, since we cannot directly experience them in order for his 'imitation' mechanism to operate. However, as discussed in the following paragraphs, criticism of Lipps' idea of empathy offer a possible solution to the problem of accessing other minds.

While Lipps' arguments against inference from analogy and his notion of an irreducible and distinct experiential act of understanding other minds have been widely accepted, his account of empathy had also been criticized (Stueber, 2008; Zahavi, 2001; Zahavi, 2010). A key criticism of Lipps' account of empathy is that it fails to explain how understanding of the Other occurs (Zahavi, 2010). This criticism focus on Lipps' idea of imitation as being the basis of empathy. However, as Max Scheler points out, we do not have to be in pain to understand that someone else is in pain. Also, in many cases we can understand expressions that we are not able to imitate (i.e., we understand that a dog is happy by observing it wagging its tail even though we are unable to imitate this expression ourselves) (cited in Zahavi, 2010).

For Scheler (1954), inference from analogy and Lipps' theory of empathy have a common two-fold starting point according to which, a) 'it is always our own self, merely, that is primarily given to us', and b) 'what is primarily given in the case of the Other is merely the appearance of the body, its changes, movements etc.' (p. 244). He rejects this and claims that when we perceive other minds there is not a clear distinction between our own and their experience, but a 'flow of experiences', a 'realm of minds', which contain both our own experiences and theirs. Since the mental life of the Other is also part of this 'universal consciousness' (thoughts and ideas which can be ours or collective ones), observing it becomes possible.

The idea of the possibility of observing not only our own mental life but also that of others, based on the notion of a common world of shared experiences, is not only to be found in Scheler but also in other thinkers in philosophy. For instance, Martin Heidegger (2008) claims that the problem of bridging the gap between me (one

isolated subject) and the Other (another isolated subject) does not exist. This is because *Dasein* (the human being) exists in a world shared with Others. Even in their absence *Dasein* constantly encounters objects (artefacts and equipment) which contain references to them (since they were created by others or are used for work by others). In this sense, we do not exist isolated from others in this shared world. Edmund Husserl and Maurice Merleau-Ponty voice similar arguments since they both 'fully recognize that we [human beings] are embedded in a living tradition' (Zahavi, 2001, p. 155). Husserl, for example, claims that 'one has been together with Others for as long as one can remember, and one's understanding and interpretation are therefore structured in accordance with the inter-subjectively handed-down forms of apperception (1973d, p.136 cited in Zahavi, 2001, p. 155).

Max Weber also rejected Lipps' account of empathy by arguing that in this account what we experience is essentially ourselves and not the experience of the Other. According to Weber, when we observe a behaviour what we experience, is not the experience of the agent and not even the experience that we would have if we were at their place (Harrington, 2001). For Weber, such as understanding 'fails to qualify as knowledge in any sense of the word' (1975, cited in Harrington, 2001, p.315). He uses the concept of *verstehen* to describe an understanding of why people do what they do that is different from Lipps' empathy in the sense that is cognitive and rational (Kim, 2021).[15] In his interpretative sociology, Weber argues that the sociologist must go beyond people's observed behaviour and 'share in their world of meaning and come to appreciate why they act as they do' (Macionis and Linda, p. 33). This argument also demonstrates a different interest regarding understanding other people. Unlike the ideas discussed in the previous paragraphs, which attempt to explain how we make sense of people in our everyday life, Weber's argument essentially refers to what a sociologist should do in order to have a better understanding of the people they study. This is in fact a key difference between discussions about folk psychology in the philosophy of mind and discussions about empathy in the social sciences. The philosophy of social sciences is primarily concerned with how interpretations and explanations of human behaviour are

---

[15] The concept of *verstehen* originally introduced by Johan Gustav Droysen and later used by Wilhelm Dilthey is discussed in more detail in section 2.3.2.

justified, rather than the mechanisms involved in understanding other people (Stueber, 2019).

The discussion so far provides a brief description of the origins of empathy and of the way its initial inception (i.e., Lipps' idea of empathy) allows for arguments against the possibility of understanding other people and especially people in the past who are not directly observable. Lipps, as previously Mill did, failed to explain how we can meet other minds which are foreign to our own. Their failure is mainly due to the fact that there is, actually, no way to do so. There is no way, at least no one epistemologically sanctioned, to transfer our mind into another. The criticism of Lipps' idea of empathy provides us with alternatives. These are the idea of understanding taking place in a common world of shared experiences and the idea of a conscious effort to relate with people from their own point of view rather than observing them from our own one.

However, as discussed in Chapter 1 (pp. 17-18), understanding people in the present who live in our present world and with whom we can have a reciprocal relationship is different from understanding people in the past who lived in a world that is no more and with whom we cannot have a reciprocal relationship. As Leslie Poles Hartley tells us in the opening phrase of his novel *The Go-Between*, 'THE PAST is a foreign country: they do things differently there' (1953). David Lowenthal who used this phrase as the title for his seminal book (Lowenthal, 1985), reminds us that '[t]he past was not only weirder than we realize; it was weirder than we can imagine' (Lowenthal, 2000, p.74). The following section focuses on historical empathy and discusses the question of understanding people in the past.

2.2.2 Empathy in the philosophy of history: understanding minds in the past

Friedrich Schleiermacher who is regarded as the father of modern hermeneutics (Mueller-Vollmer, 2006) claims that 'the success of the art of interpretation depends on one's linguistic competence and one's ability of knowing people' (Schleiermacher, 2006, 76). Schleiermacher refers here to the knowledge of the language that the author uses but also to the knowledge of their intentions, beliefs, ideas and context (Schleiermacher, 2006). This knowledge allows the interpreter to 'put himself both

objectively and subjectively in the position of the author' (Schleiermacher,2006, p.83).

These ideas can also be found in the work of German historians such as Wilhelm von Humboldt who, as Schleiermacher does, argues that understanding is based on a common understanding of language between the speaker and the listener. Humboldt extends this idea in the case of history and claims that the historian can understand history because they are part of the social world in which historical process takes place; 'for everything which is effective in world history is also active within man himself' (Humboldt, 2006, p.112) this is the 'preliminary basis of comprehension' (Humboldt, 2006, p.112), the bond between the historian and the object of their historical investigation.

The fact that this kind of understanding is a particular way of investigation, which is to be found in social sciences, is expressed in Johan Gustav Droysen's famous distinction between the social and the positive sciences. Referring specifically to history, he argues that 'historical research does not want to explain; that is, derive in a form of an inferential argument, rather it wants to understand' (Droysen, 1977, p.403 cited in Stueber, 2019). This is because, according to Droysen,

> historians study the intentionality of actions and… such intentions cannot be depicted from causal analysis in the manner of the natural sciences. The intention of an action can be grasped only through an understanding of the concrete situation (or context) in which the action takes place (Johnsen and Olsen, 1992, p. 421)

As Schleiemarcher and Humboldt do, Droysen argues that historical understanding is based on a notion of familiarity between the historian and the object of their investigation. He argues that '[t]he method of historical investigation is determined by the morphological character of its material. The essence of historical method is understanding by means of investigation. The possibility of this understanding arises from the kinship of our nature with that of the utterances lying before us as historical material.' (Droysen, 2006, p.121). For Droysen, this is also a major difference between the social and the positive sciences. In the case of the latter, one's

understanding is limited because of their essential differences with the objects of their observations (i.e., animals, plants and the inorganic world) (Droysen, 2006). Droysen refers to this kind of understanding as *verstehen* and he describes it in ways that are arguably really close to Lipps' conception of *empathy*.

> A further condition of this possibility [of historical understanding] is the fact that man's nature, at once sensuous and spiritual, speaks forth every one of its inner processes in some form apprehensible by the senses, mirrors these inner processes, indeed, in every utterance. On being perceived the utterance, by projecting itself into the inner experience of the percipient, calls forth the same inner process. Thus, on hearing the cry of anguish we have a sense of the anguish felt by him who cries (Droysen, 2006, p.121).

In fact, for some time, *verstehen* was closely associated to *empathy* and in many cases the two concepts were used interchangeably to denote a methodological difference between the social and the positive sciences (Stueber,2010). Droysen however does not consider *verstehen* to be only a matter of identification through projection. As he points out,

> [t]he human being is, in essential nature, a totality in himself, but realizes this character only in understanding others and being understood by them, in the moral partnerships of family, people, state, religion, etc. The individual is only relatively a totality. He understands and is understood only as a specimen and expression of the partnerships whose member he is and in whose essence and development he has part, himself being but an expression of this essence and development (Droysen, 2006, p. 122)

As Humboldt did before him and as the phenomenologists did a few decades later (see section 2.3.1), Droysen describes the understanding of others as the participation in a shared social world. Furthermore, both Humboldt and Droysen make clear that this kind of understanding is only part of the process of historical research. Humboldt believes that historical understanding is not sufficient in the absence of historical investigation. These are '[t]wo paths… [that] must… be followed simultaneously in order to approach the historical truth: the exact, impartial, critical determination of what has taken place and the connection of the results of [the historian's] investigation, the intuitive conjecture of that which is not attainable by

the former means.' (Humboldt, 2006, p.107). In a similar vein, Droysen stresses that historical understanding must be combined with the craft of the historian. This craft has to do with a) securing the authenticity of the sources and alleged facts (criticism) and b) the evaluation and explication of what is portrayed as historical facts by the sources (interpretation- Mueller-Vollmer, 2006).

Wilhelm Dilthey also used the term *verstehen* to describe an understanding of the people in the past, based on the experience of human life itself (Johnsen and Olsen, 1992). For Dilthey, our understanding of people in other times is to be found in our life experience of our own world (Johnsen and Olsen, 1992), which allows us to re-experience past life (Makkreel, 2011). As he claims, '[r]e-experiencing follows the line of events. We progress with the history of a period, with an event abroad or with the mental processes of a person close to us' (Dilthey, 2006, p. 159). Dilthey's answer to the question of bridging the gap between our self-understanding and historical understanding of people in the past was the adoption of Hegel's idea of the 'objective mind' (Johnsen and Olsen, 1992). He argues that '[i]n this objective mind the past is a permanently enduring present for us. Its realm extends from the style of life and the forms of social intercourse to the system of purposes which society has created for itself and to custom, law, state, religion, art, science and philosophy' (Dilthey, 2006, p.155).

Dilthey acknowledges that *re-experiencing* does not happen without knowledge of the context in which past experience takes place. He explicitly refers to the importance of historical context, when he admits that in his effort to write Schleiermacher' biography, it would not be possible to understand his life 'without comprehending the history of the period in which he so actively participated' (Makkreel, 2011). Furthermore, his idea of *verstehen* is not one of projecting one's self into another person in the past but a 'a deliberate process that finds the proper context to relate others and their objectifications to what is already familiar to us. It is a reflective mode of inquiry that provides the framework for more specific explanations, whether causal or rational' (Makkreel, 2021).

Alfred Schütz (1967), in a similar vein with Dilthey, claims that our knowledge of both our world and the world of our predecessors allows understanding of people in the

past. As he points out, the world of our predecessors 'contains within itself many levels of social experience of varying degrees of concreteness, and in this respect, it is like [our] world of contemporaries. It also resembles [our] world of contemporaries in the sense that the people in it are known to [us] through ideal types.' (Schütz, 1967, p.210). He also acknowledges that the distance between our experience and the experience of our predecessors is a major reason for understanding people in the past being different to understanding our contemporaries. He argues that '[m]y predecessor lived in an environment radically different not only from my own but from the environment which I ascribe to my contemporaries…The same experience would seem to him [the predecessor] quite different in the context of the culture of his time. Strictly speaking, it is meaningless even to speak of it as "the same" experience' (Schütz, 1967, p.210). Far from ruling out any possibility of understanding the people in the past, though, Schütz, as Dilthey did, claims that although the two worlds are different ones, they are bound together by the fact that they are both experienced by the human mind. In this way, we can understand people in the past by relying on our knowledge of human experience in general. For Schütz, the latter transcends worlds, making understanding people in the past possible.

> any experience of my predecessor is open to my interpretation in terms of the characteristics of human experience in *general.* In the words of Schiller, the uniformity and unchangeable unity of the laws of nature and of the human mind . . . constitute the reason why events of long ago happen again today, although in different circumstances, and the reason why from the most recent events light can be shed upon pre-historic times (Schütz, 1967, p.210).

As mentioned earlier in this chapter and in Chapter 1, the idea of historical empathy introduced by Sylvester was based on Robin George Collingwood's philosophy of history. For Collingwood, thought has a central place in history and it is a major distinction between natural sciences and history. He argues that unlike processes in nature, historical processes 'are not processes of mere events but processes of actions, which have an inner side, consisting of processes of thought; and what the historian is looking for is these processes of thought. All history is the history of thought' (Collingwood, 1994, p.215). The idea of the human mind being the means to transcend time is also to be found in the work of Collingwood, who claims that the

same act of thought can be re-enacted in different minds from different times. He argues that,

> [w]hen a man thinks historically, he has before him certain documents or relics of the past. His business is to discover what the past was which has left these relics behind it. For example, the relics are certain written words; and in that case he has to discover what the person who wrote those words meant by them. This means discovering the thought which he expressed by them… to discover what this thought was, the historian must think it again for himself (Collingwood, 1994, pp.282-283).

For Collingwood, human thought has a universal character that allows for the understanding of people in the past without being affected by the present (Retz, 2015). What makes past thought possible to be re-thought (re-enacted) by the historian, in a different context, is its rationality (McIntyre, 2008 cited in Retz, 2015). Furthermore, in Collingwood's thought, re-enactment is not an immediate mystical grasp of people in the past, but 'always a critical examination of the presuppositions of others' thoughts and, thus, always involves a strong element of self-reflection upon one's own thinking about the agent being studied' (Retz, 2015, p. 217). As with Dilthey and the rest of the hermeneuticians discussed earlier in this section, Collingwood also acknowledges the importance of the knowledge of historical context. This is evident, when he claims that interpretations of historical agents' intentions can only make sense if they fit with the historian's reconstruction of past contexts (Collingwood, 1994).

The discussion so far provides us with possible ways of understanding people in the past; namely, the common experience of the social world and the ability of human mind to transcend time. However, there is still a question that remains unanswered. A question that is crucial for claims about the place of historical empathy in education to be sustained. This is the issue of 'what to do with our own ways of thinking when trying to think like people from the past' (Retz, 2015, p.216). Claiming to be able to suspend our own thinking in order to understand the thinking of others is a rather naïve notion (Wineburg, 2001). Furthermore, suspending our own thinking is also undesirable since this in fact the only way we have to think about the past anyway (Gadamer, 2004; Wineburg, 2001). Authors in history, and social sciences in

general, while acknowledging Collinwood's contribution, criticize the lack of an explanation of how the historian deals with their own contextuality and biases while attempting to re-enact past thoughts (Gadamer, 2004; Skinner, 2002; Winch, 1958).

A solution to this problem is proposed by Hans-Georg Gadamer's moderate hermeneutics (Retz, 2015). In this our own thinking, our historicity, is not viewed as a problem 'but as the very factor that enables us to understand the historical other' (Retz, 2015, p.224). For Gadamer, understanding takes place in a 'fusion of horizons'. This happens not by concealing the tension between our own horizon and the horizon of the historical agent, but by consciously bringing it to light (Gadamer, 2004). This process 'will make conscious the prejudices governing our own understanding, so that the text, as another's meaning, can be isolated and valued on its own' (Gadamer, 2004, p. 298). As he explains:

> Foregrounding (abheben) a prejudice clearly requires suspending its validity for us. For as long as our mind is influenced by a prejudice, we do not consider it a judgment. How then can we foreground it? It is impossible to make ourselves aware of a prejudice while it is constantly operating unnoticed, but only when it is, so to speak, provoked. The encounter with a traditionary text [a past behaviour] can provide this provocation. For what leads to understanding must be something that has already asserted itself in its own separate validity (Gadamer, 2004, p.298).

Apropos the claim that the past is not empathetically retrievable because it is mediated to us by the historians, Lee and Ashby (2001) point out that this is an aphorism rather than an argument. The same kind of indirect experience – transmitted to us through sources – is also what we rely on in the case of our knowledge of most of what we know (people and knowledge of the physical and the social world). Insisting on the problems caused by our indirect experience of people in the past not only rules out the possibility of understanding people in the past, but also eliminates the prospect of understanding most of the people in the present and the world itself.

Regarding the claim that we cannot have valid interpretation of our sources due to linguistic change, this is arguably an overestimation of the latter. As Quentin Skinner

(2002) points out, explicitly agreeing with Ludwig Wittgenstein's criticism of the concept of private language, the language of written historical sources, as in the case of contemporary sources, is the way to understand them. This is because 'the intentions with which anyone performs a successful act of communication must, *ex hypothesi*, be publicly legible' (p.120). Also, as in the case of the mediation of the historians, discussed in the previous paragraph, we should also bear in mind that similar issues regarding the difference in our experiences and the use of language exist (albeit in different degrees) in the case of trying to make sense of people in the present. Even among the speakers of the same language, there is not always agreement about the meanings of the words they commonly use. Hence, to claim that the past is not empathetically retrievable on the basis of linguistic differences is essentially to claim that we cannot empathize even with people in our own time.

Even though providing arguments for the possibility of historical empathy is crucial in order to argue in favour of its place in education, this is inadequate without a clarification of the meaning of the term. As mentioned earlier, the meaning of historical empathy and consequently its place in education are highly contested. The following section discusses this issue and provides a description of the concept as it is approached by this study.

2.3 What is and is not historical empathy

Much of the meaning confusion and objections related to historical empathy in education is arguably due the fact that public understanding of the term empathy is defined by a specific approach of the concept in the field of psychology. In this approach, empathy is considered to be an affective phenomenon which takes place when we encounter others (Stueber, 2008). Although today empathy as a cognitive phenomenon is also a research field in psychology (Stueber, 2008), this aspect of the concept is usually not taken into consideration in the ways the term is publicly used. According to Merriam- Webster dictionary, one of the most prominent dictionaries in the English language, empathy is

> the action of understanding, being aware of, being sensitive to, and
> vicariously experiencing the feelings, thoughts, and experience of another of
> either the past or present without having the feelings, thoughts, and

experience fully communicated in an objectively explicit manner…the feeling that you understand and share another person's experiences and emotions: the ability to share someone else's feelings (Merriam- Webster, 2022).

A similar definition can be found in *Psychology Today* one of the most popular magazines on issues related to psychology. According to PT, '[e]mpathy is the ability to recognize, understand, and share the thoughts and feelings of another person, animal, or fictional character. Developing empathy is crucial for establishing relationships and behaving compassionately (*Psychology Today*, 2022). The idea of empathy as identifying, sharing feelings, sympathising and with others is also prominent in the way the term is used by international organisations such as UNICEF (n.d.), the Council of Europe (2021), the European Union (Council of the European Union, 2018), and the United Nations (2019).

As discussed in section 2.2, a number of criticisms against historical empathy in education are based on such views of the concepts that stem primarily from the field of psychology (i.e., an affective rather than a cognitive act of identifying with others and sharing their feelings). Although, as mentioned in the previous paragraph, this is not the case today in psychology, authors argue that the identification of empathy strictly with the affective was due to the fact that for many years, almost a century of literature in philosophy was usually neglected by psychology (Stueber, 2008; Zahavi, 2010). The discussion in the previous section (section 2.3) demonstrates that the concept's cognitive nature was acknowledged in the field of the philosophy of history for over a century. Thus the claim that the concept 'belongs within the affective rather than the cognitive domain of knowledge' (Low-Beer, 1989, p. 8), and therefore the teaching historical empathy is by definition problematic, becomes unconvincing.

This problem of terminology is not confined to discussions about historical empathy but extends across time and disciplines. The problem of defining a specific meaning for the term *empathy* has existed since the beginning of its use. Lipps himself described *einfühlung* in different ways on different occasions and the phenomenologists' accounts of understanding other minds are not consistent in

terms of using the term to support, extent or reject it (Zahavi, 2010).[16] The problem is amplified by the use of the English translation of *einfühlung* to empathy; a non-English word which has undergone changes in its meaning even within the Greek language from which it originates.[17] For these reasons, it is necessary to offer a clear definition of the term historical empathy, as it is understood in the context of this study.

2.3.1 What historical empathy is not

In order to avoid many of the possible misuses of the term, Foster (2001) suggests that a better understanding of historical empathy 'may be derived from an appreciation of what is not' (p. 169). Foster's suggestion is quite helpful in terms of practice, since merely defining what a concept is does not necessarily inform us about all of its parameters. It may therefore be possible for people to assign to the concept characteristics which, although they may seem to fit its definition, are essentially inconsistent with it.

In this sense, we should make clear that first of all historical empathy is not in any way a metaphysical ability to transfer ourselves into the mind of people in the past and identify with them. Understanding other people is not identical with understanding ourselves. In fact, as Husserl and Levinas claim, the alterity of the Other is what makes understanding them possible, since in the absence of alterity the Other would simply cease to exist as such (Husserl, 1969; Levinas, 1990). In this sense, to claim that the only way to understand other people is to identify with them is problematic as in this case we would not be able to tell the difference between them and us. The impossibility of such a task is demonstrated by Weber's critique to Lipps' theory of empathy through the discussion of the latter's example of an observer identifying with an acrobat. In this Weber argues that '[w]hoever "empathizes" with Lipps' acrobat "experience" neither what the acrobat "experiences" on the tightrope, not what he would "experience" if he were on the tightrope. What he "experiences" does not even have any unambiguous, imaginative relationship to the

---

[16] For example, while Scheler rarely uses *einfühlung* (usually to criticize Lipps' idea of understanding other minds), his theory is described by other phenomenologists (i.e., Stein and Husserl) as a theory of *einfühlung* (Zahavi, 2010).
[17] See note 14.

experience of the acrobat' (1975, cited in Harrington, 2001, p.315). For Weber this does not constitute knowledge of the acrobat's experience, but merely knowledge of the observer's experience of observing the acrobat (Harrington, 2001). Since identifying with people whom we encounter in our everyday life is impossible, claims that such ability exists when we try to make sense of people in the past cannot be sustained.

In addition, the idea of identification is incompatible with the study of history since it ignores a) the principle that historians are interpreting the past from their contemporary point of view and b) the notion of hindsight (Foster, 2001). Apropos the former, as Husserl claims, whenever we experience an object, the latter is also experienced by Others. If we do not acknowledge this, our experience of the object will never be objective and real (Husserl, 1969). To realize that our understanding of the world is one among others also means to become aware of the fact that our own perspective is also contextualized. For Barton and Levstik (2004), 'this is the recognition that our own perspectives depend on historical context: They are not necessarily the result of logical and dispassionate reason but reflect the beliefs we have been socialised into as members of cultural groups' (p. 219). As Shemilt reminds us, 'although the empathizing historian may be said to explain action "from the inside", as it were, he does so from the inside of our *known-in-common world* not from that of our predecessors' (1984, pp. 44-45). In other words, the historian is not standing on an Archimedean point, from which they then transfer into the historical agent's mind unaffected by their own contextuality. Besides this being an impossible feat outside the fantasy and science fiction genres, as discussed in the previous section, it is also undesirable since it strips us from the very tools we use to understand people in the past (Gadamer, 2004; Wineburg, 2001).

Foster's (2001) claim about the notion of hindsight being important, when we try to make sense of people in the past is rejected by Cunningham (2003) who argues that 'empathy scholarship has typically emphasised that such understandings need to be somehow mentally quarantined to try to view happenings as actors did at the time' (p. 19). This idea, however, leads again to identification which as described above is both impossible and undesirable. Furthermore, in the case of understanding people in the past, as Schütz (1967) argues, hindsight is a major difference in the way we

understand people in the present and people in the past. This is because in the case of the past, '[t]he historian already knows perfectly well what the actor intended to do because he knows what he did in fact do. Furthermore, he knows the whole further course of historical events right down to the time he himself asked his question' (p. 213). Although we should refrain from claiming that knowing what the historical agent did can always inform us about their motives and intended outcomes, we can still argue that their intentions can be illuminated by their later actions and the general course of events that followed. For example, the most convincing argument that the airplane hijackers on the 11th of September 2001 took control of four airplanes and crashed them on buildings following orders to perform terrorist attacks, is the knowledge of what happened later (i.e., the official claim of responsibility by Al-Qaeda). In order to explain why they hijacked the planes we do not attempt to identify with them at the moment they took control of them. We explain this action's (hijacking) by reference to a later action (claim of responsibility by Al-Qaeda).

Historical empathy is also not about sharing feelings or sympathising. As Scheler (1954) argues, sharing the feelings of the Other is not a necessary condition in order to understand them. When, for example, a third person observes the parents grieving for the loss of their child, this person does not have to feel their sorrow and despair in order to understand that they have these feelings. Although the observer does not feel their sorrow, this feeling is the object of their empathy (Scheler, 1954). This does not exclude the possibility of the observer also feeling sad, but this is not necessary in order to identify the presence of the feeling. This phenomenon of feeling what the Other feels is not empathy (in terms of understanding the Other), but, in the words of Scheler (1954), 'emotional contagion' and it is not related to understanding. Furthermore, we can also argue that we cannot even 're-feel' feelings that we ourselves previously experienced. The claim is quite valid if we think of the countless situations in our life where we cannot feel the way we ourselves previously felt, or completely understand why we felt in a certain way, a few years or even a few hours before. When it comes to history, it would also be unreasonable to try to share the feelings of people in the past since we do not share their beliefs. We cannot also share their hopes or fears since we already know whether they came true or not (Lee and Ashby, 2001). Commenting on the false assumption that simulation exercises allow students to share the feelings of people in the past, Barton and Levstik (2004)

point out that '[n]either they nor we can know what someone in a World War I trench felt like, because we know the simulation will be over in a few minutes, whereas a soldier at the time had no idea if he would live or die (p. 236). A similar idea is to be found in the work of Collingwood (1994), who distinguishes between acts of thought and feelings and claims that while an act of thought can be re-enacted, the same does not apply in the case of a feeling. The latter 'does not reappear, the stream of immediate experience has carried it away for ever; at most there reappears something like it' (p. 293).

A number of authors argue in favour of an affective aspect of empathy claiming that feeling something of what people in the past felt (SREB, 1986 cited in Cunningham, 2003; Epstein, 1994; Holt, 1990; Barton and Levstik, 2004; Endacott and Brooks, 2013; LaCapra, 2001) and caring about them enhances our empathetic understanding (Barton and Levstik, 2004; Endacott and Brooks, 2013; Lee, 1983; Lee, 2005). Despite the fact that authors who argue that historical empathy should include an affective connection with people in the past, usually argue that this is different to sympathy or identification (LaCapra, 2001), they do not adequately explain this distinction (Moyn, 2006). As already discussed in previous paragraphs, feeling what people in the past felt is impossible. As I argue elsewhere, this 'does not exclude the possibility of feeling something. This feeling, though, could be an illusion (falsely believing that what we feel now is what the people in the past felt) or could be related to sympathy (emotional engagement with people in the past)' (Perikleous, 2014, p.24). The coexistence of the two phenomena does not prove their contribution to understanding people in the past (or even in the present). Illusion does not enhance understanding and sympathising with someone does not necessarily mean that we understand them better. For instance, in educational systems, such as the Greek Cypriot one (see Chapter 1, pp. 26-36) in which history aims to develop feelings of respect and admiration for the students' ancestors and 'a moral purpose and potential to generate positive feelings for one's nation' (Christou, 2007, p. 714), we cannot claim that what is developed is genuine understanding of the people in the past. At best, the students respect, admire and strive to follow the steps of their ancestors, but this does not mean that they understand them. Bearing these in mind we can only echo Foster's (2001) concern that sympathising can be

problematic in the case of history since unexamined emotional engagement might hinder disciplined historical understanding.

Of course, sympathising is likely to make us more receptive to different points of view and more willing to understand historical agents. In history, though, in many cases, we seek to understand the actions of people with whom sympathising is difficult and, for many people, even undesirable. For instance, as I argue elsewhere although many teachers would be happy to see their students sympathising with the Nazis' victims, they would rightly not wish them to do the same for the Nazis themselves. In history, however, we do not only seek to understand the 'victims', but the 'perpetrators' too (Perikleous, 2014). In fact, in terms of understanding the Holocaust as a phenomenon, focusing on developing students' understanding of the victims' experience 'has little value if the reasons and motivations of the perpetrators are not addressed also' (Pingel, 2014, p.85). In a similar vein, the UCL Centre For Holocaust Education (n.d.) suggests that understanding of how extremist views can grow in any society can benefit from an understanding of how the wider historical context contributed in order for the NSDAP to become popular among German people at the time. Sylvester refers to a similar example that he used during the days of the introduction of historical empathy in English history education in order to distinguish the concept from sympathy: 'We want to learn about Hitler. I don't want people to sympathise with Hitler, but youngsters ought to understand something of his background – why he was led to such views and in that sense they can empathise with at least why he took the actions he did (Sylvester and Sheldon, 2009, p.27).

The above do not mean that historical empathy is unrelated to the affective domain. Although this study does not explore them, I approach historical empathy as also having affective aspects. These have to do with the acknowledgment that a) people in the past acted also because of the way they felt and b) caring to understand people in the past is an important part of historical empathy (discussed in the next section, 2.4.2).

Collingwood (1994) stresses the importance of historical imagination by claiming that this is not a complimentary part of history but a structural one. Lévesque (2008) also

argues that 'The only possible way to understand more about past actors is to mentally recreate - to imagine - what it was like to be in their position, even if historians may (and often do) lack some of the keys to the past' (p.147). However, imagination can also be a misleading notion when we think about historical empathy, and history in general, and its misuse often leads to unsophisticated approaches. As Lee (1984) points out, 'a good historian, it seems, must have imagination, and a mediocre one lacks it. Too much of it, however, and the result is not just a mediocre historian, but a downright bad one' (p. 85). Although Lee here is right to say that imagination can benefit or hinder historical thinking, we should not think of this issue as one of quantity. Collingwood makes a clearer distinction regarding the role of imagination in history when he claims that although the work of a novelist and a historian are both works of imagination, 'the historian' s picture is meant to be true' (1994, p. 246). Historical imagination is the historians' way of connecting the available evidence. In this process, 'the whole picture is constantly verified by appeal to these data, and runs little risk of losing touch with the reality which it represents' (Collingwood, 1994, p.242). In this sense, as I argue elsewhere 'the historian is responsible both for the connections they make and the evidence they use… [and]… they are [also] aware of the fact that their picture can be challenged in terms of the validity of both of these elements (Perikleous, 2014, p.25). If these cautions and elements of historical investigation are not taken into consideration, 'our explanations will be closer to a work of fiction than a historical explanation of past behaviour' (Perikleous, 2014, p.25).

Summarizing the above, in this section it is argued that we should avoid thinking of historical empathy as a) identification, b) sharing of feelings or sympathy, and c) sheer imagination. As argued in this section these notions can be problematic in the study of history. While on some of these issues an agreement seems to exist, at least among history educationalists (i.e., historical empathy not being about identification or sheer imagination), others are still a matter of debate (i.e., historical empathy's relation with sympathy and sharing of feelings). In this section, I do not claim to have made an exhaustive discussion of these issues. My aim, in this and the following section, is to present the key arguments on which my approach to the conception of historical empathy is based.

2.3.2 What historical empathy is

Lee and Ashby (2001) claim that historical empathy 'requires hard thinking on the basis of evidence, but it is not a special kind of mental process' (p. 24). In this sense, empathy is the result (an achievement) of the effort to 'know what past agents thought, what goals they may have been seeking, and how they saw their situation, and [and be able to] connect all this with what they did' (Lee and Ashby, 2001). Conversely, Yeager and Foster (2001) claim that historical empathy can be both a process and an outcome and quote Portal's claim that to exercise historical empathy 'it is necessary to establish what people thought was going on and how they saw their own range of options before any explanation of their motives has a chance of success' (1987 cited in Yeager and Foster, 2001, p. 15). Although at a first glance these two descriptions seem to differ, they essentially describe the same two components involved in understanding people in the past. These are a) the knowledge of the historical agents' ideas and view of the situation and also of the historical context and b) the effective use of this knowledge to explain their actions.

Shemilt (1984) suggests that the exercise of historical empathy rests upon specific theoretical assumptions. The first one is that the perspectives of people in the past are likely to be different from our own ones (Shemilt, 1984). In other words, we cannot expect people in the past to share the same ideas, beliefs and world views with people today. This is based on the assumption that the past and the present worlds are different. In the absence of this realization, the different world of the past is viewed as culturally homogenous with our present world. In this case, the only way to explain the 'strange' behaviour of its people is to think that they were usually inferior or irrational. On the other hand, acknowledging that the perspectives of people in the past were different, allows for the possibility of thinking that people in the past behaved rationally based on their beliefs and the way they perceived their world.

This leads to Shemilt's second assumption according to which, empathetic explanations should aim to identify rational and meaningful behaviours based on 'reasonably coherent and cohesive systems [of meaning]' (1984, p. 48). Based on this second assumption, we can then proceed to try to connect the historical agent's

ideas, aspirations and views of the situation to their action in question. As Lee and Shemilt (2011) point out, '[t]he aim is to understand how it could make sense: why what was done would have seemed to be the best thing to do in the circumstances' (p. 40). This assumption also stresses the importance of acknowledging the agency of people in the past. In this sense, empathetic understanding also has to do with the acknowledgment that people in the past made decisions and their behaviour was not simply imposed by their situation.

A third assumption, proposed by Shemilt, is the fact that '[w]e share a common humanity with people in the past (1984, p. 47). As Lee and Ashby (2001) argue, in order to understand the past empathetically we need to 'entertain purposes and beliefs held by the people in the past without accepting them' (p. 25). In this way we will start thinking about what it would have been reasonable for these people to do, having these beliefs. This is possible exactly because people in the past are human beings as we are. Shemilt, here, as other authors, previously discussed in section 2.3.2, do (Collingwood, 1946; Dilthey, 2006; Schütz, 1967), essentially argues that the human mind transcends time and allow us to think about the experience of our predecessors.

Finally, Shemilt (1984) argues that our way of life is genetically connected to the way of life of the people in the past. This means that although we cannot experience this past way of life, our contemporary one is developmentally related to it. Here Shemilt, essentially repeats the argument, discussed in section 2.3.2, of the possibility of historical empathy because of the connections between the social worlds of the past and the present (Schleiermacher, 2006; Humboldt, 2006; Droysen, 2006, Dilthey cited in Makkreel, 2021). Hence empathetic explanations are also based on an understanding of how this past way of life fits into a broader pattern of ideas, goals and beliefs which extends to the present.

Although the above does not constitute a definition of historical empathy, Shemilt's suggestions offer a clear and coherent picture of some of the major issues related to attempting empathetic explanations in history. As in the case of clarifying what historical empathy is not, the identification of what we need to take into consideration

when we attempt to make sense of people in the past is also quite valuable in terms of avoiding misuses of the concept.

As mentioned in the previous section, the emphasis so far on the cognitive aspects of historical empathy, 'does not mean that the feelings of people in past should not be acknowledged or respected. People in the past did things also because of the way they felt. Therefore, in history we seek to understand the feelings too' (Perikleous, 2014, p. 25). Megill discussing the use of historical memory (i.e., the memories of people who participated in historical events) suggests that in order to reconstruct the participants' experience historians need to study 'what went on in their minds and feelings' (2007, p.29). Atkinson (2004) claims that history 'depends on an assumption of shared humanity. That assumption involves feeling… historians who fail to register the importance of feeling, whether explicitly or not, cut themselves off from the roots of their discipline' (p.23). Also, as Lee (1983) points out '[e]mpathy requires that the historian knows *that* the subjects believed what they did with regard to facts and values, and *that* they felt as they did. It does not require that historians share either the beliefs or the feelings. What it does demand is that they can recognize at some level their appropriateness in their context' (p.40).

In order to do this, we need to see and respect the people in the past as human beings and to care about understanding them. Lee reminds us that if we 'treat people in the past as less than fully human and do not respond to those people's hopes and fears, …[we]… have hardly began to understand what history is about' (2005, p. 47). As I argue elsewhere,

> [t]his is something that we strive to do, though, not only for those whom we like or for whom we feel pity, but also for those who did things with which we disagree, whom we consider to be the wrong-doers, the perpetrators and even evil. In this sense historical empathy is also a disposition of respecting the people in the past, their ideas, feelings and beliefs and caring to understand them (Perikleous, 2014, p.25).

Lee (1983) argues that, 'if empathy as achievement is a necessary condition of historical understanding… acquiring the disposition to empathize may be regarded as an essential part of learning to think historically' (p.37). Lee (1983) acknowledges

that this is an affective aspect of historical empathy. If we do not want to understand people in the past, then it is unlikely that we will try to understand them. Barton and Levstik (2004) echo Lee by claiming that '[e]mpathy without care sounds like an oxymoron. Why would anyone expend energy trying to understand historical perspectives if they had no care or concern for the lives and experiences of people in the past? Care is the motivating force behind nearly all historical research, and it shapes our interest in its products' (p. 228).

In the light of the above, it can be argued that despite the fact that historical empathy is primarily a cognitive act and that, as discussed in section 2.3.1, feeling what people in the past felt and/or sympathising with them can be impossible and/or problematic, understanding why people in the past did what they did does have affective aspects. This is in the sense that a) understanding people in the past involves understanding their feelings and how these affected their behaviour and b) understanding people in the past can only be achieved if we care to understand them. In other words, despite the fact that we cannot feel what people in the past felt, we do need to take into consideration how they felt. Also, despite the fact that sympathising with people in the past can distort our understanding, we do need to care about understanding them. These distinctions are not a matter of quantity, they are not about more or less affective empathy. They are a matter of quality. As already discussed in the paragraphs above and in section 2.3.1, taking one's feelings into consideration is different to sharing them. Caring to understand someone is different to sympathising with them.

Megill (2007) describes four key historian's tasks. These are description (what happened in the past), explanation (why this happened), argument/justification (how do we know), and interpretation (what is the meaning of what happened in the past for people in the present and the future). One could argue that historical empathy, with its primary aim being to explain past actions, falls within this description of historical explanation. However, Megill (2007) warns us that this distinction is primarily a conceptual one that helps as to think about the different aspects of the historian's writing and not a practical one. In a similar vein and in some aspects, Shemilt (1984) points out that in order for empathetic explanations to be considered as historical explanations they need to satisfy criteria that have to do with the

coherence of what they describe, the efficiency of their arguments, their agreement with other accounts and the degree to which they privilege the less exotic explanations when the previous three criteria are satisfied. What Megill (2007) and Shemilt (1984) remind us here is that historical explanation, in general, and historical empathy, in particular, are not disconnected from the other aspects of historical thinking and the discipline of history.

The above also relate with the idea that, as many authors argue, historical empathy involves a strong substantive knowledge of the past (knowledge of the views and ideas of people in the past and of the historical context in which the historical agents lived).[18]Substantive knowledge of the past, though, is not simply to be discovered (since the past is not hidden to be discovered), but to be reconstructed based on the available historical evidence (Wineburg, 2001). In this sense, the historian reconstructs the past using the methods and the logic of the discipline of history in order to do so. As Megill (2007) argues, history is a discipline in which what passes as knowledge has to be based on the questioning of historical sources. As discussed in previous paragraphs, the idea of understanding people in the past being depended on historical investigation is also to be found in the work of earlier thinkers (Humboldt, 2006; Droysen, 2006; Dilthey, 2006; Collingwood, 1946). Therefore, historical empathy cannot exist on its own in the absence of sophisticated disciplinary and substantive knowledge.

As also discussed in section 2.2.2, dealing with our contextuality and biases, while attempting to understand people in the distant past, poses a challenge. As argued in the same section, understanding people in the past cannot happen by abandoning our own historicity since this is the only way we have to do so (Gadamer, 2004; Wineburg, 2001; Retz, 2015). Instead, we can attempt a 'fusion of horizons' (Gadamer, 2004) between our world and the world of the past by acknowledging our own contextuality and biases, allowing in this way the meaning behind past actions to emerge as different from our meanings. In this sense, historical empathy is also

---

[18] See, for example, the discussion of the ideas of Collingwood (1946), Dilthey (2006), Schleiermacher (2006), Humboldt (2006), and Droysen (2006) in section 2.3.2. See also, Shemilt (1984) and Foster (2001).

an acknowledgment of our own contextuality and biases and the role they play in our understanding of past behaviour.

In the light of the above, a brief answer to the question posed in the title of this section is that historical empathy is a cognitive act and a disposition. It is a cognitive act of explaining why people in the past did what they did by thinking of what it would be reasonable for them to think, by taking into consideration their beliefs, ideas and intentions and also their situation, and the wider historical context. It is a disposition in the sense that it demands treating people in the past as human and caring to understand them. It is also a disposition in the sense that it involves an acknowledgment of our own contextuality and biases when attempting to explain past behaviour.

2.5 Conclusion

This chapter discussed the introduction of historical empathy in English history education and the phenomenon of the concept becoming a contested issue. It also discussed the main objections for its implementation in the teaching of history.

The chapter addressed some of the objections against the teaching of historical empathy in schools described in its first section. Apropos the claim that empathy is an affective and not a cognitive exercise, reference to the philosophy of mind and the philosophy of history demonstrate that there is a long tradition of empathy being considered as also a cognitive act. Options against the claim that other minds are strictly private and inaccessible were provided, based on the idea of the experience of a common social world and an intentional effort to take into consideration the perspective of the Other. Furthermore, claims against the possibility of empathising with people in the past, were countered with arguments for the possibility of the human mind to transcend time. The latter is not approached as a fictional ability, similar to sending a Betazoid or a Vulcan into the past using a TARDIS, but as a cognitive act that is based on rational thinking, disciplined reconstruction of the past and the acknowledgment of our own contextuality and biases.[19]

---

[19] Betazoids and Vulcan are fictional species from the popular science fiction franchise Star Trek, who can literarily access other minds and share feelings and thoughts. A TARDIS is time machine in the Doctor Who fictional universe.

Finally, in order to provide a possible answer to the issue of meaning confusion, this chapter discussed different notions related to the meaning of historical empathy and distinguishes between those that can be problematic (i.e., identification, sympathy, sheer imagination) and the ones that can helpful (i.e., a cognitive act of understanding past behaviour and a disposition of respect of people in the past and acknowledging our own contextuality and biases).

As I acknowledged earlier, I do not claim that this chapter provides an exhaustive discussion of these issues. Such a claim cannot be sustained within the constrictions of space of a single chapter. However, this chapter provides a justification of my conception of historical empathy and discusses the main arguments upon which this is based.

The most important conclusion of this chapter, in terms of teaching history, is that historical empathy is possible despite the limitations which derive from the effort to make sense of other people who lived in a different world. Also, as it will be argued in Chapter 3, students can develop sophisticated ideas of historical empathy. Therefore, identifying the challenges that such an act poses for both students and teachers, as this study aims to, is a necessary condition in order to be able to suggest ways to develop children's understanding of people in the past and consequently their understanding of history.

Chapter 3 Research in students' and teachers' ideas of historical empathy

> There are many roads to Rome and some pupils prefer to head for Geneva
> (Lee and Shemilt, 2003; p.22).

3.1 Introduction

This chapter discusses research findings related to the issues explored in the present study. Following a brief review of the development of research on students' historical reasoning in general (section 3.2), it discusses findings about students' ideas of historical empathy (section 3.3), about teachers' ideas of historical empathy (section 3.4) and about the issue of the effect of temporal and cultural distance in empathetic explanations (3.5).

Research so far provides us with evidence of students' ideas of historical empathy from a variety of educational contexts. The same does not apply in the case of differences in ideas of historical empathy according to students' age and teachers' ideas of the concept. In these cases, limited evidence does not allow for claims about the universality of the current findings. Finally, in the case of how temporal and cultural distance affect ideas of historical empathy, existing findings do not provide us with evidence about the issue. Despite, the fact that both aspects are involved in some studies, the involvement of other factors (e.g. identity issues and personal interest) does not allow for a clear picture of these phenomena.

3.2 Research in historical reasoning

History education research has been influenced by researchers' ideas about the nature of history and the meaning given to historical understanding as well as by their ideas about learning and cognitive development. In this sense, as mentioned in Chapter 1, Wineburg (2001) rightly claims that studies in history education 'tell us as much about the researchers who conducted them as about the children and teachers who participated in them' (p. 29).

Despite the fact that, as discussed in Chapter 1, approaches aiming to develop students' disciplinary understanding in history emerged during the second half of the

20th century, Aldrich (1984) argues that it would be unhistorical to claim that these were something new in the sense that such ideas never existed before. For example, in 1910, Maurice Keatinge was advocating for the use of sources in history education as a way to stimulate students' developing critical thinking. He also claimed that history could contribute to students' moral development since he believed that reasoning and respect for evidence are signs of moral maturity (Aldrich, 1984; McAleavy 1998). Also, in the 1920s, Frederick Happold argued in favour of the use of sources in history teaching and was also responsible for the introduction of an O-Level syllabus, by Oxford Local Examinations Board, which included source-based questions (Aldrich, 1984; McAleavy 1998). Aldrich (1984) also refers to the example of Catherine Firth who in 1929 argued that the questions of 'Is it true?' and 'How we know?' should be central in the teaching of history.

These views were not necessarily identical to the ones that were popularised in the 1970s and the 1980s by the SHP. Chapman (2017), for example, argues that Keatinge's idea of using sources in history teaching was not about developing disciplinary understanding, but about finding a way to 'encourage them [students] to treat history seriously… [and]… help to shape their thinking in the ways educators might want from a citizenship perspective without the students being aware of this'. Despite this and despite the fact that these ideas did not became prominent at the time, they did influence later developments. This is evident by the fact that David Sylvester, the first director of the SHP, explicitly acknowledges his debt to Keatinge and Happold by describing them as his two main influences at the beginning of his career (Sylvester and Sheldon, 2009).

At the beginning of the 20th century in the U.S., some educational psychologists were also discussing interesting ideas about history education. In 1915, Charles Judd discussed the phenomenon of presentism (viewing the past not in its own terms but from our contemporary point of view) and 'the difficulties of causal judgment, the dangers of dramatic re-enactments, the psychological difficulties presented by historical evidence and the motivational role of social history' (Wineburg 2001, p.30). Carletton Bell, in 1917, was concerned with issues such as the essence of historical understanding, the determination of success on tasks that do not have a single answer and the role of instruction in developing students' ability to think (Wineburg, 2001).

Also, in 1920, F.S. Camp claimed that tests of historical thinking should be designed in order to measure students' ability to think in terms of examining and weighing facts in their attempt to formulate a response (Wineburg 2001).

The work of Garry Myers, in 1917, who found that students' mistakes were due to wrong connections between facts, is another example of ideas which emerged in the early 20th century and were subsequently rediscovered (Wineburg 2001). Myers claimed that students need to use 'hitching post' and memory slots which must be constantly in view by the learner. These claims, according to Wineburg (2001), 'anticipated later notions of cognitive organizers' (p. 34). One can also claim that Myers' ideas can be associated with relatively recent approaches who look at the development of big pictures of the past using synoptic frameworks that are organised around key changes and continuities Lee, 2004; Shemilt, 2000; Lee and Howson, 2009; Shemilt, 2009; Shemilt, 2011; Hammond, 2014).

Despite the above examples, McAleavy (1998) argues that, in England, the idea of history education as primarily a means of transmitting substantive knowledge remained dominant among teachers at the time. To support this claim, he discusses the example of a 1929 conference that brought together academic historians and schoolteachers. In this conference, while the academics favoured an emphasis on 'training in critical method and a scholarly mental outlook' and 'were keen to highlight the use of evidence' (McAleavy, 1998, p. 11), schoolteachers criticized this approach and advocated for the importance of knowledge transmission. This view seems to have been popular among teachers until the 1960's as demonstrated in a publication by the, where it was claimed that students are not able to work with sources in the ways of the discipline and therefore

> [t]he real, and immensely valuable, function of source-material in the junior and middle school classroom is as illustration- illustration of historical facts, the proof of which the young historian has to largely take on trust.
> (Incorporated Association of Assistant Masters in Secondary Schools, 1965, p. 45)

In the case of the US, Wineburg (2001) claims that at the beginning of the 20th century, the dominance of the idea of history teaching as a process of knowledge

transmission, was not a phenomenon restricted to education, but it was also present in the 'prevailing [positivistic] views of knowledge in the discipline of history' (p.36) at the time. According to these views the historians' task was the rigorous pursuit of the verification of facts. This phenomenon is demonstrated by Novick (1926) in his description of the *American Historical Review* policy for communication to the journal. According to this, communication to the journal was possible only in cases of 'matter of fact, capable of determination one way or the other, for such discussion is likely to add to the reader's knowledge' (Novick, 1988, p. 200). Letters that were related to 'matters of opinion' for which historians views 'might differ endlessly, with little profit to the reader' were rejected (Novick, 1988, p. 200).

Research based on the above assumptions about history and history education was focused on testing students' ability to recite names, dates and facts, usually with poor results (Wineburg, 2001; Whittington, 1991) which in most of the cases prompted criticism about schools' inability to educate students in history. An example of this is Bell's and McCollum's (1917) comment on the results of a study they conducted: 'Surely a grade of 33 in 100 on the simplest and most obvious facts of American history is not a record in which any high school can take pride' (cited in Wineburg, 2001, p. 32).

The ascendancy of behaviourism, sweeping learning theories that claimed to be applied equally in all subjects, the lack of consensus about right answers in history which complicated measurements and the absence of an active community of researchers and experts in history education who borrowed and contributed to psychological theories led to a period (from the end of World War I to the beginning cognitive revolution in education) of neglect in research on history education (Wineburg, 2001).

During the 1950s, in England, the influence of Piaget's theories turned educational psychologists' interest to students' thinking processes in history (and other subjects) instead of the acquisition of substantive knowledge. In 1972, in an issue of the *Educational Review* focused on students' thinking, Edwin Peel claimed that understanding historical texts has to do with the students' ability to 'follow the sequence or pattern of causes and effects… to envisage actions, conditions and

intentions and relate them to their consequences… a grasp of cause and effect, a capacity to follow a sustained argument and a power to evaluate' (1972, p. 164).

However, the findings of studies based on the Piagetian tradition, showed that students' thinking in history was developing later than in maths or science (Hallam, 1967; Stones 1955 cited in Steele 1976; De Silva, 1972). These studies attempted to explore students' historical thinking, in ways similar to the ones used to explore thinking in natural sciences (Wineburg, 2001). In this sense students were asked to answer questions out of historical context and to exhibit their abilities to work with logical relations and test hypotheses. For Wineburg (2001), however, this kind of approach 'bore only a faint resemblance to the rich hybrid of narration, exposition, and imaginative reconstruction familiar in the discipline [of history]' (p. 40). Dickinson and Lee (1978), Booth (1987) and Shemilt (Shemilt and Sheldon, 2009) also claim that Piaget's levels of thinking based on students' work in relation to the natural sciences cannot be used in history since there are many differences in the logic and methods used by these disciplines.

Approaching students' historical understanding in terms of reciting substantive knowledge or in terms of thinking in the natural sciences led to pessimistic assumptions regarding students' ability to think historically. These assumptions caused low expectations from educators and at the same time provided an excuse to explain why teaching practices did not seem to be achieving very much (Macintosh, 1987 cited in Wineburg, 2001). One can also claim that the lack of theories and studies supporting the idea that students could develop historical thinking at younger ages, left history education in the hands of those who saw history as a way to promote social and moral ideals instead of developing historical thinking in terms of disciplinary understanding.

The early 1970s was a turning point in history education in England. In 1972 the School Council History 13-16 Project (later School History Project-SHP) was launched in an effort to reform history teaching in secondary education. The project's evaluation study by Denis Shemilt (1980) showed that adolescents can develop a refined understanding of history as a form of knowledge and that this can be taught. Similarly optimistic views about adolescents were supported by other studies (Booth,

1980;1983). Later studies (see for example Cooper, 1994; Downey and Levstik, 1988; Knight, 1989b; Waldron, 2004; Barton and Levstik, 2004) and especially the CHATA (Concepts of History and Teaching Approaches) project, showed that the potential of an understanding of history is not confined to secondary education students and that younger students can also develop sophisticated ideas.[20]

At this point it is important to acknowledge that although the initial work based on Piagetian tradition contributed to the negative climate regarding students' potential of developing historical thinking, its focus on thinking processes was crucial in terms of moving research interest beyond the acquisition of factual knowledge to students' reasoning in history. In this sense, this work should not be viewed as a merely problematic or even a misguided approach to exploring historical thinking, but as an important (and maybe necessary) stage of the development of research in the field. As Wineburg (2001) points out, the Piagetians were the ones who 'reminded researchers that the best indication of historical reasoning was not children's selection of the correct answers… [but]… their ability to connect ideas, and the justifications they offered for their conclusions' (p. 40). Also, Shemilt (1980), whose work overturned pessimistic conclusions regarding students' historical reasoning drawn by studies based on Piagetian traditions, explicitly acknowledged the usefulness of the Piagetian approach, as long as it was adapted in ways that allowed the differences between history and natural sciences to be taken into consideration.

Today, as demonstrated by the published work in the field, research in the area of students' historical understanding in terms of historical reasoning flourishes around the world.[21] In the case of the Greek Cypriot educational system, however, very little research evidence regarding students' historical thinking exists. At the moment there are only three published studies related to students' historical reasoning. The first one is my own previous study of primary school Greek Cypriot students' ideas of historical empathy (Perikleous, 2011). The second one is study that reports findings on the effect

---

[20] For more about the findings of CHATA project which support the claim that young children can develop sophisticated ideas of history see Lee (2006), Lee and Ashby (2000 and 2001) and Lee, Dickinson and Ashby (2001).
[21] This is demonstrated in section 3.3 by the references to a plethora of studies on students' historical reasoning.

of an augmented reality mobile learning approach on students' empathetic explanations (Efstathiou, et. al., 2017). A third study, explores 17–18-year-old students' ideas about variations in historical accounts (Chapman and Georgiou, 2021). This suggests a lack of research interest in students reasoning in history. However, the fact that these three studies as also the one reported in this thesis took place during the last decade, suggests that there is a potential for an increase in terms of the investigations of students' historical reasoning.

Despite the fact that the importance of teachers in developing student's historical reasoning was noted since the 1980's (Shemilt, 1984; Ashby and Lee, 1987; Booth, 1980), their own historical reasoning did not receive much attention, at least during the 20th century (Wineburg, 1996), with some exceptions (see for example Yeager and Davis, 1996 and Evans, 1994). During the 21st century, research work in teachers understanding of history has increased (see for example Husbands, Kitson, and Pendry, 2003; Maggioni, VanSledright and Alexander, 2009; VanSledright, Maggioni and Reddy, 2011; VanSledright and Reddy, 2014; Boadu, 2020; Wineburg and Wilson, 2001). However, it is still not as rich as it is in the case of students' historical reasoning.

3.3 Students' ideas of historical empathy

3.3.1 Research in students' ideas of historical empathy

Research in students' ideas of historical empathy is part of the wider approach in history education research which investigates students' ideas of second-order disciplinary concepts such as historical accounts (see for example Chapman, 2009b; Lee and Shemilt, 2004; Lee, 1998; Hsiao, 2005; Shemilt, 1980; Lee and Ashby, 2000), evidence (see for example Shemilt, 1980; Barton, 2008b; Ashby, 2005; Lee and Shemilt, 2003; Ní Cassaithe, 2020), causal explanations (see for example Lee, Dickinson and Ashby, 1996; Lee and Shemilt, 2009; Carretero López-Manjón and Jacott, 1997; Bermudez and Jaramillo, 2001) and historical significance (see for example Cercadillo, 2001; Seixas, 1994; Peck, 2010).

The first attempt to explore students' ideas of historical empathy, at least in the English-speaking context, was the one by Alaric Dickinson and Peter Lee in 1978. In this study, students were asked to explain the decision of Admiral John Jellicoe to turn

his fleet away from the Germans in the Battle of Jutland (31 May- 1 June 1916) during WW1 (Dickinson and Lee, 1978).[22] Subsequent small-scale studies of students' ideas of historical empathy by the Institute of Education group of researches (Dickinson and Lee, 1984; Ashby and Lee, 1987) essentially laid the ground for historical empathy component of the CHATA project study during the 1990's.[23] Denis Shemilt's evaluation study of the Schools Council History Project 13- 16 (Shemilt, 1980; Shemilt, 1984) and the work of Alaric Dickinson, Peter Lee and Rosalyn Ashby in CHATA project (Lee and Ashby, 2001; Lee, Dickinson and Ashby, 2001; Lee, Dickinson and Ashby, 1997) were the two most important studies in the area in the 20th century.[24] At the beginning

---

[22] The 131 students (aged 12 to 18) who participated in this study were given a text with a narrative of the battle and 3 diagrams depicting the position and moves of the two fleets (and also information about ships' capability to fire from certain positions) and were then asked to answer open-ended questions regarding Jellicoe's decision.
[23] In their 1984 study, Lee and Dickinson provided groups of three students with passages on either the Anglo- Saxon Ordeal (oath helping and the ordeal) or Spartan education. In the case of the Anglo- Saxons task, students were given open ended questions to discuss and answer, explaining why the Anglo- Saxons used these ways to decide whether someone was guilty of a crime. In the Spartan task, some of the groups were also given questions to discuss and answer by giving their opinion on Spartan education. Some other Spartan task groups were asked to set suitable questions for the rest of the class. The discussions of the students were recorded on video tape. In 1987, Ashby and Lee used the same technique employed by Dickinson and Lee in 1984. The main deference was the fact that the camera was used much more extensively. Students were recorded during ordinary classwork exercises as well as on specially constructed tasks. Also, students were generally working completely alone without an adult in the room.
[24] Shemilt's Evaluation Study was the formal evaluation of the Schools Council History 13- 16 Project, which comprised of three studies in which formal concept tests and interviews were used. Part of these tests and interviews were asking for empathetic explanations. In these empathy tasks, 156 students' (aged 15) were given sources describing actions and ideas of people in the past (in a variety of historical topics; e.g. Wellington's plan in the Battle of Talavera; the belief in therapeutic properties of the Royal Touch, Custers decisions during the American Frontier Wars) and were asked to give explanations for these actions and ideas. During interviews students were also asked general questions about understanding people in the past (1980; 1984). In the CHATA project, 320 students (aged 7 to 14) completed three written task sets using similar questions but different content. In all three task sets, historical information was offered through simple narrative and pictures specially drawn for the purpose. Then, they were asked to answer a series of question in order to explain specific actions, institutions and practices. The first task set asked about a particular action of one person and more specifically why Claudius decided to invade Britain in 43 A.D., even though it cost the Romans more than what they got out of it. In the second task, students were asked why the Romans had a law which stated that if a slave killed their master, then all the slaves in the Roman's household should be executed. Then, they were asked why the law had been carried out on a specific occasion (i.e., the murder

of the 21st century, Wineburg (2001) argued that these two studies provided the most in-depth analysis of students understanding in history to date. Barton and Levstik (2004) repeated this claim for the case of the CHATA project. This is arguably the case until today, especially due to the fact that, unlike the majority of the available studies on students' ideas of historical empathy, the SHP Evaluation Study and the CHATA project used a variety of tasks to explore the ideas of relatively large samples from a variety of schools.

Perhaps the most important contribution of these two studies was that they challenged established beliefs at the time (see discussion in section 3.2), according to which children do not possess the cognitive abilities to explain past behaviour. Shemilt's Evaluation Study showed that adolescents can think effectively about past behaviour and that this can improve with teaching that aims to develop such kind of thinking (1980; 1984). CHATA project showed that the potential of providing empathetic explanations is not a phenomenon observed only in older students, but also primary age ones (Lee and Ashby, 2001). Despite the Evaluation Study and CHATA project being the most comprehensive ones, other studies during the same period (i.e., the last two decades of the 20th century) also suggested that students can attempt to explain actions, institutions and practices in the past in sophisticated ways, both at the ages of secondary (Knight, 1989b; Dickinson and Lee, 1978; Wineburg and Wilson, 1991; Ashby and Lee, 1987; Dickinson and Lee, 1984) and primary education (Knight, 1989b; Blakeway, 1983, cited in Cooper, 1994; Downey and Levstik, 1988).

During the 21st century these findings are confirmed by studies in a variety of educational contexts again for both adolescents (see for example Doppen, 2000; Berti, Baldin and Toneatti, 2009; Davison, 2012; McKenzie, 2015; Huijgen et. al., 2014; Kosti, Kondoyianni and Tsiaras, 2015) and younger children (see for example Barton and Levstik, 2004; Cooper, 2007; Perikleous, 2011; Berti et. al., 2009; Ogawa, 2000; Huijgen et. al., 2014). These findings challenge the criticisms for teaching historical empathy in education, discussed in Chapter 2, according to which students, especially younger ones, do not possess the mental capacity and knowledge to make sense of

---

of the Roman Pedanius by one of his slaves). In the third task, students were asked to explain why Anglo-Saxons used the Ordeal (trial by oath helping and the ordeal) to find out if someone was guilty of a crime.

people in the past. This is not to claim that students' empathetic explanations can be as sophisticated to the ones of professional historians. Students hold a number of problematic ideas discussed in the next section. However, history teaching is not about creating mini historians (Shemilt, 1980; Lee, 2005; Wineburg, 2007). History is about contributing to the education of people who think historically, and this involves that the distinct ways of thinking in history should be taken into consideration (Megill, 2007; Tosh, 2008). In other words, as Lee (2005) reminds us 'developing students' understanding of history is worthwhile without implying any grandiose claims' (Lee, 2005: 40).

Today, research in students' ideas of historical empathy take place in a number of different educational contexts.[25] This kind of research investigates mainly students' default ideas of historical empathy (see for example Levstik, 2008; Huijgen et. al., 2014; Perikleous, 2011; Berti et. al., 2009) and the contribution of teaching in the development of ideas of historical empathy (see for example Cooper, 2007; Ogawa, 2000; Brooks, 2011; Endacott, 2014; Kosti et. al. 2015). The following section (3.3.1) focuses on research in students' default ideas of empathy which is the main object of this study's investigation.

3.3.2 Students' ideas when trying to make sense of actions, institutions, and practices in the past

Research shows two main characteristics of students' ideas that hinder their effort to make sense of human behaviour in the past. These characteristics, which are related to each other, are presentism, a tendency to interpret the past using the ideas and beliefs of the present world, and the failure to take into consideration the historical context in which an action, institution, or practice took place. Lévesque (2008) describes presentism as 'the tendency of contemporary people not to differentiate the past from the present, to naively impose their present-day values and norms on

---

[25] For research on students' ideas of historical empathy in Spain, see for example Serrano (2013) and Franco (2016), in Greece, see Kosti et al. (2015) and Kourgiantakis (2005), in New Zealand, see Levstik (2001) and Davison (2012), in Italy, see Berti et. al. (2009), in Finland, see Virta and Kouki (2014), in Germany, see Hartmann and Hasselhorn (2008), in the Netherlands, see de Leur, van Boxtel and Wilschut (2017; 2015) and Huijgen et. al. (2014), for Israel see Goldberg (2013), in Cyprus, see Perikleous (2011) and Efstathiou et. al. (2018).

predecessors, as if the two contexts could magically be merged into a single transhistorical entity' (p.151). Wineburg (2001) claims that presentism (the idea of a familiar past, which is simple and speaks directly to us, without the need of any translation) is the natural way of thinking; a way of thinking that requires little effort. This is a way of thinking that underestimates the historicity of culture and the degree to which cultural matters are historically contingent and variable (A. Chapman, personal communication, May 5, 2010).

Students with presentist views often see the past 'as culturally homogenous with the present, only inhabited by people who were less smart/rational or less moral than people today' (Chapman and Perikleous, 2011), p.18). In other words, they view the past as a deficit version of the present. For example, many students, especially younger ones, in CHATA project explained the Saxon Ordeal by saying that Saxon's were not clever (Lee and Ashby, 2001). Similarly, primary students in a study by Barton and Levstik (2004) explained the phenomenon of some popular names of today being unknown at the time their grandparents were born by claiming that back then people could not pronounce these names. The idea of a deficit past is one of the most prominent ones in studies in students' thinking in historical empathy.[26] The deficit past is also evident in studies investigating other aspects of students' historical thinking (Barton, 1996; Levstik, 2008, Barton, 2008c). This flawed past seems to be the result of a combination of students' inability to realise that people in the past saw the world differently (hence the actions of people in the past look strange) and their idea that people in the past did not have what we have in terms of technology, knowledge etc. (Lee and Ashby, 2001; Lee, 2005). According to Lee (2005), students' tendency to think of the past in deficit terms is also the result of how their families introduce them to the differences between the past and the present and the prevailing ideas about progress. School, in some cases, also reinforces these ideas since there are examples of curricula, textbooks and teaching practices which favour the idea of a present which is better than the past (Lee and Ashby, 2001). The latter is also demonstrated in the

---

[26] For findings which show that students view the past as a deficit version of the present see Ashby and Lee (1987), Cooper (2007), Dickinson and Lee (1978), Dickinson and Lee (1984), Kourgiantakis (2005), Lee and Ashby (2001), Lee, Dickinson and Ashby (2001), Ribeiro (2002 cited in Barca, 2004), Shemilt (1984), Knight (1989b), Berti et. al. (2009) and Perikleous (2011).

discussion about the place of historical empathy in Greek Cypriot education in Chapter 1 (p. 39).

Another effect of presentism in students' ideas is the assimilation of past actions, institutions, and practices to familiar and recognisable modern ones. 'Students, in this case, seem to be unable to realise the difference between the present and the past in terms of beliefs and social conventions, hence they cannot interpret actions, practices and institutions in any other way than using what they already know from their own world' (Perikleous, 2011, p. 228). In my previous study with primary students in Cyprus, many of them assimilated Spartan education to modern day compulsory army service for Greek Cypriot men and argued that young males in Sparta should join the army after they finish school (Perikleous, 2011). In a similar way, a number of students in CHATA project viewed the Saxon Ordeal not at as a form of trial but as a form of punishment (Lee and Ashby, 2001). Again, there is a number of studies that demonstrate the above.[27] The deficit past is not absent here since students usually assume that institutions in the past serve 'the same functions as our equivalent institutions, only badly' (Ashby and Lee, 1987:69).

Even when students begin to realize that people in the past lived in a world that was different in some ways to the one that they live in today, presentism can hinder their attempt to explain the actions of people in the past and their practices and institutions. In this case students explain past behaviour in terms of what people from the present would do if they found themselves in the past. For example, in CHATA project, students explained the execution of a Roman owner's slaves, who was murdered by one of them, by claiming that it would be difficult to sell these slaves to another owner (Lee, Dickinson and Ashby, 2001). Similarly, in my previous study primary students, a number of them explained the institution of Spartan education by not taking into

---

[27] For research findings related to students tendency to assimilate actions, practices and institutions of the past to contemporary ones, see Ashby and Lee (1987), Cooper (2007), Dickinson and Lee (1978), Dickinson and Lee (1984), Lee and Ashby (2001), Lee, Dickinson and Ashby (2001), Ribeiro (2002 cited in Barca, 2004), Shemilt (1984), Berti et. al. (2009) and Perikleous (2011).

consideration that this was a compulsory institution and by saying that Spartans chose it because it was for free (Perikleous, 2011).[28]

Limited research evidence suggests that presentism might also be prompted by tasks in which students are asked to provide first-person explanations of past behaviour (i.e., explaining the behaviour in question as if they were the historical agents). For example, a study by Brooks (2008) reports that secondary education students were more likely to provide presentist explanations for young women leaving farms to work in factories (early 1800s in the US) and factory workers supporting the Ten-Hour Movement (in the mid-1800s in the US), when the students wrote first-person explanations (compared to what they did, when they wrote third-person explanations; writing about the choices made as a historian would do). First-person explanations often relied on their own imagination rather than evidence to make inference and failed to distinguish between the past and the present. For this reasons, Brooks (2008) suggests that third-person explanations are likely to be more suitable for historical empathy exercises. Similar findings, about first-person accounts being vulnerable to presentism, are reported in two more studies by de Leur, van Boxtel and Wilschut (2015; 2017).

The second major characteristic of students' ideas when trying to make sense of past behaviour is their tendency to not take into consideration the context in which the actions, institutions, and practices took place. Thus, they focus more on reasons of personal preferences and intentions of individuals when trying to give explanations and not the wider historical context.[29] For example, in Knight's (1989b) study of primary and secondary students, a phenomenon observed was the explanation of the actions of King William I with references to his personality at the expense of the situation in which he was. In Barton's (2008a) study, primary students frequently

---

[28] For findings related to the phenomenon of students of explaining past behaviour in present terms, even when they acknowledge the different situational context, see for example Lee and Ashby (2001), Kourgiantakis (2005), Perikleous (2011), Berti et. al. (2009), and Shemilt (1984).

[29] For research findings related to students' tendency to ignore the historical context, see for example Ashby and Lee (1987), Barton (2008a), Bermudez and Jaramillo (2001), Dickinson and Lee (1978 and 1984), Lee, Dickinson and Ashby (2001), Lee and Ashby (2001), Shemilt (1984), Virta and Kouki (2014), Savenije and de Bruijn (2017), Berti et. al., (2009), and Perikleous (2011).

explained the French and Indian Wars (1688-1763) in North America as the result of conflict between individual settlers from France and England who run to each other rather than the fact that the two countries were at war for territorial control. As in the case of presentism, this is a natural way of thinking, since children's everyday experience of the world is one of personal intentions (e.g., Anna hit Christopher because she was angry about something he did).

Students who move beyond individual intentions, in many cases, use stereotypes to explain why people in the past did what they did.[30] In CHATA project, for example, students often explained the decisions of the Roman Emperor Claudius with references to the fact he was an emperor (Lee, Dickinson and Ashby, 2001). Again, students' experience of the world, where usually additional information about the wider context is not available can lead to explanations in terms of stereotypes. This way of thinking is likely to be reinforced by education in general and by history education specifically. For example, the traditional focus on historical personalities and their important actions, and the presentation of groups as homogenous with no special attention to differences within them are examples approaches in history education that can prompt students to think in terms of personal intentions and stereotypes.

We have to bear in mind that students' ideas discussed above are not natural in a sense that the human mind is designed to see the past as inferior or that stereotypes used to explain behaviour in the past are fixed by a natural disposition (e.g., we do not all think of kings as brave and righteous people). What seems to be natural is, according to Wineburg (2001), our tendency to use the easiest way of thinking and, in the case of history, the easiest one is to see the past as another version of the present. The fact that this other version is usually a flawed one is, as mentioned above, due to the messages students receive from their experience (inside and outside the classroom).

---

[30] For research findings related to the use of stereotypes by students, see Ashby and Lee (1987), Barton (2008a; 2008c), Bermudez and Jaramillo (2001), Brophy, VanSledright and Bredin (1992 cited in Barton, 2008a), Cooper (2007), Dickinson and Lee (1984), Lee, Dickinson and Ashby (1997; 2001), Lee and Ashby (2001) and Shemilt (1984).

All studies cited above are localized in the sense that they report findings about individual educational contexts. Also, the majority them are small-scale case studies. One could argue that even studies with large samples, which report findings about individual educational context, are case studies in the sense that they explore the single case of an educational context. In this sense, these studies cannot claim for general application of their findings at global level. For example, the CHATA project (Lee, Dickinson and Ashby, 2001; Lee and Ashby, 2001), which reports findings from England, despite its relatively large sample, cannot support claims for external validity in terms of its findings being generalised for other educational contexts. However, the fact that these ideas are reported by several case studies can support arguments for generalisations. This is in the sense that case studies can contribute to generalisations by pointing out similarities and differences between their findings and the findings of investigations of other similar cases (Gerring, 2007, Yin, 2013). As Bassey (2000) points out generalisations in case studies have a cumulative effect in which the findings of newer case studies can suggest changes to the conclusions of older ones by refining their claims by bringing to light new aspects of the phenomenon under investigation. In this sense, we can argue that the findings discussed in this section, provide evidence for the existence of these ideas, at least in the context of Europe and North America where these studies took place. Perhaps more importantly, evidence of the existence of these ideas today are stronger than it was 40 years ago. This is because, as demonstrated in this section, a number of these ideas which were identified by the early work in England (Dickinson and Lee, 1978; Dickinson and Lee, 1984; Ashby and Lee, 1987; Shemilt 1980;1984) keep appearing in research findings from different educational contexts until today.

3.3.3 Differences in students' ideas of historical empathy by age

Few studies have compared students' ideas of historical empathy in different ages. The most comprehensive one is the CHATA project that investigated differences according to age in ideas of historical empathy, accounts, evidence and cause (Lee and Ashby, 2000; 2001; Lee, Dickinson and Ashby, 2001). During the first phase, the project investigated the ideas of 320 students aged between 7 and 14. In subsequent phases, the project explored the progression of another 92 children (7-14 again) over a period of two terms and then followed the Year 3 children of this second sample

94

through year 5 in a small-scale longitudinal study. The results of the first phase suggest a shift with age in students' ideas - in fact, a shift from everyday present conceptions to ideas that take values and beliefs of the past into consideration. Older students, in CHATA project, were also attempting to unpack beliefs and values behind institutions and referred to the wider situational context more often (Lee and Ashby, 2001).

The progression study of CHATA project showed that at any given age student's ideas differ widely and that some younger students have more sophisticated ideas than some students who are much older. It also suggests that the development of students' understanding in different second-order concepts does not happen in parallel and that this development may occur at different times. Finally, in this part of the study, the least progression was observed in two schools, in which history was not a clearly identifiable subject in the curriculum. The later suggests that teaching may influence the development of students' ideas about second-order concepts.

The CHATA longitudinal study provided 'strong indications of progression between years 3 and 5, although small number dictates a degree of caution' (Lee, Dickinson and Ashby, 2001: 111). Also, this part of the study re-affirms findings in previous phases according to which a) development in different concepts is not happening in parallel and b) change was clearer in schools where history was an identifiable subject (Lee and Ashby, 2000; Lee, Dickinson and Ashby, 2001). Furthermore, students' ideas differed to an important degree in year 3, while this spread increased by the end of the study. (Lee and Ashby, 2000; 2001; Lee, Dickinson and Ashby, 2001).

In the light of the above, it is clear that the CHATA project study findings suggest that there is a progression in students' ideas in historical empathy by age. Similar findings are reported by two other studies investigating differences in the sophistication of ideas according to participants' age. This was another study of 104 students aged 6 to 14 in England (Knight, 1989b) and one of 1270 students aged 10 to 17 in the Netherlands (Huijgen et. al., 2014). In my previous case study with 32 Greek Cypriot students aged 9 to 12 (Perikleous, 2011), progress was observed between the 16 students who completed one of the two tasks, but not the 16 who completed the other one. However, the very small sample of my study does not allow for claims that the

lack of progress in the one of the two groups is a counterevidence for the existence of the phenomenon.

Lee and Ashby (2000) warn us that such observations 'can give the misleading impression that all that needs to be said about progression is that it is age related' (p. 214). They point out that there are cases of 8- and 10-year-old students who work with very sophisticated ideas and also that CHATA project does not provide any evidence that students' ideas simply mature by age. It should be pointed out, however, that the findings of the CHATA project do not provide us with strong evidence regarding progression due to education either. This is because, as already mentioned, apart from the distinction between schools in which history was a clearly identifiable subject and those in which it was not, no other data related to history teaching were collected.

Claims about the contribution of teaching in the development of ideas of historical empathy are supported by the findings of Shemilt's (1980) Evaluation Study of the Schools Council History Project 13-16. This study showed that students who are taught in ways which explicitly aim to promote historical reasoning express more sophisticated ideas. Also, numerous studies from different educational contexts provide evidence of improvement in students' empathetic explanations when taught in ways that support their understanding of past behaviour.[31] It is therefore reasonable to claim that teaching has also an important role in the progression of students' ideas of historical empathy.

Some studies suggest that available information on historical context also seems to improve students' empathetic explanations (Downey, 1995; Yeager and Doppen, 2001; Doppen, 2000). Also, Ashby and Lee (1987) point out that students work at higher levels, when the content is familiar. One could argue that this means that older students who, at least in theory, possess more substantive knowledge are likely to respond in ways which suggest higher levels of historical empathy. However, the contribution of contextual information and the familiarity of the content to empathetic explanations is not that clear. For example, in Knight's (1989b) study, students did not

---

[31] See for example, Cooper (2007), Ogawa (2000), Jensen (2008), Endacott and Pelecanos (2014), Brooks (2011), Davison (2012), Endacott (2014) and Savenijea and Bruijnb (2017)

always provide better explanations when topics were the same ones that they were taught in school. Similar evidence is provided by my previous study in which students who responded to the task about an unfamiliar topic provided more sophisticated explanations than the ones that responded to the task about a familiar one (Perikleous, 2011). Furthermore, students' contextual knowledge does not always come from school, but also from other sources such as literature, movies, and games. Regardless of the validity of this knowledge, students tend to use it (Bronkhorst and Akkerman, 2016 cited in de Leur, van Boxtel and Wilschut, 2017). Seixas and Peck (2004) warn us that these experiences can provide a false sense of familiarity by creating images of people in the past that are essentially a version of us. This distortion can lead to problematic explanations of their actions. In the light of these, it can be argued that the contribution of contextual knowledge and familiarity is not always beneficial.

A key question here is whether students' progress by age is also due to a genuine development of their ideas of historical empathy. In other words, as I ask elsewhere 'are older students more inclined [than younger ones] to look closer at the beliefs, ideas, and values of people in the past when they realise that an action, institution or practice seems to be paradoxical and their already held substantive knowledge cannot provide any assistance?' (Perikleous, 2011, p. 230). Also, is it more likely that older students 'entertain purposes and beliefs held by the people in the past without accepting them' (Lee and Ashby, 2001, p. 25)? Are they more likely to acknowledge that understanding past behaviour, means that we need to understand past ideas, beliefs and the way they historical agents viewed their world, even when these views are not visible at a first glance? Are they more likely to understand the need to reconstruct the historical context in which these people were situated? The fact that some evidence suggests that even teachers may claim that 'people in the past thought and behaved in exactly the same way as people today, and that only the setting was different' (Shemilt, 1980, p.76) is an indication that ideas of historical empathy do not come simply with age.

The above also relates to the existing literature about the contribution of teaching to the development of historical empathy. Studies in this area investigate changes in students' empathetic explanations during and after a certain period of intervention. Some of them focus on changes within a certain group (see for example Ogawa, 2000;

Doppen, 2000; Efstathiou et. al. 2018; Jensen, 2008; Wilschut and Schiphorst, 2019), while others compare ideas between test and control groups (see for example Yeager and Doppen, 2001; Cooper, 2007; Shemilt, 1980; 1984). However, the vast majority of these studies focus on how the teaching of a specific topic can improve empathetic explanation on that topic. Two issues arise from this approach. First, these findings cannot inform us about whether observed changes in students' explanations were due to a genuine development of their conceptual understanding or simply due to a development of their substantive knowledge. Second, these findings cannot inform us about whether these improved empathetic explanations will occur when students encounter a new topic. Unlike most of these studies, the SHP Evaluation Study (Shemilt, 1980; 1984), adopted a comprehensive approach in which the project's impact on students' understanding of historical empathy (and other concepts) was investigated with tests on a variety of topics (not necessarily taught) and interviews that moved beyond specific topics asking also questions about understanding people in the past, in general. Only few other studies investigate how teaching can contribute to the development of students' ideas of historical empathy by testing the effect interventions on different topics than the ones taught (see for example Cooper, 2007; Wilschut and Schiphorst, 2019).

In the light of the above, it is clear that, although available findings suggest a progression of students ideas by age, we are still far from making claims about the universality of this phenomenon. More research is also needed in order to identify the factors that can contribute to, or inhibit, this progression. Finally, more research is also needed in order to be able to make suggestions for teaching interventions that contribute to a genuine and lasting development of students conceptual understanding of historical empathy that is transferable to topics beyond the ones are taught.

3.3.4 Research based progression models

A number of ways have been suggested to map students' ideas of historical empathy (in order to explore default ideas and investigate change by age or due to teaching interventions). These attempt to identify the key aspects of historical empathy to be explored when investigating ideas of the concept.

A first attempt to suggest a model that maps students' ideas of historical empathy was the progression model proposed by Lee (1978) and used to map the ideas of students in the very first study that explored ideas of historical empathy (Dickinson and Lee, 1978). Another model, also based on theoretical assumptions that was used to map of students' responses in the SHP Evaluation Study was proposed by Shemilt (1984). This was essentially the beginning of a tradition of using research-based progression models of ideas of historical empathy. As Lee and Shemilt (2003) point out, progression models of historical empathy and of other aspects of historical reasoning are attempts to map students' preconceptions and that

> derive from research employing inductive categories to pick out broad divisions of ideas in children's responses to tasks, but they also owe much to the early days of SHP analysis of examination responses, which added considerably to our knowledge of children's ideas

(Lee and Shemilt, 2003: 15)

Unlike Lee's (1978) and Shemilt's (1984) progression models which were based on theoretical assumptions, subsequent ones emerged from the analysis of students' responses, as described by Lee and Shemilt (2003) above. Based on their own study and the previous studies by Dickinson and Lee (1978; 1984), Ashby and Lee (1987) suggested the model presented in Figure 1. The model suggests a route from presentist explanations that do not take into consideration the different views of people in the past and the different historical context (Levels 1 and 2), to ones that begin to realise differences in the context (Level 3), to ones that realise that people in the past view their world differently (Level 4) and explicitly acknowledge differences in the historical context and that the different views of people in the past are related to this (Level 5).

Figure 3.1 Progression model of ideas of historical empathy by Ashby and Lee (1987, pp. 68-85)

Level 1: The 'divi' (deficit) past
Students see people in the past as inferior (less clever and morally defective) and assimilate actions and practices to familiar and recognisable modern ones.
Level 2: Generalised stereotypes
Students explain past actions or institutions using known stereotypes.
Level 3: Everyday empathy
Students still believe that people would have thought like us, but they start to look for explanations of what they did in their situation. In this case people behave the way they did, not because they were stupid or less clever, but because of the opportunities or constrains set by certain circumstances.
Level 4: Restricted historical empathy
This level is a breakthrough since students realise that people in the past were as mentally capable as we are, but they saw the world in a different way. Still, though, they cannot take their explanations far beyond the specific circumstances and make connections with other beliefs, ideas and conditions.
Level 5: Contextual historical empathy
Students realise that reconstructing historical context is essential in understanding ideas and actions in the past. In this sense they attempt to fit understandings and explanation into a wider picture.

Later, based on the findings of CHATA project, Lee, Dickinson and Ashby (2001) proposed the progression model, presented in Figure 3.2, which describes a similar route, from presentist explanations that do not take into consideration the different views of people in the past and the different historical context (Levels 1 to 4) to ones that begin to realise differences in the context (Level 5) and then to ones that realise that people in the past view their world differently (Level 6) and explicitly acknowledge differences in the historical context and that the different views of people in the past are related to this (Level 7).

Figure 3.2 Progression model of students' ideas of historical empathy by Lee, Dickinson and Ashby (2001, pp. 113)

Level 1   Bafflement: there is no way to make sense of some past actions, institutions or practices
Level 2   Explanation by deficit: people in the past were not as clever as us, or lacked basic knowledge, or simply could not do certain things
Level 3   Explanation in terms of personal wants or purposes
Level 4   Explanations by role and stereotype
Level 5   Explanation in terms of the logic of the situation (offering opportunities or setting constrains) understood in everyday terms
Level 6   Explanations by reference to the way which people at the time saw the action or institution in question
Level 7   Explanations in terms of the wider context of ideas and material life

More recently, Lee and Shemilt (2011), based on the findings of CHATA and the SHP Evaluation Study, suggested a progression model, presented in Figure 3.3, that could be considered an attempt to synthesise the previous ones. Again, the same path is observed from presentist explanations, that do not take into consideration the different views of people in the past and the different historical context (Levels 1 to 3), to ones that begin to realise differences in the context (Level 4), to ones that realise that people in the past view their world differently (Level 5) and explicitly acknowledge differences in the historical context and that the different views of people in the past are related to this (Level 6).

Figure 3.3 Progression model of students' ideas of historical empathy by Lee and Shemilt (2011, pp. 42- 43)

Level 1: Explanation by description

Students do not provide explanations for what people did in the past. Instead, they provide descriptions and even when they are made aware that something else than description is needed, they provide judgments or comments of the facts (e.g. what they did was horrible).

Level 2: Explanation by assimilation to the known present or by identification of deficits in the past

When students face an action or practice that seems strange, they either explain it in terms of deficits (people in the past were less clever, their technology was inferior, they were less sensible etc.) or assimilate it to contemporary ones. Actions and practices that do not seem 'abnormal' are not recognised as being in need of explanation by students.

Level 3: Explanation by stereotype

Students offer explanations for both 'unproblematic' practices as well as 'strange' ones. They tend to explain them in terms of 'what they know about the world', which is usually in the form of stereotypes.

Level 4: Explanation by means of everyday empathy

Students think of people in the past as equally intelligent and sensitive as contemporary people who lived, though, in situations different from ours. They still fail to see that people in the past had different ideas and beliefs. Consequently, they explain their actions in terms of what we would do in similar situations.

Level 5: Explanation by means of historical empathy

This is a watershed in the development of students' understanding who realise that people in the past did not see the world as we see it today, since there are practices and actions in the past that cannot be explained if we assume that the beliefs and ideas in the past where the same as our own.

Level 6: Explanation with reference to 'forms of life'

Students go beyond the understanding that people in the past had different ideas and beliefs and start thinking why people viewed the world differently. At these level students begin to make connections between the beliefs and ideas held by people in the past and their way of life.

A number of studies by other researchers used these progression models in order to map the ideas of their participants (see for example Kourgiantakis, 2005; Rantalla et. al., 2015; Berti et. al. 2009; Rantala, 2011). Other studies, attempted to develop their own progression models which are grounded on the ideas that emerged from their own data. This was the case of a study by Bermudez and Jaramillo (2001) and my previous study in Cyprus (Perikleous, 2011). In both cases, the suggested progression models describe a similar route as the one described in by the models discussed above.

Progression models are essentially typologies in which ideal types are related to each other hierarchically in terms of sophistication. In other words, a progression model describes a route from simplistic ideas about history to more powerful ones. This route is not one that teaching should prompt children to follow and neither is one that all children have been observed to follow in studies. Progression models cannot predict a student's way of mastering the concept in a Piagetian manner, in which all students are presumed to follow the same route and every subsequent level replaces the previous one (Lee and Shemilt, 2003; Lee, 2006; Lee and Shemilt, 2011). As Lee (2006) describes, 'they are like the trails left by sheep on a mountainside, which show us the way most of the sheep happen to go, not the paths they must take' (p. 138). In this sense, progression models are more useful as a guide as to what preconceptions we are likely to encounter in a history class and what we can expect to achieve by developing our students' ideas (Lee and Shemilt, 2003; Ashby and Lee, 1987; Lee, 2006; Lee and Shemilt, 2011). In this sense, it can be argued that progression models have a heuristic value and can serve both diagnostic and pedagogical purposes. This is in the sense that they can model explanations of past behaviour (heuristic value), which in turn allows for the identification of different ideas in explanations about past behaviour (diagnostic purposes). Their pedagogical value stems from the fact that they can inform how teaching interventions can support the development of ideas of historical empathy, by suggesting a possible route from simplistic ideas to more powerful ones.

An important consideration, when it comes to using progression models in teaching, is that these are not lists of ideas that must be taught one after the other. Using a

progression model does not mean to teach a problematic idea just because it is the next level on the list (Lee and Shemilt, 2003). On the contrary, the different levels in a progression model suggest key problems in students' understanding and inform us about what can be considered as progress in their thinking. For example, for students that explain past behaviour in terms of people being irrational (deficit past), teaching should focus on how people in the past were as rational as we are today. This will not necessarily take them to a next level of explaining past behaviour in terms of stereotypes. It is possible that some students, when they realise that people in the past were as rational as we are today, will be prompted to think about the different views of people in the past and/ or the different context in which they were situated.

A criticism to the use of progression models comes from VanSledright (2001) who argues that the progression model proposed by Ashby and Lee (1987) is conceptually problematic. To support this argument, he refers to the example of a prospective primary school teacher with a European background who appears to operate at two levels of the model simultaneously while reading a historical text. According to VanSledright, this was evident by the fact that while they acknowledged that what they were reading in a text about the forcible dispossession of Native Americans by the US in the 19th century took place in a different historical context when people had different ideas, they also expressed their frustration for the fact that it was their ancestors that were responsible for this mistreatment. For VanSledright their acknowledgement of the different historical context and views of historical agents suggested that they operated at the level of restricted empathy (level 4), while their frustration for what their ancestors did suggested that they operated at the lower level of everyday empathy (level 3). The problem with VanSledright's argument is that it is based on a misinterpretation of both the level of everyday empathy in the progression model in question and the way in which Ashby and Lee conceptualize historical empathy in general. In the case of the former, VanSledright is wrong to believe that disagreeing with a past behaviour suggests that a responder do not realise that these are based on ideas and views different to their own ones. The level of everyday empathy is not defined by the disagreement with certain actions in the past, but by the failure to understand that people in the past had different ideas. The case of the teacher discussed by VanSledright was one of the former, not the latter.

Apropos their conceptualization of historical empathy, Lee and Ashby (2001) answer to VanSledright's argument by pointing out that in historical empathy 'it is possible to entertain purposes and beliefs held by people in the past without accepting them' (p.25). This is similar to the idea of historical empathy advocated by Sylvester when he said that in the case of Hitler 'youngsters ought to understand something of his background – why he was led to such views and in the sense they can empathise with at least why he took the actions he did' (Sylvester and Sheldon, 2009, p.27).

Whilst Hartmann and Hasselhorn (2008) acknowledge the value of these progression models and qualitative approaches in general in providing in-depth views of students' ideas, they argue that a standardised measure is more effective for gathering data from large representative samples. In this sense, they suggested a standardised measure of historical perspective taking (HPT), which measures three aspects of understanding past actions; contextualisation (the degree to which historical context is taken into consideration), presentist point of view (the degree to which presentist views appear in explanations), and role of the agent (the degree to which the role the historical agent is take into consideration). Hartmann and Hasselhorn (2008) are right to argue that the advantage of a standardised measure is that it is time- and cost-effective way for the investigation of large samples. However, attempts to adopt the measure using historical topics different to the one of its original version were proved difficult. This was because these new versions lacked the reliability and validity of the original one (Huijgen et. al., 2014; Wilschut and Schiphorst, 2019). This was a limitation acknowledged by Hartmann and Hasselhorn (2008), since the introduction of the measure. Furthermore, such an approach implies that ideas of historical empathy are transferable from one topic to another. This, however, is an assumption that is not backed by research evidence. Research findings discussed in section 3.3.3 about the effect of substantive knowledge in empathetic explanations suggest the contrary. Research evidence also suggests that the type of the task and the questions it asks also affect empathetic explanations (see for example Perikleous, 2011; Berti et. al., 2009; Brooks, 2008; de Leur, van Boxtel and Wilschut, 2017; Wilschut and Schiphorst, 2019). In the light of these, the use of this measure has a limited value both for research and teaching beyond perhaps the topic that it uses. These are not issues related only to the specific measure, but rather issues related to the used of standardised measures in

exploring ideas of historical empathy. In this sense, other standardised measures that have been suggested (see for example, Gehlbach, 2004; Angvik and Von Borries, 1997) are subjected to the same limitations.

Endacott and Brooks (2018), explicitly referring to the progression models discussed above, reject the idea of measuring historical empathy. They argue that a) an overall score of historical empathy cannot describe the understanding of a complex concept like historical empathy and cannot account for the fact that empathetic explanations are affected by a number of factors related to the topic students are engage with, b) research findings challenge the idea that historical empathy can be measured by students' selection of predefined possible responses and c) levels of understanding are too abstract and do not say anything about how students' ideas of historical empathy affect who they are as citizens.

Despite the fact that the first two points made by Endacott and Brooks are valid in the case of standardised measures, they do not apply in the case of research-based progression models discussed in this section. As discussed in the previous paragraphs, progression models do not measure and do not aim to provide an overall empathy score. Furthermore, studies that propose them do not make any claims for students' ideas being unaffected by factors related to the topic they are engaged with. Also, they do not measure historical empathy based on the selection of predefined responses by students. They describe characteristics of ideas that the researcher or the teacher can look for in their students' responses. Also, as Lee and Shemilt (2003) stress, there is no 'guarantee about a model's shelf life; changes in either teaching or social mores may compel its reconfiguration' (p.16). Levels of understanding are also not abstract, but describe certain ideas and their relation with other ideas in lower and higher levels. For example, I cannot see how one can fail to understand the description of students' ideas in different levels as described by Lee and Shemilt (2011).

Endacott and Brooks (2018) are right to claim that progression models do not say anything about how students' understanding of historical empathy affects the kinds of citizens they become. However, they do not provide a model or a conceptualisation of historical empathy that can do this. They suggest a three-

106

dimensional model (Endacott and Brooks, 2013; 2018) in which historical empathy is viewed as:

Historical Contextualization — a temporal sense of difference that includes deep understanding of the social, political, and cultural norms of the time period under investigation as well as knowledge of the events leading up to the historical situation and other relevant events that are happening concurrently.

Perspective Taking — understanding of another's prior lived experience, principles, positions, attitudes, and beliefs in order to understand how that person might have thought about the situation in question.

Affective Connection — consideration for how historical figures' lived experiences, situations, or actions may have been influenced by their affective response based on a connection made to one's own similar yet different life experiences (2013, p. 43).

The reader might easily recognise that the first two dimensions of this model are essentially the two aspects which are described by all the progression models discussed above (i.e., a route from presentist views that do not take into consideration the perspective of people in the past and the different historical context to ones that realise that people in the past view the world differently and explicitly acknowledge differences in the historical context and that the different views of people in the past are related to this). One could argue that the third dimension (affective connections), although Endacott and Brooks (2018) do not explicitly claim this, can serve this purpose by developing positive attitudes in the present. For example, students that seem to have an affective connection to the prosecution of the Jewish people by the Nazis, might be the ones who will be sensitive to the prosecution of immigrants in modern day societies. However, no research findings support such claims. Taking into consideration that research findings suggest that students' expressed ideas are also affected by issues of identity and personal interest (see discussion in section 3.5) this claim becomes even less convincing.

In the light of the above, it can be argued that progression models have significant value both in terms of teaching and research. The fact that a number of criticisms, which were discussed above, are challenged does not mean that progression

107

models are above any limitations. Lee and Shemilt (2003) remind us that when it comes to teaching progression models cannot capture everything about historical understanding and cannot prescribe everything about our teaching. For this reason, they urge us to approach progression models as a scaffold for the teaching of history and avoid using them as cage. They also acknowledge that progression models can inform us about the progress of groups of students but cannot define the course of each individual. As they put it, '[t]here are many roads to Rome and some pupils prefer to head for Geneva' (Lee and Shemilt, 2003; p.22). Finally, they point out that progression models are low-resolution pictures of students' understanding and as such they cannot be used as units of work (which are by definition high resolution). What the former can to is to inform the latter.

Perhaps the most important limitation of progression models is that their application in research remains limited to date. Despite Lee's and Shemilt's (2003) optimism two decades ago about the increasing body of research that tested these models, today we are not much closer to make claims about their universal applicability. In order to move closer to such claims more research in a variety of contexts is needed both in terms of testing existing progression models and in terms of developing new progression models grounded on research data. In the light of this, the present study is suggesting a progression model which is tested both for its heuristic and pedagogic value and it is compared with the existing ones.

3.4 Teachers' ideas of historical empathy

As mentioned in section 3.2, teachers' historical reasoning is a rather under-researched area compared to the one of students' historical reasoning. The same applies in the case of teachers' ideas of historical empathy. While there are studies that explore the ways in which in-service teachers conceptualize historical empathy and teach it in their classrooms (see for example Cunningham, 2003; Zembylas, Loukaides and Antoniou, 2020; Bartelds, Savenije and van Boxtel, 2020; Endacott and Sturtz, 2015; Oner and Kinaci, 2020), much less is known about their own ideas of historical empathy (i.e., the ideas the use to explain past actions, institution and practices).

Shemilt (1980) in his Evaluation Study reports that 16% of the teachers that participated the School History Project expressed the belief that the Project should 'make pupils realize that people in the past thought and behaved in exactly the same way as people today, and that only the setting was different' (p. 76). This is not the case only for historical empathy. Shemilt (1980) also refers to problematic ideas expressed by teachers about other aspects of historical reasoning. He reports that 44% of the teachers expressed the view that students should be persuaded that primary sources are always more reliable than secondary ones. Taking into consideration that, as Shemilt (1980) points out, these were teachers that received extended briefing about the philosophy and the objectives of the SHP, it can be argued that problematic ways of thinking about past behaviour can be deeply rooted in teachers' ideas too.

Some evidence about teachers' ideas of historical empathy is provided by studies of pre-service teachers. These suggest that problematic ideas held by students, as the ones described in section 3.3, can also be observed among future teachers. In his study of preservice teachers in the US, some of which were history majors, Wineburg (2001) found that most of them interpreted documents written by Abraham Lincoln in presentist terms. Some of them took his words at face value without showing any interest in the context in which they took place. Others, although they acknowledged the need for a context, they failed to construct one (despite the fact that a number of sources were available to them) and instead they still used their knowledge of the contemporary world to explain Lincoln. Rantala (2011) in his study of pre-service teachers in Finland, reports that while the majority of the participants acknowledged the different historical context and took the different views of people in the past into consideration, some of them failed to do so affected by their presentist points of view. Presentist views are also reported by Carril-Merino, Sánchez-Agustí and Muñoz-Labraña (2020) with pre-service teachers in Spain. In this case, presentist views were expressed by the majority of the participants and only a few expressed sophisticated ideas of historical empathy at the highest level. A failure to attain this level by the majority of the participants is also reported in another study of pr-eservice teachers in Spain (Carril-Merino, Sánchez-Agustí and Miguel-Revilla, 2018).

At the moment, also, no studies compare students' and teachers' (in-service or pre-service) ideas under the same settings. In other words, we do not have any evidence of how students and their teachers explain the same behaviour in the past. Taking into consideration that in classrooms students and teachers work with the same topics, such comparisons will provide us with important insights.

Despite the fact research in teachers' ideas of historical empathy is still scarce and despite the fact that the few studies that report on pre-service teachers' ideas are small-scale ones in only some educational contexts, these findings suggest that problematic ideas can exist among teachers too. Taking into consideration that teachers' ideas of the discipline influence their teaching (Shemilt, 1980; Evans, 1994; Husbands et. al., 2003; Maggioni et. al., 2009; Wineburg and Wilson, 2011) a further understanding of teachers reasoning when the try to make sense of people in the past is imperative. As Maggioni et. al. (2009) rightly put it 'one can teach only what one knows' (p. 210).

3.5 The effect of temporal and cultural distance on ideas of historical empathy

The effect of temporal and cultural distance on ideas of historical empathy are two aspects remaining unexplored at the moment. Despite the fact that research evidence for related phenomena and theoretical assumptions provide some indications, no evidence exists currently able to inform us about the effect of temporal and cultural distance when these are the only differences between actions, institutions or practices to be explained.

The phenomenon of presentism occurring when participants attempt to explain past behaviour, is well documented in literature as demonstrated in section 3.3.2. Taking this into consideration, it is reasonable to assume that this is a reason for differences between explanations of past behaviour and explanations of behaviour in the present (temporal distance). It is, for example, reasonable to expect explanations of past behaviour to refer to deficits of the historical agents more often than explanations of behaviour in the present. Knight (1989a) argues that findings in the field of psychology about explanations of behaviour in the present is of little use for

educators, especially in history, because explaining behaviour in the present differs from explaining the behaviour of people in the past in the sense that the latter do not have a reciprocal relationship with us. It is more likely that here Knight (1989a) wants to emphasize the fact that psychology focuses on our understanding of people in the present, rather than to claim that in psychology researchers only study how we understand others when we interact with them. The latter would be an oversimplification since psychology also studies how we make sense of individuals and groups with whom we do not interact (see for example Tajfel, 1970; O' Laughlin and Malle, 2002; Olcaysoy Okten and Moskowitz, 2018). Wilschut and Schiphorst (2019) make a clearer distinction when they point out that historical distance, the strangeness of the past, is an element that does not exist when we attempt to explain behaviour in the present. However, no empirical evidence exists on how explanations of past behaviour compare to explanations of similar behaviours in the present when the same data generation instruments are used and when temporal distance is the only aspect that affects participants' explanations.

A study that attempted to compare social perspective taking and historical empathy concluded that a correlation between the two only exists within certain groups (Gehlbach, 2004). However, these findings are based on the comparison of explanations of behaviour in the past and the present that differ to each other and with different data generation instruments in each case (i.e., the ability to explain past behaviour in the past was measured with instruments that asked to explain a specific behaviour in the present, while the ability to explain past behaviour was measured with different instruments that asked for explanations of completely different kinds of behaviour).

Also, in a study by McCully, Pilgrim, Sutherland and McMinn T. (2002) Northern Irish students in a Unionist school were more likely to take into consideration the Republican perspective when they studied the Easter Rising 1916 than when they studied events in the 1980s. At first look, this suggests that temporal distance affected students' empathetic explanations. However, this was a case in which the actions in question affected students' lives in a number of ways. The Easter Rising 1916 could be perceived by them as having less effect on them than events in the 1980s. In other words, temporal distance was not the only aspect at play.

In the case of cultural distance, there is also a lack of evidence about how this affects explanations of past behaviour. As clarified in Chapter 1, in the present study, cultural distance is explored as the difference between in-group (a group in which one belongs or believe that they belong) and out-group (a group to which one does not or does not believe that they belong). Studies in the field of psychology suggest that people (adults and children) tend on many occasions, but not always, to judge in-groups more favourably than out-groups in the present (see for example Tajfel, 1970; Bennett et. al. 2004; Appiah, Knobloch-Westerwick, and Alter, 2013). However, at the moment, there are no research findings on whether this phenomenon exists in the case of in-groups in the past (groups we consider to be our ancestors) and out-groups in the past (groups in the past not related to us).

One could argue that the above is not accurate since there are studies which compare participants' explanations of actions of their in-group and out-group in the past. For example, Barton (1999 cited in Barton and Levstik, 2004) found that students in Northern Ireland tend to see injustices only against their in-group in the past. Also, students of European ancestry in Aotearoa/New Zealand, found it difficult to take the Māori perspective regarding the loss of their land to Europeans (Barton and Levstik, 2004). Similarly, Goldberg (2013) found that adolescents' explanations related to the relations between the Mizrahi and Ashkenazi ethnicities favour their in-group. Finally, findings from Cyprus suggest that Greek-Cypriot and Turkish- Cypriot teachers provide opposing explanations for the Turkish military intervention in Cyprus in 1974 depending on the group to which they belong (Psaltis, Lytras and Costache, 2011) while in a similar way Greek Cypriot young adults were more likely to take into consideration only the Greek Cypriot perspective when asked to summarize a Greek Cypriot and a Turkish Cypriot account of the same event (Iordanou, Kendeou, Zempylas, 2019). Finally, Gottlieb and Wineburg (2011) give as an example of a comparison between religious historians and non-religious historians reading a religious text and a historical one. The findings of this study suggest that the religious allegiance of the religious historians affected the way they applied epistemological criteria for truth, reliability and warrant when reading the religious text (epistemic switching). Although, this is not about historical empathy and

not about students or teachers, it is an example of how cultural distance, in this case the religious historians' participation in a religion, affected their historical reasoning.

However, in all of the above cases, cultural distance was again not the only aspect at play. In all cases issues of identity (often perceived as threatened) and personal interest were involved in the behaviour that participants were asked to explain. In other words, these cases essentially tell us much about how identity and personal interests affect empathetic explanations and less about how cultural distance affect such explanations.

3.6 Conclusion

This chapter discussed findings about students and teachers' ideas of historical empathy. Research so far provides us with evidence of students' ideas from a variety of educational contexts. Despite the fact the majority of these studies are small-scale case studies, the replication of similar findings across contexts strengthens arguments for generalisations. The same does not apply for teachers' ideas of historical empathy. Despite the general agreement about the importance of these ideas, only a few studies (mostly about pre-service teachers' ideas) that explore the topic are available at the moment. Also, no research evidence is available about comparisons between students' and teachers' ideas.

A need for more research is also identified on the issue of differences in ideas of historical empathy according to the age of the students. The available findings are limited both in case of sample sizes (in most of the cases) and in terms of the educational contexts in which such research has taken place.

This chapter also discusses research-based progression models as a way of mapping ideas of historical empathy. Despite the criticism voiced, in some occasions, against their use, this chapter argues that these have a heuristic, diagnostic and pedagogical value as long as their limitations are taken into consideration.

Finally, this chapter identifies the lack of evidence about the effect of cultural and temporal distance between the participants and the historical agents on explanations of past behaviour. In this it is argued that even though these aspects are involved in some studies, the fact that other factors (such as issues of identity and personal interested) are involved makes these findings being about the latter rather than the former.

Chapter 4: Methodology and Methods

4.1 Introduction

This chapter discusses the methodology and provides a detailed account of the methods of this study. Apropos the former, the chapter discusses the general orientation of the study (section 4.2.1), ethical considerations that guided the design of the study (section 4.2.2), and the ways in which the issues of validity and reliability are approached (section 4.2.3). In the case of the latter, the chapter describes in detail and provides justifications about the selection of the study's participants (section 4.3.1), the design of the data generation instruments and the data collection (section 4.3.2), and the analysis of the collected data (section 4.3.3).

4.2 Methodology

4.2.1 General orientation

This study is an exploratory qualitative case study of students' and teachers' ideas of historical empathy with quantitative elements. It is an exploratory study in the sense that it is 'concerned with the exploration and description of some phenomenon' (Blaikie, 1993, p. 4), that is, the students' and teachers' ideas of historical empathy. More specifically, this study aims to explore and describe primary students' and teachers' ideas in terms of providing answers to the following three research questions (see discussion of research questions in Chapter 1, pp. 20-21):

a) What kinds of ideas are used by Greek Cypriot primary students and teachers when asked to explain the choice of practices made by people in the past?

b) Do the ideas used by Greek Cypriot primary students and teachers, when asked to explain the choice of practices made by people in the past differ according to their age?

c) Do the ideas used by Greek Cypriot primary students and teachers to explain the choice of practices differ according to their temporal and cultural distance from the people who made those choices?

One could argue that studies concerned with the exploration and description of phenomena are of less value, since they do not answer questions related to explanations of these phenomena and/or ways to bring change. However, such questions cannot be answered without an understanding of what is going on. In other words, we cannot say much about why students and teachers hold certain ideas of

historical empathy and/or how these ideas can develop, before we have a picture of what these ideas look like. As Blaikie (1993) points out 'without an adequate grasp of the regularities that exist, there is nothing to be understood or explained, except, perhaps, a figment of a researcher's imagination' (pp. 203-204).

This study explores and describes teachers' and students' preconceptions of historical empathy. As discussed in Chapter 1 (p. 18) failing to identify students preconceptions can hinder education's efforts for the development of their historical understanding. Similarly, teacher training programs are unlikely to have a substantial contribution to the development of disciplinary understanding, if they are not being informed by research about pre- and in-service teachers' preconceptions of history. These assumptions are obviously true in the case of research. Research for example that seeks to investigated ways in which students' and/or teachers' ideas of historical empathy can develop, must be informed by findings about their preconceptions (the ideas that they already hold).

The term case study has been given different contents by different researchers and its use often overlaps with other terms (e.g., participant observation, ethnography, fieldwork and life history- Scott and Morrison, 2005, p. 17; Gerring, 2007; Bassey, 2000). In the light of this, Scott and Morrison (2005) argue that it is more useful to define case study in terms of 'the amount of detailed information collected, the number of cases pursued, the nature of the data collected, and the purposes for which such detailed data collection is sought' (p. 17). Based on this, they define case study as the in-depth study of a few or one naturally occurring case (in contrast with artificially created cases used in experiments). A case study's data are usually (but not always) qualitative, and its purposes vary. By 'giving the people of the case a voice' (Scott and Morrison, 2005, pp. 17-18), a case study aims to a) contribute to tentative generalisations or b) narratives and accounts of the case in question or c) evaluate the case in question (Bassey, 2000). In this sense, the present thesis reports on a case study that is an in-depth exploration of one case (a group of 8-12 years old Greek Cypriot students and their teachers in a primary school), using both qualitative and quantitative data, for the purpose of understanding a larger class of cases (i.e., primary students and teachers). The latter means that this is a study that aims to contribute to generalisations. In this sense, it is an 'instrumental' (Stake, 1995) or 'theory-

seeking/theory testing' (Bassey, 2000) case study. Its purpose is to inform not only about the specific group of students and teachers that participated in the study, but also to provide insights about primary students and teachers in general.

Besides reasons related to practical aspects (difficulty of access to large samples and/or many cases and constraints related to the fact that the study is conducted by a single researcher), the case study approach was primarily selected because of its 'natural advantage in research of an exploratory nature' (Gerring, 2007, p. 39). As Gerring (2007) argues, producing insight about a phenomenon is not related to the number of cases observed, but to the study's ability to recognise new phenomena or new aspects of a phenomenon. In this sense, the in-depth knowledge of one case can potentially be more enlightening than lower resolution knowledge of a larger number of cases, since we can gain a better understanding of the whole by carefully examining a part of it (Gerring, 2007). In other words, despite its small sample a case study can be a 'selected observation point for an object of study' (Hamel, 1993, p. 44). In the light of the above, the fact that this study aims to explore students and teachers' ideas of historical empathy contributed to the decision of the use of a case study approach.

Of course, the question of how 'instrumental' or 'theory-seeking/ theory-testing' case studies can contribute to generalisations still needs to be answered. How can the findings of this study, about the ideas of a group of Greek Cypriot primary students and teachers in one school, inform about the ideas of primary students and teachers in general? Gerring (2007) rightly points out that a single case study's 'insights, regardless of their brilliance, cannot be integrated into a broader field of study' (p. 85). However, he adds that this does not necessarily mean that case studies cannot contribute to generalisations. On the contrary, he argues that case studies should aim for cross-case generalisations by seeking connections between their findings and the findings of investigations of other cases. In a similar vein, Yin (2013) refers to analytic generalization in terms of 'the extraction of a more abstract level of ideas from a set of case study findings − ideas that nevertheless can pertain to newer situations other than the case(s) in the original case study' (p. 325). Bassey (2000) uses the term 'fuzzy generalisations' in order to acknowledge the particularities of claims for general application by case studies. He points out that 'a fuzzy generalisation carries an element of uncertainty. It reports that something had happened in one place and that

117

it may also happen elsewhere. There is a possibility but not surety. There is an invitation to 'try and see if the same happens to you' (Bassey, 2000, p. 52). He also argues for the potential of a cumulative effect where the findings of newer case studies can be used to amend the conclusions of older ones by refining their claims based on aspects of the phenomenon in question that were not encountered before. In the light of the above, the present study's findings will be compared with the findings of previous studies of the same phenomenon (students' and teachers' ideas of historical empathy) in order to explore differences and similarities and to also identify new aspects of the phenomenon. It is also expected that the present study's findings will be used in the same way by future ones.

The qualitative element derives from the study's interpretive (interpreting students' and teachers' responses in order to construct pictures of their ideas) and descriptive character (describing students' and teachers' ideas). The study 'centres upon the subjective realities of research participants' (Morrison, 2002 cited in Scott and Morrison, 2005, p. 182) in order to answer the first research question (students' and teachers' ideas when explain the choice of past practices). The study's quantitative element derives from its use of numerical data in order to 'establish whether differences or relationships within a sample [the participants of this study]… can be expected to exist' (Blaikie, 2000, p.237). More specifically, participants' responses in terms of attainment of levels of sophistication are compared in order to provide answers to the second and the third research questions. As mentioned earlier, this is a primarily qualitative study, because even the numerical data used in it (attainment of levels of sophistication) are stemming from a qualitative data analysis. This is in the sense that the different types of explanations and levels of sophistication are identified through the qualitative analysis of participants responses.

Drawing on previous explorations of ideas relating to second-order concepts in history, this study attempts to model teachers' and students' ideas of empathy by systematically analysing data from their responses to written tasks and interviews. The existence of an already established research tradition using this approach in the investigation of second-order conceptual understanding in history provides useful

insights and paradigms.[32] Despite the existence of research-based models mapping the ideas of historical empathy (Lee, 1978; Shemilt, 1984; Dickinson and Lee, 1984; Ashby and Lee, 1987; Lee, Dickinson and Ashby, 2001; Bermudez and Jaramillo, 2001; Lee and Shemilt, 2011; Perikleous, 2011) held by students, this investigation does not intend to test whether its participants express specific ideas identified previously or meet certain standards. Instead, the present study follows primarily an inductive approach where the observation of specific instances (the ideas of historical empathy expressed by each participant of the study) leads to a general statement (students' and teachers' ideas of historical empathy in general- Blaikie, 1993). This approach was chosen because it allows for a degree of freedom from preconceived ideas about students' thinking. Although theoretical discussions and research in this area provide interesting clues about students' and teachers' ideas, we cannot claim that these are the only ones and that they are present in every case. Research suggests a variety of factors affecting these kinds of ideas (age, cultural and educational background, educational context, substantive knowledge, content of the tasks etc., (see for example Lee, Dickinson and Ashby, 2001; Lee and Ashby, 2000; Barca, 2005; Cercadillo, 2001; Hsaio, 2005; Barton, 2006; Berti, Baldin and Toneatti, 2009; Brooks, 2008; de Leur, van Boxtel and Wilschut, 2017; Wilschut and Schiphorst, 2019).

Furthermore, the researchers themselves and their methods also affect what is seen in the data, since 'what we [the researchers] bring to the study also influences what we can see' (Charmaz, 2006, p. 15). In this sense, it is imperative to avoid the phenomenon of preconceived ideas about students' and teachers' thinking dominating the researcher's interpretation of the data. By this, I do not claim that I (the researcher) pursue an Archimedean point, from which I can observe unaffected by previous

---

[32] For examples of studies which explore ideas of historical empathy in a similar way, see the CHATA project (Lee and Ashby, 2001; Lee, Dickinson and Ashby, 1997; 2001), the evaluation study of the School Council History 13- 16 Project (Shemilt, 1980; 1984), small-scale studies by Dickinson and Lee (1978; 1984) and Ashby and Lee (1987), and my previous investigation of Greek Cypriot primary students' ideas (Perikleous, 2011). For examples of studies that explore ideas of other second-order concepts, see the work of Chapman (2009), Cercadillo (2001), Barca (2005), Hsiao (2005) and also components of CHATA project (Ashby, 2005; Lee, 1998; 2006; Lee and Ashby, 2000; Lee, Dicksinson and Ashby, 1996) and SHP evaluation study (Shemilt, 1980) that investigate a variety of second-order concepts.

knowledge in the field. On the contrary, this knowledge is extremely useful, since previous discussions and research endeavours will be crucial at every stage of this study. As Strauss (1987) points out, researchers are able to generate questions, think effectively and propositionally, and work with their data because they have this kind of experience to draw upon. Barton (2008) agrees with this perspective by pointing out that 'any research involves choices – where to look, who to talk to, what to ask, and so on – and these choices are inevitably based on theoretical assumptions' (p. 153). In this sense, this study attempts to achieve equilibrium between possible new insights, emerging from the analysis of its data, and the knowledge of current claims and ways of conceptualising students' and teachers' ideas.

The above also relate with two major points of criticism against inductive approaches to research. The first one has to do with arguments of external validity, locating the issue of the impossibility of observing all instances of a phenomenon. As Blaikie (1993) points out,

> [i]n an inductive argument, if the premises are true, it does not follow that the conclusion will be true. It may be the case that all observed cases [point to a particular phenomenon] …, but a further observation may reveal a case that is different. Hence on the basis of the original observations, the conclusion… cannot be regarded as true (p. 140).

In other words, even though the participants of this study exhibit certain ideas, it is possible that a new investigation with new participants would reveal ideas that were not identified in this study. This criticism is similar to the concerns about generalisations in case studies discussed in previous paragraphs. This kind of criticism is only valid, if we claim that the findings of a single study can give definite answers for the entire population. As already discussed, this study does not claim that its findings can provide definite generalisations. Instead, it aims to contribute to the field by seeking connections in terms of similarities and differences with previous studies and to provide insights that could be taken into consideration by future ones.

The second point of criticism relates to arguments concerning the researcher's objectivity, locating the issue of the impossibility of objective observations. As already discussed above, the researcher brings their own views and biases to every aspect of

a study, and this includes their observations. Claiming that all observation is essentially interpretation, Popper (1961 cited in Blaikie, 1993) argues that 'in the social sciences it is even more obvious than in the natural sciences that we cannot see and observe our objects before we have thought about them. For most of the objects of the social sciences, if not all of them, are abstract objects; they are theoretical constructions (Popper, 1969 cited in Blaikie, p. 142). Furthermore, Pole and Lampard (2002) point out that '[t]he discovery of theory within the data is a construction of the researcher, brought about by his/her knowledge of the data and the capacity to identify codes and concepts within it' (cited in Scott and Morrison, 2005, p. 121). As in the case of the first point of criticism, this second one is only true under certain circumstances. This is when such an approach is accompanied by positivist arguments according to which values and facts can be distinguished and thus effective use of research techniques can secure objective and value-free findings. However, the present study approaches reliability in constructivist terms, claiming that its findings are negotiable constructs rather than copies of reality. As Dey (1993) suggests, the problem of the researchers' objectivity can be addressed by being open to assessment. This requires 'openness and transparency at all stages of data collection and analysis' (cited in Scott and Morrison, 2005, p. 122). In this sense, the assessment of objectivity of this study's findings is invited by providing a detailed account of its instruments, data collection process and data analysis.

Despite the fact that, as mentioned above, this study follows a primarily inductive approach, it also contains elements of a deductive and an abductive approach. The study's deductive element has to do with its response to research questions two and three, in the sense that it begins with general statements/hypotheses (i.e., expressed ideas of historical empathy differ according to age, and temporal and cultural distance between the participants and the agents) and looks for conclusions in terms of singular statements (i.e. differences in expressed ideas of historical empathy by the participants of the study according to their age, and their temporal and cultural distance from the people who held practices they explain- Blaikie, 1993).

The study also contains elements related to an abductive approach. This is in the sense that the study attempts to produce 'accounts of social life [i.e., a typology of explanations of past behaviour] by drawing on the concepts and meanings used by social actors [i.e., explanations of the choice of specific practices used by the study's

participants]' (Blaikie, 1993, p. 176). At a first stage, the study collects data about how participants understand reality (i.e., participants explanations of the choice of practice). At the second stage, I (the researcher) move from the description of these lay accounts provided by the participants to the construction of a theory (i.e., a typology of explanations of past behaviour- Scott and Morrison, 2005). Some argue that moving from the participants' responses to certain tasks to the construction of social scientific accounts of their ideas can be problematic. This is because the process of constructing a scientific account includes analysis and synthesis that goes beyond the original account (Scott and Morrison, 2005). In order to mitigate this problem, this study attempts to construct ideal types (Weber, 1949) of explanations. Max Weber's (1949) ideal types are mental constructs that derive from observing real life behaviour (in this case the responses of participants to the pen and paper tasks). They are not ideal in the sense of being perfect, but in the sense of being constructs of ideas. They do not describe the data exhaustively, but stress specific elements common in all cases of the use of a type. As Weber points out, '[o]nly through ideal-typical concept-construction do the viewpoints with which we are concerned in individual cases become explicit. Their peculiar character is brought out by the confrontation of empirical reality with the ideal-type' (p. 110). In this way, ideal types allow for simplification and can be used for heuristic purposes; in this study a tool for modelling explanations of choices of practices.

Furthermore, this kind of research is based on the assumption that conceptualizations can be manifested in written or verbal responses to certain tasks. Of course, one could claim that there are serious limitations in such an enterprise since meaning has no natural structure and therefore cannot be adequately represented; language cannot provide us with exact copies of ideas. This concern is not unreasonable and indeed we should be careful when attempting to interpret this kind of data. This study, however, approaches the issue through an 'experientialist account of understanding and truth' (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980, p. 192) in which, although there is no claim to perfect understanding, there is the idea that we can aim for 'a kind of objectivity relative to the conceptual system of a culture' (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980, p. 193). This means that although we cannot claim to be able to mirror other people's minds in their words, we can try to give meaning to those words by using our common social and cultural experiences and by being able to 'bend …[our]… world view and adjust the way

…[we]… categorize our experience' (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980, p. 231). As Charmaz (2006) points out, 'although we cannot claim to replicate their views, we can try to enter their settings and situation to the extent possible' (p. 14). The question here is not whether we can replicate students' and teachers' conceptualizations through language or not, but how to interpret their responses as evidence of their ideas in the best way possible. The latter means that the aim is to construct pictures of students' and teachers' ideas and not to discover exact copies of them. It also means that the findings of this study are tentative and subject to its validity and reliability.

4.2.2. Ethical considerations

Every research has to take into consideration a number of aspects related to ethics in terms of responsibilities to participants, to the community of educational researchers, and of responsibilities for publication and dissemination (British Educational Research Association, 2019).[33]

Apropos responsibilities to the participants, this study takes a primarily open approach (Scott and Morrison, 2005). In such an approach, the participants are informed about the study and its purposes before they provide their consent to participate. This approach was chosen instead of a covert approach, in which the participants are not informed about their participation in a study (Scott and Morrison, 2005; Spicker, 2011), primarily because of the fact that the latter raises a number of ethical issues related to the participants' rights, privacy and autonomy (Spicker, 2011). Furthermore, participants' awareness of their participation in the study was not expected to pose a serious threat to the validity of the collected data.

Open approaches can be either autocratic or democratic. In the case of the former and despite the fact that the participants are informed about their participation in a study, the researcher is the one responsible for the data collection and the report of the study's findings (Scott and Morrison, 2005). In an open democratic approach, the participants are also involved in terms of having 'a veto over what is included and

---

[33] The BERA Ethical Guidelines for Educational Research (British Educational Research Association, 2019) also refers to other aspects (i.e., responsibilities to sponsors, clients and stakeholders in research and responsibilities for researcher's wellbeing and development) which are not applicable in the case of this thesis.

what is not included in the research report' (Scott and Morrison, 2005, p.88). Waldron and Pike (2006) describe such an approach in which participants (primary school students) were not only informed about their participation in the study, but they were also engaged in discussions about research in general (i.e., what research is, its contribution to knowledge, why people might want to engage in research projects) and about the particular study. In the case of the latter, students were informed about the study's methodology and purposes and invited to ask questions about it. At a later stage student were also given the opportunity to discuss a preliminary analysis of the study's data and invited to discuss the data and the researchers' interpretation of them. A similar approach inspired by Waldron and Pike (2006) is reported by Ní Cassaithe (2020) in her own study with Irish primary school students. As demonstrated in the next paragraphs, in the present study, an open autocratic approach was adopted in the case of the students while an open democratic one was followed in the case of the teachers. More specifically, students were involved in the former part (discussion of research in general and the present study), but not the latter (discussion of data analysis). This decision was based primarily on the fact that time constraints on behalf of the school did not allow for extra sessions with students. Furthermore, as Scott and Morrison (2005) point out, even when an open democratic approach is adopted, an autocratic element always exists since participants, especially primary age children, usually, do not have an equal standing with researchers in such a process. In this sense, the responsibility of protecting the participants' interests remains primarily with the researcher (Scott and Morrison, 2005).

Besides the issue of transparency, partly discussed in the previous paragraph, a number of other issues in terms of responsibilities to the participants were taken into consideration. These were the issues of consent, the right to withdraw, harm arising from participation in research, and privacy and data storage (British Educational Research Association, 2019).

As Scott and Morrison (2005) emphasise, '[o]btaining consent to conduct research projects, and therefore gaining access to research settings, requires researchers to give as much information to participants as they can about the purposes of their enquiry, their methodological approach and their dissemination and reporting

strategies' (p.2). In this sense, all participants (teachers and students) were informed about the study and its aims, methodology and dissemination methods and only those who agreed to participate were asked to complete the pen and paper tasks and be interviewed. In the case of the students, I spent time with each class (two teaching periods; 80 minutes) to discuss the idea of research as a way to understand the world. During our discussion I connected the idea of research with their experience of the process of investigating physical phenomena in science classes. This was because, at the moment, Physical Sciences is the only subject in which primary students in Greek Cypriot education encounter aspects of empirical research in terms identifying research questions and investigating them in order to provide answers to them. Following this brief introduction, we discussed, in simple terms, the methodology and the purposes of the present study and how this would allow me to learn more about them and how they think about the past. The issue of how their participation might be useful for me and their teachers in order to find ways to help them understand more about the past and its people was also discussed. During this, students were encouraged to express their own ideas of how the study could investigate these ideas and how its findings could be used. Finally, I emphasized that I would not be testing them to assess how much they know about history. I also emphasised that although a written consent from their parents and/or guardians was needed, this would be sought only if children themselves were willing to take part. Parental consent would certainly not over-ride any reluctance on their (the students) part (see Appendix A for the consent form for parents/guardians).

In the case of the teachers, preliminary discussions focused on the idea of research in history education and how this can contribute to educational policy, development of teaching materials and teachers pre-service and in-service training. The discussion of the latter was particularly useful since all teacher-participants acknowledged their own need to develop not only in terms of teaching history, but also in terms of their understanding of the discipline. This acknowledgment was prompted by the discussion of the History Curriculum 2016, which, as discussed in Chapter 1 introduces a disciplinary approach in the teaching of the subject. During the discussion of the present study, it was made clear that their responses to both the pen and paper tasks and interviews would be analysed, critically discussed, and compared to the ones of their students in terms of how they facilitate their own understanding of people in the

past. This was imperative in order to achieve fully informed consent. Furthermore, it was stressed that the aim was not to assess their ideas according to some standard, but to explore and discuss them. It was also stressed that their ideas and practices would be treated with respect and not be a target for criticism by me assuming the role of supposedly higher authority. Instead, they would be interrogated in their own terms as in the case of any expert idea or approach. In other words, I would not act as an authority who assesses them, but as a reader who critically engages with them. As mentioned earlier, in the case of teachers an open democratic approach was followed. Therefore, teacher-participants were also informed that following the data collection, I would discuss with them the data from their responses to pen and paper tasks and interviews and my interpretation of them.

Taking into consideration that my existing relationships with a number of teachers formed through my role as teacher trainer at the time (see discussion in section 4.3.1), would possibly made them feel more comfortable taking part in this study, which sought to explore their understanding of history, I approached teachers with whom I had this relationship. This relationship with the teacher-participant was also useful in terms of allowing them to make their own decision about whether or not to participate and ensure that they were genuinely happy to do so. In this sense, the teachers were my first point of contact in selecting the study's case school. This allowed them to make a decision without feeling pressured by any authority (headmasters, educational authorities etc.). I contacted their school to negotiate access, only after I received teachers' verbal consent. Teachers' written consent (see Appendix B) was sought after the access to the school was allowed by the headteacher and permission to contact research in the school in question was provided by the Centre for Educational Research and Evaluation (CERE) of the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports and Youth.

All participants and students' parents/guardians were also informed, both verbally (during the preliminary discussions with participants) and in writing (with the consent forms), about the participants' right to withdraw from the study at any point. It was made clear that this could be done without any negative consequences and without the need to provide an explanation of their decision. One of the teachers had to

withdraw during the study for personal reasons that did not allow them to take part in the interview.

Avoiding harm arising from participation in research was also an important aspect of the design of this study. In this sense, the study was carefully designed in order to minimise demands in terms of time that could disrupt the quality of education provided by the school. The content of the pen and paper tasks (description of practices and questions) and interviews (questions) was carefully selected in order not to cause any kind of distress. With the purpose of avoiding any possibility of performance anxiety, participants, especially students, were repeatedly reminded that a) the tasks did not seek to assess their knowledge in history, b) they could withdraw at any point without the need to explain their decision, and c) their responses would be anonymised. Finally, following the guidelines provided by the CERE (Centre of Educational Research and Evaluation, n.d.), interviews with students were conducted with the presence of a member of the school's teaching staff.

In order to ensure privacy all documentation of the study, this thesis contains only anonymised versions of the data (i.e., pseudonyms for the school and all participants). The same will apply with any future publication that will report on the findings of this study. Participants' real names can only be found on the completed pen and paper tasks which are stored in a locked cabinet at my home. Digital versions of the pen and paper tasks only contain the pseudonyms of the participants. Although digital recordings of the interviews are named using the pseudonyms of the participants their names are mentioned in the recordings. Also, a digital version of the document which contains the list with the assignment of pseudonyms to the participants exists. However, all digital content is stored in password protected encrypted folders only on my personal computer. The computer is also protected by a personal password and with an active subscription to Norton 360.

The issue of responsibility to the community of educational researchers is also an important one.
As pointed out by BERA Ethical Guidelines for Educational Research.

> All educational researchers should aim to protect the integrity and reputation of educational research by ensuring that they conduct their research to the highest

standards. Researchers should contribute to the community spirit of critical analysis and constructive criticism that generates improvement in practice and enhancement of knowledge (British Educational Research Association ,p.29).

In this sense, besides the obvious aim of achieving validity and reliability, I made every effort to be respectful of other points of view, research paradigms and approaches, to conduct this study in the most appropriate and scientifically sound way, and to report on my work as meticulously and clearly as I possible. Furthermore, the work of other authors and researchers, and my own previous work, is properly attributed.

Before the beginning of data collection, according to UCL Institute of Education regulations, an ethics approval was sought and provided by the Institute (UCL Institute of Education, 2021). Furthermore, permission to conduct research at the selected school was sought and provided, after an ethics review of the proposed project, by the Department of Primary Education, Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports and Youth, through the Centre of Educational Research and Evaluation (Centre for Education Research and Evaluations, n.d.).

According to BERA Ethical Guidelines for Educational Research (2019) '[r]esearchers have a responsibility to make the results of their research public for the benefit of educational professionals, policymakers and the wider public' (p. 32). This highlights the importance of making research findings available by avoiding, when possible, the restrictions posed by the traditional subscription-based model where readers have a financial cost in accessing academic work. In this sense, this thesis, in accordance with the UCL requirements, will be made available for open access in UCL's Research Publications Service (UCL, 2021). Also, according to the requirements of the CERE for obtaining a permit to conduct research in public schools in the Republic of Cyprus, a summary of the findings of the study will be send to the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports and Youth of the Republic of Cyprus. This summary will also be sent to the participants of the study. Research articles which report the findings of this study will also be submitted for publication in open access academic journals such as the *History Education Research Journal* (published by UCL Press), *Historical Encounters Journal* (published by HERMES History Education Research Network, University of Newcastle, Australia) and *Panta Rei: Digital Journal of History and History Teaching*

(published by Centre of Studies of the Middle East and Late Antiquity of the University of Murcia, Spain).

4.2.3. Validity and reliability

The quality of a research project is primarily defined by its internal validity, external validity, and reliability. Internal validity is the accuracy of the description being made (Scott and Morrison, 2005). The fact that data generations instruments' design was informed by earlier studies contributed towards internal validity in the sense that similar questions and techniques were used by previous studies that explored the same phenomenon (ideas of historical empathy). Such studies were the CHATA project (Lee, Dickinson and Ashby, 1997; 2001; Lee and Ashby, 2001), earlier studies by Dickinson and Lee (1978; 1984) and Lee and Ashby (1987), and my own previous study in Cyprus (Perikleous, 2011). In addition, ideas were drawn from the evaluation study of School Council History 13- 16 Project (Shemilt, 1980; Shemilt, 1984).[34] A pilot study (see discussion in section 4.3.2.3) also contributed to the study's internal validity since it allowed for the identification of ambiguities and difficult questions and also allowed the assessment of questions in terms of their ability to prompt an adequate range of responses (van Teijlingen and Hundley, 2001).

Triangulation, the use of different methods to investigate a certain phenomenon (Scott and Morrison, 2005), can also contribute to a study's internal validity. In this study, a methodological triangulation was implemented (Denzin, 1970). The study used two different methods of collecting data about participants explanations of past behaviour. These were the pen and paper tasks (completed by all participants) and the interviews conducted with some of participants. The methodological triangulation was also implemented with the use of different questions within the pen and paper tasks, aiming to generate data about the same phenomenon (participants explanations of past behaviour). In both cases, triangulation was not used as a means to establish the 'truth' of the study's findings by looking for identical

---

[34] Unpublished material from the tasks used for the CHATA project and the evaluation study of School Council History 13- 16 Project were kindly provided by Peter Lee and Denis Shemilt respectively.

responses in different types of tasks (pen and paper tasks and interviews) or different questions. Triangulation was approached as a way to provide a more comprehensive picture of participants' explanations of past behaviour by taking into consideration both the similarities and the differences in responses prompted by the different tasks and the different questions (Denzin, 1970).

Regarding the issue of external validity which refers to a study's findings' 'application to other cases, across place and time' (Scott and Morrison, 2005, p. 253), a single case study usually cannot make claims for general application of its findings. However as already discussed in section 4.2.1, case studies can contribute to generalisations by pointing out similarities and differences between their findings and the findings of investigations of other similar cases (Gerring, 2007, Yin, 2013). As also already discussed in section 4.2.1 generalisations in case studies have a cumulative effect where the findings of newer case studies can suggest changes to the conclusions of older ones by refining their claims by bringing to light new aspects of the phenomenon under investigation (Bassey, 2000). In this sense, the present study's findings are compared with the findings of previous investigations of ideas of historical empathy in order to identify differences and similarities and to also identify new aspects of the phenomenon. Furthermore, it is expected that the findings of this study will be used in similar ways by future studies that will investigate the same phenomenon.

Despite the fact that case studies cannot make claims for generalisations based only on the observation of their own sample, Stake (1995) points out that in case studies which are not 'intrinsic' (the case is given, and the research questions are aiming to explore this specific case), but 'instrumental' (we study a case in order to satisfy the need for general understanding) some cases are more suitable than others. In this sense, cases that may be considered as special (e.g., schools with low diversity in socioeconomic backgrounds and/ or academic performance) were avoided. This issue is discussed in more detail in section 4.3.1.

Reliability is traditionally understood as an instruments' ability to provide the same results in different occasions (Scott and Morrison, 2005) and in this way is usually related to quantitative research (Golafshani, 2001). Some authors even claim that reliability is not an issue in qualitative research because the concept relates to

measurements in quantitative research (Stenbacka, 2001 cited in Golafshani, 2003). However the general goal of reliability, that is, to try to minimize errors and biases is also important for qualitative studies (Yin, 1994). Discussing the issue of reliability, Yin (1994; 2013) points out that '[a] good guideline for doing case studies is… to conduct the research so that an auditor could repeat the procedures and arrive at the same results' (p. 37). In other words, a piece of research should be reported in such a way that an outside researcher could repeat its stages and produce the same findings. In this sense, this thesis gives special attention to the documentation of the study in order to provide a clear picture of what was done in every stage (by reporting in detail its every aspect), and in this way make it possible for the reader to assess its reliability.

Lincoln and Guba (1985 cited in Scott and Morrison, 2005) also emphasise the importance of external audit in qualitative research in order to achieve 'dependability', which is their alternative for reliability in qualitative research. Therefore, they introduce the idea of an external researcher who confirms that the researcher acted appropriately during the different phases of the study (i.e., design of study, data collection, data analysis, interpretation of findings). In the case of a doctoral thesis, as it is the case of the present study, a supervisor essentially acts as an auditor in the sense described by Lincoln and Guba. This study was no exception, since my supervisor provided valuable suggestions, critical comments and guidance during all phases of it. A further step related to the idea of external audit was taken in this study with the involvement of a second coder who coded a sample of the pen and paper task responses and interview responses (see discussion in section 4.3.3.) in order to test the agreement of their coding with mine.

4.3 Methods

4.3.1 The participants

This study was situated in Coal Hill Primary School, an urban public primary school in Nicosia, Cyprus.[35] Public schools in Greek Cypriot education are no-fee schools funded and operated by the Republic of Cyprus. The vast majority of 6- to 12-year-old students in Greek Cypriot education attend public primary schools. As mentioned

---

[35] As mentioned earlier this is a pseudonym.

earlier in this chapter, Stake (1995) points out that in 'instrumental' case studies that, as the present one, aim to satisfy the need for general understanding, some cases are more suitable than others. In this sense, the typicality of the school was an important criterion. At the moment, there is a lack of data shedding light on the issue of differences and similarities between primary schools in Greek Cypriot education. However, a number of aspects of the Greek Cypriot educational system suggest that in most of the cases there is a low diversity between public primary schools in terms of school population, teaching stuff and teaching approaches. These are the country's small population and size, the system of student admissions (which is based strictly on the students' residence address), the system of teacher's placement in schools (which requires teachers to move between schools often), the common curricula that schools are obligated to implement, and the common textbooks provided to schools by the Ministry of Education, Culture, Youth and Sports.

The issue of the typicality of the students' population was also discussed in preliminary informal discussions with a number of teachers, working in different schools, with whom I had a personal relationship as a teachers' trainer. Coal Hill was one of the schools whose teachers', based on their experience of different schools, considered their school's population as typical of Greek Cypriot primary schools in terms of socio-economic background and academic performance.

However, Coal Hill was atypical in one aspect. This was the relatively small number of students with immigration background attending the school. At the time of the data collection, 16.2% students in primary education students were not Greek Cypriots or Greeks (Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports and Culture, n.d.). However, only 4.5% of the students attending the classes of the study fell in that category (four out of 89 students), while the overall percentage for Coal Hill Primary School was 5%. Furthermore, none of the student-participants fell in that category because in all four cases of students with an immigration background, a written permission for them to participate the study was not provided by their parents. Coal Hill was chosen despite this fact, because none of the available schools had a student population with an immigration background that was close to the national percentage either.

Sixty-eight students aged between 8 and 12 participated in the study. This sample consisted of four different age groups (Year 3 to Year 6) from five classes in order allow a) the investigation of differences according to participants' age and b) the collection of data from all ages in which history is taught. As mentioned in Chapter 1, in Greek Cypriot public primary education, history is taught in Years 3, 4, 5 and 6. The classes in which the study was conducted were determined by the willingness of their teachers to participate. The exact size of the students' sample was determined by the number of students of the selected classes, who were willing to participate and whose parents/guardians provided a written permission. Table 4.1 shows the distribution of student-participants among classes and age groups, and the teacher-participant who taught in each class.

Table 4.1 Student-participants and teacher-participants

Class (age)	Boys	Girls	Total	Teacher[36]
Year 3 (8-9)	6	15	21	Clara
Year 4 (9-10)	2	4	6	Ian
Year 5A (10-11)	5	2	7	Barbara
Year 5B (10-11)	8	6	14	River
Year 6 (11-12)	9	11	20	Danny
Total	30	38	68	

As can be seen in Table 4.1, there was an equal number of students in each age group (21 in Year 3, 21 in Year 5 and 20 in Year 6) with the exception of Year 4. This was due to a) the small size of the whole class (13 students) and b) the small number of parents who provided a written permission for their children participation in the study.

---

[36] As already mentioned, pseudonyms are used for both teachers and students in this thesis.

From the table, it is also apparent that more girls than boys participated in the study. This was similar to the case of the whole school population where 54% of the students were girls and 46% were boys.[37] According to the classes' teachers, there was a wide range of achievement among the students of each class. Furthermore, all teachers described their classes as typical in terms of academic performance, basing their judgement on their previous experience.

The teachers' sample consisted of the five teachers (2 male and 3 female) who taught the five classes that participated in the study. In all cases, the teachers participating were the class teachers. Class teachers in Greek Cypriot primary schools teach Language and Maths and some of the other subjects in the curriculum. In this study, all teacher-participants also taught History in their classes. As already mentioned, teachers' consent to participate in the study was sought in preliminary discussions before requesting access to the school from the CERE, and the willingness of teachers to participate was a key criterion for selecting Coal Hill Primary School as the study's case. All five of the teachers participating held degrees in primary education from universities in Greece and Cyprus. Ian also held an MA in ICT in Education while River and Barbara held MAs in Educational Administration. They were all experienced teachers with 15 or more years of teaching experience at the time of the data collection. More specifically, Danny (Year 6) and Clara (Year 3) had 22 years of teaching experience, River (Year 5B) 21, Barbara (Year 5A) 18, and Ian (Year 4) had 15.

Barbara did not have any courses in history teaching during her pre-service training. Ian had a course in social studies education. Danny, Clara and River reported that they had history teaching courses, which however were essentially courses regarding Greek and Cypriot history. None of them had received in-service training regarding the teaching of history. Also, none of them had any training in historical enquiry. All of the participating teachers, stated (during their interviews) that when teaching history, they primarily aim to help students acquire substantive knowledge about the past. Despite the fact that they all acknowledged the importance of the development of historical

---

[37] No available data exists about the gender of the total population of students in these year groups in Greek Cypriot education.

understanding, they did not report any teaching strategies, besides the acquisition of substantive knowledge, for the development of second-order understanding in general or ideas of historical empathy specifically. Furthermore, they all expressed concerns about their teaching of history and expressed their need for training in the disciplinary approaches prescribed by the History Curriculum 2016. Although there are no research findings regarding teaching practices in the context of Greek Cypriot history education, the discussion in Chapter 1 (pp. 35-36) suggests that focusing on the acquisition of substantive knowledge without any special provisions for the development of disciplinary thinking is likely the typical approach in Greek Cypriot education.

4.3.2 Data generation instruments and procedure

Pen and paper tasks and semi-structured interviews were used as data generation instruments for this study. Inspiration and useful insights on the design of data generation instruments were provided by previous studies in the area of history education. More specifically, as already mentioned, the data generation instruments were influenced by the work on historical empathy undertaken as part of the CHATA project (Lee and Ashby, 2001; Lee, Dickinson and Ashby, 1997; 2001) and also by earlier small-scale studies (Dickinson and Lee, 1978; Dickinson and Lee, 1984; Ashby and Lee, 1987) and by the evaluation study of the School Council History 13- 16 Project (Shemilt, 1980; 1984). Of course, the experience of my previous study of students' ideas of historical empathy, conducted with a similar sample of students (in terms of age and educational context), was particularly useful (Perikleous, 2011). Figure 4.1 summarizes the ways in which data generation instruments corresponded to research questions.

Figure 4.1: Instruments' correspondence to research questions

Research question	Instruments
What kinds of ideas are used by Greek Cypriot primary students and teachers when asked to explain the choice of practices made by people in the past?	Pen and paper tasks about past practices Interviews
Do the ideas used by Greek Cypriot primary students and teachers when asked to explain the choice of practices made by people in the past differ according to their age?	Pen and paper tasks about past practices
Do the ideas used by Greek Cypriot primary students and teachers to explain the choice of practices differ according to their temporal and cultural distance from the people who made those choices?	Pen and paper tasks about past practices Pen and paper tasks about practices in the present

In both types of tasks (pen and paper tasks and interview), participants were not asked to provide definitions of what empathy is nor to describe the concept's characteristics at a theoretical level. This was because ideas of concepts are in many cases tacit and therefore not necessarily revealed in responses to theoretical questions, especially in the case of students (Schommer-Aikins, 2002; Lee and Ashby, 2001; Moschner, et al., 2008). This phenomenon was also evident in my previous study of primary students' ideas of historical empathy were children's responses to general questions about how we make sense of past behaviour did not reveal their ideas of historical empathy in most of the cases (Perikleous, 2011). On the contrary, research evidence suggests that even younger children can provide responses that reveal these ideas when they are asked to provide answers to contextualized questions (see for example Moschner, et al., 2008; Lee and Ashby, 2001; Perikleous, 2011; Berti, Baldin and Toneatti, 2009). In the light of this, questions asked by the research instruments were situated in a

specific (questions about the choice of the specific practices in pen and paper tasks) or a wider context (questions about differences in behaviour between people in the present and the past in interviews).

4.3.2.1 The pen and paper tasks

Four pen and paper tasks were used in this study (see Appendix C). All tasks asked participants the same seven open-ended questions about four different healing ceremonies (practices) related to religious beliefs. Two of them referred to past religious healing practices. One of them was a practice held by an in-group (Ancient Greeks) and the other one was a practice held by an out-group (Ancient Maya). The term in-group is used to describe groups to which people belong or believe they belong. The term out-groups is used to describe groups to which people do not belong or they believe they do not belong (Tajfel, 1970). The Ancient Greeks were considered to be an in-group for the participants since all of them were Greek Cypriots. As discussed in Chapter 1 (pp. 27-31), in Greek Cypriot education, and society in general, the idea of Greek Cypriots being member of the Greek nation and descendants of the Ancient Greeks is a prominent one. Large parts of Year 3 and the entire duration of Year 4 history are devoted to the study of the Ancient Greeks. Participants were culturally familiar to Ancient Greeks through their personal experience and formal education. In this sense, the Ancient Greeks were considered to be culturally close to the participants. On the other hand, Ancient Maya were considered to be an out-group for the participants. Greek Cypriot participants did not belong and were not expected to believe that they belong to this group. In this sense, the Ancient Maya were considered to be culturally distant from the participants.

The other two tasks referred to practices still being used today by some people. One of them was a practice that is held by some members of an in-group (Orthodox Christians), while the other was a practice held by some members of an out-group (Muslims). Orthodox Christians were considered to be an in-group for the participants since all of the participants identified as Orthodox Christian, whilst the Greek Orthodox religion maintains a prominent place in Greek Cypriot education and society, in general. As in the case of the Ancient Greeks, this group was considered to be culturally close to the participants. On the other hand, Muslims were considered to be

an out-group since none of the participants identified as a Muslim. Greek Cypriot primary education does not provide any opportunities to study the group. Despite the fact that Muslims are presented as the enemy of Greeks and Greek Cypriots in the past (and the present), who is usually barbaric, this is in the sense of conflicts mainly between Greeks and Turks. Muslim religion and/or culture is not part of this teaching. As in the case of the Ancient Maya, this group was considered to be culturally distant from the participants.

Assumptions about in-groups and out-groups were based on students' background, on the characteristics of the school and the education system, and not on an explicitly expressed self-identification of the students with the in-groups. This is obviously a limitation. Still, identifying student's in-groups and out-groups on the basis of their background is a common practice in similar studies (see for example Benet et. al., 2004; McCully et. al., 2002; Barton and Levstik, 2004). These studies do not discuss this specific choice. In the case of the present study this choice was primarily a decision based on the fact that this was a time-effective approach adopted by previous studies, as opposed to an additional investigation of students' self-identification (or not) with the groups in question which have its own complexities (see for example Milanov, Rubin and Paolini, 2014) and one that would increase the demands in terms of participants' time.

As shown in Figure 4.1 (above), tasks about past practices were used to answer the first and the second research questions (What kinds of ideas are used by Greek Cypriot primary students and teachers when asked to explain the choice of practices made by people in the past?; Do the ideas used by Greek Cypriot primary students and teachers when asked to explain the choice of practices made by people in the past differ according to the their age?). All four tasks were used to answer the third research question (i.e., Do the ideas used by Greek Cypriot primary students and teachers to explain the choice of practices differ according to their temporal and cultural distance from the people who made those choices?). More specifically, in this case, responses to the tasks about past practices were compared to responses to the tasks about present practices in order to explore the first aspect of this question (differences according to temporal distance). Responses to tasks about the past in-group practice (Ancient Greeks) were compared to responses to the task about the

past out-group practice (Ancient Maya) in order to explore the second aspect of the question (differences according to cultural distance).

In order to avoid the effect of factors related to the content of the practice that participants were asked to explain (beyond temporal and cultural distance), the four practices were selected on the basis that they were all a) used for the same purpose (treating diseases), b) based on the same idea of divine intervention on the physical world (god or gods intervene to heal people from diseases), c) described procedures that were clearly religious ceremonies instead of medical interventions, and d) they were all unknown to all participants.[38] The latter also meant that participants have never been affected by the practice in question in any way.

One could argue that asking participants to explain religious practices would prompt them to think about their beliefs more readily than when asked about practices not related to religion. In fact, this is a phenomenon also identified by previous studies (Lee and Ashby, 2001). However, for the purposes of this study, this would be a problem only if some of the participants were asked to explain religious practices while others were asked to explain non-religious practices. In this case, the religious character of some of the practices would be an additional factor that could affect participants responses beyond cultural and temporal distance. As mentioned in the previous paragraph, this was not the case in this study. In fact, the topic of religious ceremonies for the treatment of diseases was chosen exactly because such ceremonies exist across temporal and cultural contexts. This allowed for the selection of practices that satisfied the criterion of using practices that did not have substantial differences except temporal and cultural distance.

Each task provided a brief description of the practice. The description of each task begun with the declaration that people of the group in question use(d) the practice when sick and then described the procedure that people follow(ed). In order to ensure

---

[38] This was established by asking participants before the submission of the pen and paper tasks whether they were aware of the practice. Teachers were aware of the existence of the Orthodox Christian practice, however none of them had a personal experience of it and none of them was aware that this practice is being used also as a treatment for diseases.

that the length of the text did not affect participants' responses between tasks, all descriptions had a similar size (122 to 137 words). In order to avoid differences in responses due to differences in the texts' difficulty, all four texts were tested for their readability level using a tool developed by the Centre for the Greek Language (Centre for the Greek Language, n.d.). The Centre for the Greek Language is a research institute of the Ministry of Education and Religious Affairs in Greece. The tool was developed based on methods used to measure the readability level of English texts (i.e., Flesch Reading Ease, Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level, SMOG and Flesch Fog Index) and was adopted for the Greek language taking into consideration the language's special characteristics (Centre for the Greek Language, 2014). All texts were tested in order to correspond to the readability level of the age of younger of the participants (Year 3). Furthermore, teachers who taught in the classes in question, but were not the ones participated the study, also read the texts in order to make sure that these corresponded to student-participants' reading comprehension level.[39]

Following the description of the practice, each task asked the same seven open-ended questions about the choice of practice by the group in question. The use of more than one question was, as discussed in section 4.2.3, one of the two techniques of methodological triangulation that were used in order to contribute to the study's internal validity, since the use of more than one questions had the potential to provide more comprehensive pictures of the participants' ideas. The phenomenon of different questions about past behaviour prompting the use of different types of explanations is suggested by the findings of previous' studies (Perikleous, 2011; Berti et. al., 2009). Pen and paper tasks' questions (translated in English) are reproduced in Figure 4.2.

---

[39] Teachers who participated in the study were not involved in this process in order not to have an experience of the texts before data collection.

Figure 4.2 Pen and paper tasks' questions

Question 1: Based on what you have read here and on your general knowledge about the Ancient Greeks/Ancient Maya/Orthodox Christians/Muslims, what is your opinion about them? (Explain your answer as fully as you can.)
Question 2: Why do you think Ancient Greeks/Ancient Maya/Orthodox Christians/Muslims chose/choose this course of treatment when sick? (Explain your answer as fully as you can.)
Question 3: Are there any other reasons for which Ancient Greeks/Ancient Maya/Orthodox Christians/ Muslims chose/choose this kind of course of treatment apart from those you mentioned answering question 2? (Explain your answer as fully as you can.)
Question 4: Is there anything strange about the fact that Ancient Greeks/ Ancient Maya/ Orthodox Christians/ Muslims chose/choose this course of treatment when sick? Why? (Explain your answer as fully as you can.)
Question 5: Do you agree or disagree with the Ancient Greeks' / Ancient Maya's / Orthodox Christians' / Muslims' choice of treatment? Why? (Explain your answer as fully as you can.)
Question 6: If you were an Ancient Greek / Ancient Maya / Muslim, would you choose this course of treatment when sick? Why? (Explain your answer as fully as you can)[40]
Question 7: Why don't we use the same course treatment when sick? (Explain your answer as fully as you can.)

Question 1 asked participants to express their own opinion about the groups in question. Despite the fact that this question did not ask directly about the practice, it was expected that a number of answers would include ideas about the choice made by people. This expectation was confirmed by the data analysis since, as shown in Chapter 5 (table 5.1, p. 162), 8% of the total references to explanations of the choice or practice made by the participants came from answers to Question 1. At the end of

---

[40] Because of the fact that all participant identified as Orthodox Christians, Question 6 in the Orthodox Christians task read as follows: Would you choose this course of treatment when sick? Why? (Explain your answer as fully as you can)

the question, a statement was included asking students to explain their answer as fully as possible. The same statement was included in all of the questions.

Question 2 asked participants to directly provide an explanation of the choice of practice made by the group in question. It was possible that participants would respond to the second question with a single definite reason as they would do in a traditional history test where these kinds of answers are supposed to demonstrate strong historical knowledge. It was also possible that some participants (especially students) would provide a description rather than an explanation of the choice of practice. In this sense, Question 3 aimed to prompt participants to think beyond a single definite reason and beyond mere descriptions of the practice. As expected, these questions, which directly asked participants to explain the choice of practice, prompted a large part of the total references (33%) to explanations of the choice of practice (Chapter5, table 5.1, p. 162).

It was also possible that participants, who felt that something was 'strange' with the choice of these practices, might not explicitly express their puzzlement in their previous answers since, traditionally and as already mentioned, questions about history are supposed to be answered in a definite way which demonstrates confidence. Therefore, Question 4 encouraged them to express this possible puzzlement by asking directly whether there is something strange in the choice of practice. The question's phrasing explicitly asked participants to explain why they found the choice of the practice strange or not. This phrasing along with the statement asking participants to explain their answer as fully as possible, were aiming to avoid simple 'yes' or 'no' answers. Despite not asking directly about an explanation of the choice of practice, the question aimed to invite participants to think about a new aspect (i.e., strangeness of the choice) and in this way to possibly prompt them to provide such explanations. This expectation was confirmed by the data analysis, since 9% of the total references to explanations of the choice of practice were prompted by this question (Chapter 5, table 5.1, p. 162).

Question 5 asked participants to state their agreement or disagreement with the group's choice of practice and in this way to express their own point of view about it. Participants were explicitly asked to state their agreement or disagreement, but also

to state the reasons for this agreement or disagreement. This was again in order to avoid simple 'yes' or 'no' answers. As in the case of Question 4, this question invited participants to think about the practice from another aspect (i.e., their agreement or disagreement) and in this way possibly be prompted to provide explanations of the choice of practice. As in the case of Question 4, a number of participants did provide explanations of the choice of practice when answering this question. More specifically, Question 5 prompted 13% of the total references to explanation of the choice of practice (Chapter 5, table 5.1, p. 162).

Question 6 asked participants to attempt to explain the choice of practice as if they were members of the groups in question. The question aimed to prompt participants to think more explicitly about the choice of practice from the point of view of the people that belong/belonged to the groups in question. This question prompted 14% of the references to explanations of the choice of practice (Chapter 5, table 5.1, p. 162).

Question 7 asked participants to think about differences between them and the groups in question which might explain the choice of practice. This question aimed to invite participants to attempt to explain the choice of practice of the groups in question from the aspect of why the practice in question is not chosen by them (the participants). Question 7 prompted 23% of the references to explanations of the choice of practice by the participants (Chapter 5, table 5.1, p. 162).

Each participant completed two of the four tasks. Table 4.2 shows the distribution of completed tasks among participants' age groups. Table 4.3 shows the distribution of different combinations of tasks among the participants.

Table 4.2 Distribution of tasks among participants' age groups

Age group	Ancient Greeks	Ancient Maya	Orthodox Christians	Muslims	Total
Year 3	15	15	6	6	42
Year 4	4	4	2	2	12
Year 5	13	11	9	9	42
Year 6[41]	13	12	6	7	38
Teachers	3	3	2	2	10
Total	48	45	25	26	144

Table 4.3 Distribution of different combinations of tasks among the participants

Combination of tasks	Participants
Ancient Greeks- Ancient Maya	20
Ancient Greeks- Orthodox Christians	13
Ancient Greeks- Muslims	14
Ancient Maya- Orthodox Christians	12
Ancient Maya- Muslims	12
Total	**71**[42]

As it is apparent in table 4.3, no participants completed the Orthodox Christians-Muslims combination. This was because the focus of the study was on students' and teachers' ideas of historical empathy. Therefore, the aspect of differences in terms of cultural distance was explored by comparing explanations of in-group (Ancient Greeks) and out-group (Ancient Maya) practices in the past. The comparison

---

[41] Despite the fact that 20 Year 6 students participated, one of them completed only one task and returned the second one without any answers, while another student was absent on the day that their class completed the second task.
[42] See previous note explaining why despite the fact that 73 students and teachers participated the study only 71 combinations of tasks are reported here.

between in-group (Orthodox Christians) and out-group (Muslims) explanations in the present was beyond the scope of the study. Furthermore, having a group of participants who would complete this combination of tasks, would decrease the sample size of the groups that completed the rest of the combinations. This would make it more difficult to establish statistical significance for the differences according to temporal and cultural distance. As discussed in section 4.3.3, sample size affects statistical significance.

The decision for administering only two pen and paper tasks to each participant instead of all four of them was based primarily on practical reasons. Administering all four pen and paper tasks to each participant would double the time spent by the participants in completing them. More specifically, completing all four tasks would take 13% of the time allocated to history teaching annually. All teachers approached for participating the study, during preliminary discussions, were reluctant to allocate such a large amount of their classes' time on one study. More importantly, this would also make the CERE more reluctant to allow access to the school for the study.

Within each age group, the different pen and paper tasks were administrated to the students according to their performance in history, reading comprehension ability and written expression ability, as these were described by their teachers. This meant that each task was completed by students of different levels of performance within each year group. This measure was taken in order to avoid these factors affecting the comparisons of explanations of past and present practices and comparisons between explanations of in-group and out-group practices.

Participants completed each task in their classrooms during a two-period school session (80 minutes). They completed the second task four weeks after they completed the first one. The four-week delay in the completion of the second task aimed to mitigate the phenomenon of the experience of the first task affecting responses to the second one. This was an additional, methodological reason, for not administering all four tasks to each participant. Despite the delay between the completion of each task, the effect of the experience of previous tasks on participants responses would increase with each new task. In other words, the effect of the experience of the first, second and third task on participants responses to the fourth

task would be much more substantial than the effect of the experience of the first task on their responses to the second.

Written instructions provided with the tasks stressed that:
- the tasks were not testing the participants' historical knowledge in any way
- the questions were about the participants' own ideas and explanations about the choice of practice
- the texts should be read carefully
- the texts were meant to provide them with information about the practices but the answers to the questions could not be found in the texts as happens with the reading comprehension exercises
- participants should answer each question and explain their answer as fully as they can

These instructions, which were discussed during my meetings with the participants before the data collection, stated verbally at the beginning of each task completion session, were meant to help participants feel more comfortable and avoid the creation of an examination climate. A comfortable non-examination environment would also probably prevent them from behaving as in a traditional examination where single definite answers strictly based on the written source is considered as academic excellence. The instructions also aimed to prevent participants (especially the students) from providing simple descriptions of the practices using the provided texts as sources of explicit answers.

4.3.2.2 The interview

Thirty participants (26 students and the four teachers) were also interviewed. In the case of the student-participants, five of them from the four classes and six from the fifth one, in which the study took place, were selected to be interviewed. Each group of students was selected based on their academic performance in language and history as these were defined by their teachers. This was in order to ensure that the group of interviewed students would consist of children that varied in terms of their

academic performance and in this way would be representative (from this aspect) of the whole student sample.[43]

As discussed in section 4.2.3, semi-structured interviews with both students and teachers aimed to increase the study's internal validity through methodological triangulation (Denzin, 1970). More specifically, interviews aimed to investigate whether participants used, during their interview, explanations of the choice of practice similar to the used in their pen and paper tasks. In the case of the teachers, the interview also asked questions about their teaching experience and approaches in teaching topics related to understanding past behaviour. These questions were not directly related to the to the study's research questions. However, answers to these provided insights that were used to understand the background of the teacher-participants and they are used in the discussion both of the context and the findings of this study.

The semi-structured interview form was selected, because it 'allows the interviewer greater flexibility to introduce 'probes' for expanding, developing and clarifying informants' responses' (Pole and Morrison, 2003 cited in Scott and Morrison, 2005, p. 134). As can be seen in the interview protocols reproduced in Figures 4.3 (students) and 4.4 (teachers), besides the leading questions that were addressed to all participants, follow up questions were asked when appropriate in order to expand and clarify responses. Follow up questions were also asked for the participants responses in pen and paper tasks in cases where clarifications were needed.

---

[43] Although all five teachers agreed to be interviewed, as mentioned earlier in this chapter, one of them could not do so due to personal reasons. They were able, however, to provide answers, in writing, to Questions 3 and 4 that required short answers about their training and years of experience in teaching.

Figure 4.3 Interview protocol for students

Question 1: Do people today behave the same way as people in the past under the same circumstances?
Question 2: What is more likely for you, to behave as a person in the past did under the same circumstance or as another person in the present?
Follow up questions about questions 1 and 2: e.g. Why do you say that? Can you tell me a bit more about this? You said that…. Does this mean that…?
Follow up questions about pen and paper tasks: e.g., In question X you answered Y. Does this mean…? What did you mean by… in question Z?

Figure 4.4 Interview protocol for teachers

Question 1: Do people today behave the same way as people in the past did under the same circumstances?
Question 2: What is more likely for you, to behave as a person in the past under the same circumstance or as another person in the present?
Question 3: How many years have you been teaching in primary education
Question 4: What kind of training have you had in history and in history teaching?
Question 5: What kinds of approaches do you use when you teach topics related to the behaviour of people in the past?
Follow up questions about questions 1 and 2: e.g. Why do you say that? Can you tell me a bit more about this? You said that…. Does this mean that…?
Follow up questions about pen and paper tasks: e.g., In question X you answered Y. Does this mean…? What did you mean by… in question Z?

A way to implement methodological triangulation with the interview would be to ask questions identical to the ones asked by the pen and paper tasks, albeit at a general level and without any context. Chapman (2009b) successfully implemented such an approach in his study of students' ideas about variations in historical accounts. While in pen and paper tasks, participants answered questions about differences between specific historical accounts, interview questions mirrored the issues raised in pen and paper tasks by asking questions about differences in accounts in general. However, in this study, asking questions identical to the ones of the pen and paper tasks (albeit without specific context) would not make much sense. Asking

participants for example 'why people in the past did what they did' is a quite vague question and this was also evident in the piloting of the interview questions. For this reason, interview questions in this study mirrored the issues raised by the pen and paper tasks in a different way. Taking into consideration that the pen and paper tasks about past practices essentially asked participants why people in the past chose a treatment that is different to the ones we choose today, the interview questions were focused on difference between present and past behaviour in general. In this sense, the purpose of methodological triangulation was still pursued. Questions 1 asked participants about differences between the behaviour of people in the present and the behaviour of people in the past. Question 2 essentially asked about the same topic (differences between present and past behaviour) by asking participants about whether their own behaviour is similar to the one of other people in the present or the behaviour of other people in the past.

4.3.2.3 Pilot study

Prior to the data collection, ten primary age students (three eight-year-olds, two nine-year-olds, two 10-year-olds, two 11-year-olds and a 12-year-old) and two teachers, who did not participate in the main study, took part in a pilot study. This pilot study was essentially a pre-testing, a 'try out' of the data generation instruments of the main study (Baker, 1994 cited in van Teijlingen and Hundley). A pilot study can warn us about potential problems with the main study; in this case problems with the data collection instruments (van Teijlingen and Hundley, 2001). In this sense, the pilot study contributed to the study's internal validity by testing a) the data collection instruments' ability to generate rich data, b) the clarity of the supporting information, instructions and questions, c) the time needed to complete the tasks, and d) any other reactions to the instruments that could not be foreseen during the initial design.

The pilot study showed that, data generation was in general satisfactory both in terms of quality and quantity and that the language used was comprehensible by the participants in both the pen and paper tasks and the interview. Some questions were amended in order to address some misunderstandings that occurred in the original phrasing. For the same reasons, small amendments were also made in the texts that described the practices in each task. The pilot also showed that, as mentioned earlier

(section 4.3.2.2), general interview questions asking the reasons for which people in the past did what they did (without any context) were very vague and most of the participants were not clear about what they were asked. All pilot participants completed the pen and paper task in less than 60 minutes which meant that the 80 minutes allowed time would be sufficient for the participants of the main study. Finally, some instructions were amended or added responding to questions expressed by participants during the pilot.

4.3.3 Data analysis

Following data collection, in order to answer the first research question (What kinds of ideas are used by Greek Cypriot primary students and teachers when asked to explain the choice of practices in the past?), responses to pen and paper tasks were analysed, using a primarily inductive coding process associated with grounded theory techniques of analysis (Charmaz, 2006; Glaser and Strauss, 1967; Strauss, 1987; Strauss and Corbin, 1990). Such techniques of data analysis were selected because they offer 'general guidelines and rules of thumb to effective analysis' (Strauss, 1987, p. 1) in qualitative research which have been successfully adopted for more than forty years in different disciplines. In addition, the existence of an already established research tradition of using these techniques for the investigation of second-order understanding in history (including historical empathy) provides useful insights and paradigms of its use in this research field.[44]

A number of criticisms have been articulated against grounded theory. Two main points of criticism are the ones that relate to a) '«knowing» when saturation has occurred', and b) 'the explanations advanced in the name of grounded theory' (Scott and Morrison, 2005, p. 121). The former refers to the issue of the impossibility of observing all instances of a phenomenon, and therefore the impossibility of knowing when saturation (the point where new data do not reveal new aspects of the studied phenomenon) has occurred. The latter refers to the issue of the researcher's objectivity and to the idea that explanations are essentially constructed by the

---

[44] For examples of studies using similar techniques of data analysis in history education, see Barca (2005), Cercadillo (2001), Chapman (2009), Cunningham (2003), Hsaio (2005), Lee and Ashby (2001)and Perikleous (2011).

researcher based on their knowledge of the data and their ability to analyse them (Scott and Morrison, 2005). These two points of criticism are essentially criticisms related to the inductive approach of grounded theory. Both points and the way this study approached these issues are discussed in section 4.2.1 (pp. 120-121).

A further criticism about grounded theory approaches is the one locating their 'failure to acknowledge the theoretical and conceptual frameworks that guide researchers in the initial stages of their work, including decisions about the research topic' (Scott and Morrison, 2005, p. 121). This is a valid criticism, when it comes to the claims initially made by grounded theory's creators, Barney Glaser and Anselm Strauss. In their book with which they introduced this approach to research, *The Discovery of Grounded Theory,* Glaser and Straus argued that, in order to avoid the imposition of preconceived ideas on their analysis of data, the researcher should avoid engaging with relevant literature before conducting their investigation (Glaser and Strauss, 1967). This however was a stance that was abandoned later by both Glaser and Strauss who argued that an engagement with literature in the field increases the researcher's theoretical sensitivity (i.e., the ability to identify concepts in their data and relate them to a theory- Glaser, 1978; Strauss, 1987). The present study approached the issue in a similar way and aimed for an equilibrium between new insights emerging from the analysis of its data and the knowledge of existing conceptualisations of students' and teachers' ideas (see discussion in section 4.2.1).

Students' and teachers' responses in pen and paper tasks were initially coded line-by-line (Charmaz, 2006) in order to produce 'low-inference descriptive codes' (Chapman, 2009b, p. 32) that represented ideas in their simplest forms (not analysable in terms of combinations of simpler ones). This was an 'unrestricted coding' (Strauss, 1987) process, in which it was important to be open to all possibilities, ideas and hunches derived from the data, and to avoid applying any prior ideas or preconceptions on them. Such a move was necessary in order to allow new ideas, which have not been hitherto described by earlier investigations, to emerge and not to be distorted or ignored due to preconceived ideas about students' and teachers' reasoning.

After initial coding, codes which seemed to have a similar content in terms of ideas were grouped in order to form categories of responses. In some cases, categories

emerged by selecting the most frequent and significant of the initial codes to become categories under which more initial codes were grouped. Following this second phase of coding, it became apparent that these categories could be grouped, in most of the cases, to even broader types of explanation of the choice of practice.

The importance of the types of explanation of the choice of practice used within each completed pen and paper task varied. Some types of explanations were more prominent than others within a completed task, therefore types of explanations within each task were graded according to their relative importance as major or minor. This allowed for a distinction between the use of types of explanation that had a substantial role within a response (major importance) and the use of types that were mere references that were not developed within the response (minor importance).

The types of explanation that emerged from the data analysis formed a typology of explanations of the choice of practice. These types of explanation can be understood as ideal types (Weber, 1949). As discussed in section 4.2.1, ideal types are mental constructs that derive from observing real life behaviour (in this case the responses of participants to the pen and paper tasks). They are not ideal in the sense of being perfect, but in the sense of being constructs of ideas. They do not describe the data exhaustively, but they do stress specific elements common in all cases of the use of a type. In this way, ideal types allow for simplification and can be used for heuristic purposes; a tool for modelling explanations of choices of practices.

Following the construction of the typology of explanations of the choice of practice, I went back to the pen and paper task responses and re-coded all data using the types of explanation that formed this typology. This was a deductive process since what I did was essentially testing my data against the types of explanation. This allowed me to test the validity of the whole process of coding (from initial line-by-line coding to the forming of types of explanation). A similar process was also used to code the data from interviews (i.e., they were coded using the types of explanation developed from the written tasks data analysis).

At this point, in order to increase the study's reliability, a process of external audit was implemented. During this process, a second coder (a colleague at the time) was

asked to code a sample of the pen and paper task responses (20 completed tasks) and interview responses (five interviews) in order to test the agreement of their coding with mine. In order to do this, the second coder implemented the method described in the previous paragraph (i.e., they coded the data using the types of explanation of the choice of practice). Agreement between my coding and the coding of the second coder in each response was 92%.

The data analysis described so far (from inductive line-by-line coding to deductive coding using the types of explanations developed) was conducted using NVivo qualitative data analysis software. In order to import the study data into the software, the written responses (pen and paper tasks) were typed into text files (Microsoft Word) while the interview audio files were directly imported into the software. The former were coded using NVivo's features of coding written data while the latter were coded using its feature of directly coding audio data. This part of the analysis (from line-to-line coding to deductive coding using the explanations developed) and its findings are presented and discussed in Chapter 5.

The typology developed from the data analysis revealed different degrees of sophistication between the ideal types included in it. In this sense a progression model (which describe different levels of sophistication) based on this typology was developed. However, most of the participants, instead of using a single type of explanation, used a combination of them to answer different questions and in some cases even a single question (in both pen and paper tasks and interviews). Due to this phenomenon, assigning responses as a whole (treating the answers to all seven questions of a task as a single response) to different levels of the suggested progression model was obviously not as straightforward as working with responses to individual questions.   In order to assign each response to the levels of the progression model, each response to pen and paper tasks about past practices and interviews was examined separately. The decision for the level to which a response corresponded was based on the line thought that it was revealed by the way the different types of explanation were used to respond to the task's questions. This part of the analysis (development of the suggested progression model and assignment of responses to levels of the model) and its findings are presented and discussed in Chapter 6.

In order to provide answers for the second research question (Do the ideas used by Greek Cypriot primary students and teachers when asked to explain past practices differ according to their age?), the responses of students (by age group) and the responses of the teachers, in pen and paper tasks, were compared in terms of the level of sophistication of the suggested progression model to which their responses corresponded. This part of the analysis and its findings are discussed in Chapter 7.

Finally, in order to provide answers for the third research question (Do the ideas used by Greek Cypriot primary students and teachers to explain the choice of past practices differ according to their temporal and cultural distance from the people who held them?), data analysis explored differences in participants' responses in pen and paper tasks between a) explanations of the choice of practices made by groups of people in the past (Ancient Greeks and Ancient Maya) and practices made by groups of people in the present (modern-day Orthodox Christians and modern-day Muslims) (temporal distance) and b) explanations of the choice of practices made by in-groups (Ancient Greeks) and out-groups (Ancient Maya) in the past (cultural distance). In both cases, I looked again at differences in terms of the level of sophistication in participants' responses (levels of the progression model). This part of the analysis and its findings are discussed in Chapter 8.

An important aspect of the discussion of numerical data (as the ones described in the previous two paragraphs) is the issue of their statistical significance. In the case of this study, this is the issue of whether the degree to which observed differences (according to participants' age and their temporal and cultural distance from the people who held the practices in question) are statistically significant (i.e., there is meaningful non-random relationship). In order to establish statistical significance, chi-square and Fisher's exact tests were employed. Chi-square tests were employed in cases of comparisons that contained values equal or above 5. In the case of comparison that contained values lower than 5 the results Fisher's exact tests were employed. The latter is because when comparisons contain values below 5 Fisher's exact tests are considered to be a more adequate way of testing the statistical significance of differences (Kim, 2017). In the main text of this thesis, the tables which contain the results of the tests for statistical significance only present the result

of the test that was used in each comparison. Versions of the tables which also indicate the type of test used in each case can be found in Appendix F.

Statistical significance was not implemented in terms of accepting or rejecting findings based only on whether the results of these tests of independence pass the conventional $p<0.05$ threshold that indicates statistically significant differences. Ronald Fisher (1956), the prominent statistician who introduced the idea of a $p<0.05$ cut-off point in the early 20th century, points out that 'no scientific worker has a fixed level of significance at which from year to year, and in all circumstances, he rejects hypotheses; he rather gives his mind to each particular case in the light of his evidence and his ideas'(cited in Concato and Hartigan, 2016; p.1167). In a similar vein the American Statistical Association stated more recently that '[a] conclusion does not immediately become "true" on one side of the divide and "false" on the other" (Wasserstein and Lazar, 2016; p. 131). For this reason, a number of authors warn us against the misuses of significance test and some even argue that they should be abandoned (Filho et al., 2013).

A more moderate approach is that decisions about the significance of findings should be made by taking into consideration a number of other contextual factors too (Wasserstein and Lazar, 2016). One such factor is the design of the study and more specifically the sample size which in the case of this study was a relatively small one. In many cases of small samples even significant differences can produce high p-values (which suggest lack of statistical significance- Wasserstein and Lazar, 2016). In this study for example, as discussed in Chapter 6, even though some differences between Year 3 students and teachers were larger than differences between Year 3 and Year 6 students in terms of percentages, their statistical significance indicated by the tests was lower due to the small teachers' sample. The possibility of not being able to establish statistical significance due to the small sample was taken into consideration and it is acknowledged as a limitation of the study.

However, this does not mean that we cannot say anything about differences according to participants age or according to their temporal and cultural distance identified by this study. Another important factor when thinking about observing a phenomenon in research findings are external evidence of its existence

155

(Wasserstein and Lazar, 2016). In this sense, the findings of other studies in a variety of educational contexts are also taken into consideration when I discuss the significance of differences found in this study.

Furthermore, differences that produced p-values that could be considered marginal are also taken into consideration in this study. Although no convention similar to the p< 0.05 or p< 0.01 for statistically significant results exists, researchers use the concept of marginal significance to report p-values over 0.05 quite often (Pritschet, Powell, and Horne, 2016; Filho et al., 2013). According to Pritschet et. al. (2016), in their study of articles published in three of the most prestigious journals in the field of psychology, the majority of p-values marked as marginally significant are between 0.05 and 0.10. However, they also report cases of studies of describing values as high as 0.18 as marginally significant.

In this study, a Fisherian approach is taken according to which values over 0.05 are not immediately dismissed (Pritschet et. al., 2016). Instead, the results of statistical significance tests are treated as providing an indication about the strength of evidence against the null hypothesis (i.e., the hypothesis that no differences exist between the different age groups). However, the issue of whether marginal significance should be reported and taken into consideration is one that has not been settled among researchers so far (Pritschet, et. al, 2016) therefore in this study all the results of the significance tests are reported to allow the reader to form their own informed opinion about the related claims being made. In order to help the reader to distinguish between the different claims for significance, I use the term marginal significance for the cases in which significance tests returned p-values lower than 0.10 and near-marginal significance for the cases in which tests returned p-values lower than 0.18.

4.4 Conclusion

This chapter provided a detailed description of the methodology and of the methods of this exploratory qualitative case study of students' and teachers' ideas of historical empathy that also includes quantitative elements. The study explores the ideas of a group of primary teachers and students in one school by analysing their responses to

pen and paper tasks, that ask them to explain the choice of practice made by groups of people in the past and the present and interviews that ask them about differences between behaviour in the past and the present. From this analysis a typology of explanations of the choice of practice and a progression model emerged which were used to provide responses to the research questions of the study. This analysis is presented and discussed in Chapters 5, 6, 7 and 8.

This chapter described the choices made both in terms of methodology and methods and discussed these decisions providing the rationale that guided them in each case. In each case possible, challenges and limitations that arise from these choices were discussed. These are also discussed in the final conclusion chapter of this thesis.

Chapter 5: Data and Discussion: Types of explanation of the choice of practices made by people in the past

5.1 Introduction

This chapter responds to research question 1 (What kinds of ideas are used by Greek Cypriot primary students and teachers when asked to explain the choice of practices made by people in the past?). More specifically, here, I discuss the different types of explanation that emerged from the data analysis of the pen and paper tasks (section 5.2) and the frequency with which these types were used by the participants (section 5.3). I also suggest a typology of explanations of the choice of practice (section 5.4) and discuss its potential to be used for heuristic purposes. This possibility is explored by comparing this typology with the findings of previous studies and also by testing the typology's efficiency in terms of modeling the responses of participants in a new set of data (i.e., responses to interview questions).

The data analysis in this chapter suggests the existence of six types of explanation of the choice of practices (Life Forms, Beliefs, Available Options, Effectiveness, Deficit and Pseudo-explanations) withing these data. It also suggests that the frequency with which these types of explanation are used is affected by the kind of questions asked. The most prominent types of explanation were the Beliefs and the Deficit ones. The prevalence of the former can be explained by the explicit reference of the tasks to religious practices. In the case of the latter, its prominence can be explained as one aspect of presentism, namely the view of the past and its people as inferior (see discussion in Chapter 3, p. 90). The correspondence of these types of explanations to types of explanations identified by the findings of previous studies and their efficiency of modelling the data from the responses of the participants to interview questions indicate the heuristic potential of the suggested typology.

5.2 Analysing the pen and paper tasks for explanations of the choice of practice: codes, code categories and types of explanation

As described in Chapter 4 (pp. 137-146), four different pen and paper tasks, asking the same seven open-ended questions about healing ceremonies (practices) related

to religious beliefs, were used. Two of them referred to past religious healing practices (Ancient Greeks and Ancient Maya) and two of them to practices that are still being used today by some Orthodox Christians and Muslims. Each participant completed two of the four tasks. For the distribution of tasks among participants see Tables 4.2 and 4.3 in Chapter 4 (p.144).

Data were analysed using an inductive coding process associated with grounded theory techniques of analysis (Charmaz, 2006; Glaser and Strauss, 1967; Strauss, 1987; Strauss and Corbin, 1990). During an initial coding phase students' and teachers' responses were initially coded line-by-line (Charmaz, 2006) in order to produce 'low-inference descriptive codes' (Chapman, 2009b, p. 32), which represented ideas in their simplest forms (not analysable in terms of combinations of simpler ones). During this process ,483 low inference initial codes were developed. The large number of initial codes was due to a) the fact that responses to each of the seven task questions were coded separately even when identical ideas in their simplest form were identified in different questions (to allow the comparison between questions in terms of the kinds of ideas they seem to prompt) and b) the large amount of written data (144 completed pen and paper tasks).

After initial coding, codes which seemed to have a similar content in terms of ideas were grouped in order to form 18 categories of responses. Following this second phase of coding, it became apparent that these categories could be grouped, in most of the cases, to 8 even broader types of explanation of the choice of practice (i.e., explanations about why the groups in question chose the specific treatment to cure diseases); Life Forms, Beliefs, Available Options, Effectiveness, Deficit, Pseudo-explanations, Lack of information, and Minor codes.

Codes, code categories, and types of explanation of the choice of practice are presented and exemplified in Appendices D and F. Brief descriptions of the types of explanation are also included here.

The **Life Forms** type of explanation includes responses which explained the choice of practice by reference to the fact that this treatment is/was an intrinsic part of the group's way of life and/or made sense for that specific context. An example of this

type is the following response by Lyra (Year 6) to the question of whether she would follow the Ancient Maya treatment if she was a member of the group: *I would choose it because it would be the treatment of the tribe to which I would belong.*

The **Beliefs** type of explanation includes responses which explained the choice of practice by reference to the groups' beliefs. Some of them referred to beliefs in general. However, the majority of these responses explicitly referred to religious beliefs. In some of the responses these beliefs were considered to be correct while in other cases they were considered to be false. Finally, some responses referred to religious beliefs as simply different from the participants' own ones. An example of this type is the following response by Clark (Year 6) to the question of why Ancient Maya chose the treatment in question: *Because they believed in different gods than we do and they believed that they would help them.*

The **Available Options** type of explanation includes responses which explained the choice of practice by reference to the fact that the treatment in question is/was the best one available. In some cases, responses referred to the fact that this is/was their last choice after all others failed. In other words, as most people do, the groups in question choose/chose the best available treatment. An example of this type is the following response by Kara (Year 5) to the question of why Ancient Maya chose the treatment in question: *I believe that there were other ways too to treat people, but this was the best I think.*

The **Effectiveness** type of explanation includes responses which explained the choice of practice by reference to its effectiveness. These responses referred to contemporary medicinal knowledge that is valid today, despite the fact that nothing in the practice's description suggested that such knowledge was involved in it, or the fact that the groups had empirical evidence of the treatment's effectiveness. An example of this type is the following response by Audrey (Year 3) to the question of why Ancient Maya chose the treatment in question: *I think they applied this treatment because maybe the red seeds came from healing herbs or weeds.*

The **Deficit** type of explanation includes responses which explained the choice of practice by reference to deficits in terms of ideas and/or medical knowledge and means and/or financial means available to the group in question. An example of this type is the following response by Deanna (Year 4) to the question of why the Ancient Mayan chose the treatment in question: *I think that this [the choice of the treatment in question] is because Ancient Maya, as other people in the past, were not as rational as we are today.*

The **Pseudo-explanations** type of explanation includes responses which essentially did not provide an explanation for the choice of practice. Instead, they referred to personal preferences and/or provided descriptions of the practice and/or used tautologies (i.e., people choose/chose the treatment in question in order to be cured). An example of this type is the following response by Jean-Luc (Year 4) to the question of why the Ancient Maya chose the treatment in question: *Because, maybe, they liked fasting and listening to prayers for the gods.*

The **Lack of Information** type of explanation includes responses which did not provide any explanation for the practice on the grounds of lack of information. An example of this type is the following response by Barbara (teacher) to the question of why the Ancient Maya chose the treatment in question: *Maybe, there are other reasons too. However, my knowledge is not adequate to provide further explanations.*

The **Minor Codes** type of explanations includes explanations which figured in a very small number of responses and therefore could not be grouped in code categories and types of explanations. An example of this is the response of Caprica (Year 5) when asked if she finds something strange with the Ancient Mayan practice: *I think that the Ancient Maya chose this treatment when they were sick, because the healers where probably wizards.*

As discussed in Chapter 4 (pp. 129-130), the use of seven questions in each task was as a method of methodological triangulation. This a way to provide a more comprehensive picture of participants' explanations of past behaviour, by taking into consideration both the similarities and the differences in responses prompted by the

different questions (Denzin, 1970). Table 5.1 presents the distribution of references to the types of explanation among questions 1-7 in the 93 completed tasks (87 completed by students and six completed by teachers) about past practices (i.e., Ancient Greeks and Ancient Maya tasks). Table 5.2 shows the results of the tests for the statistical significance of the differences in the frequency of references to each type for each question.

Table 5.1 Distribution of references to the types of explanation by question (Ancient Greeks and Ancient Maya tasks) (N=93)

This table counts the number of references (f) and shows the percentage of references to each type of explanation by question. The highest percentage for each question is marked with numbers in bold.

Types of explanation	Q1 f	Q1 %	Q2-Q3 f	Q2-Q3 %	Q4 f	Q4 %	Q5 f	Q5 %	Q6 f	Q6 %	Q7 f	Q7 %	Total f
Life Forms	1	3	3	2	3	8	5	9	4	7	2	2	18
Beliefs	17	**53**	52	**38**	17	**45**	24	**45**	17	29	14	15	141
Available Options	0	0	15	11	3	8	11	21	30	**52**	5	5	64
Effectiveness	5	16	29	21	2	5	2	4	0	0	1	1	39
Deficit	7	22	15	11	11	29	5	9	5	9	72	**75**	115
Pseudo-explanations	0	0	14	10	0	0	2	4	2	3	0	0	18
Lack of Information	0	0	2	1	1	3	2	4	0	0	0	0	5
Minor Codes	2	6	6	4	1	3	2	4	0	0	2	2	13
Total	32	100	136	100	38	100	53	100	58	100	96	100	413

Table 5.2 Tests for the statistical significance of differences in references to types of explanation (Ancient Greeks and Ancient Maya tasks) [45]

This table shows the results of the tests for the statistical significance of the differences in the frequency of references to the different types of explanation in responses for each task question.

Question	Statistical significance (p-value)
Question 1	<0.01
Questions 2-3	<0.01
Question 4	<0.01
Question 5	<0.01
Question 6	<0.01
Question 7	<0.01

The Beliefs type was the one used most in terms of the total number of references in all tasks (141), followed by the Deficit type (115). Most references to explanations of the choice of practice were prompted by Questions 2 and 3, which asked directly about why the groups in question choose the specific treatments (132). The different types of explanation were not used with the same frequency in responses to each question. Most references used in answering questions 1 to 5 belonged to the Beliefs type. Most references used in responses to Question 6 belonged to the Available Options type and most references used in Question 7 belonged to the Deficit type. The differences in terms of the frequency with which the types of explanation were used in responses to each question were all statistically significant (p<0.01; table 5.3). In the light of these, it can be argued that this study provides strong evidence for the phenomenon of different questions prompting the use of types of explanation of the choice of practice with different frequency.

The phenomenon of different questions prompting different responses was also observed in my previous study of Greek Cypriot primary students' ideas of historical empathy (Perikleous, 2011), but also in studies in other educational contexts. For

---

[45] In the case of comparisons that contain values equal or above 5, the results of chi-square tests are reported. In the case of comparison that contain values lower than 5, the results of Fisher's exact tests are reported. The latter is because for values below 5 Fisher's exact tests are considered to be a more adequate way of testing the statistical significance of differences.

example, Berti, Baldin and Toneatti (2009) also report than in their study of children's and university undergraduates' ideas of historical empathy different questions prompted responses of specific types of explanation with different frequency. Furthermore, the effect that questions, and in general the type of tasks that participants are invited to complete, have on their responses is reported in a number of studies of ideas of historical empathy (see for example Brooks, 2008; de Leur, van Boxtel and Wilschut, 2017; Wilschut and Schiphorst, 2019).

When asked about the practice itself (Questions 2-5) or the people who choose it (Question 1), participants were more likely to explain the choice with references to what people believed (Beliefs type) than any other aspect. On the contrary, when asked to think about their own choices, should they be members of the groups in question (Question 6) they were more likely to response with references to the options available to the groups in question (Available Options type). When asked to compare these practices with what happens in their own context today (Question 7), the participants were much more likely to respond with references to inferior means, knowledge and ideas possessed by the people in the past (Deficit type). In other words, it seems that the participants were more likely to think about the groups' different options or the groups' shortcomings when invited to think about these practices in ways that involved themselves (the participants; question 6) or their contemporary context (question 7). Participants in Berti et. al. (2009) study were also more likely to refer to deficits when asked to comment on a past practice from their own point of view (i.e., questions that asked them to provide their opinion about the practice in question).

Explaining the choices of people in the past in terms of what contemporary people would do (Available Options type), or the shortcomings of the people in the past compared to us (Deficit type), appears to be based on a presentist view of the past. As discussed in Chapter 3 (pp. 89-92), presentism is the tendency to interpret the past using ideas and beliefs of the present world. Wineburg (2001) claims that this is the natural way of thinking; a way of thinking that requires little effort. It is the idea of a familiar past, which is simple, and speaks directly to us without the need of translation (Wineburg, 2001). This assumption does not take into account the historicity of culture and the degree in which cultural matters are historically

contingent and variable (A. Chapman, personal communication, May 5, 2010). It is likely then that these kinds of questions prompted participants to interpret the past in presentist terms. Presentist views are also reported to be more frequent when participants are asked to respond to historical empathy tasks by writing first-person accounts of past behaviour than when they are asked to write third-person accounts (Brooks, 2008; de Leur, van Boxtel and Wilschut, 2015; 2017).

In the light of the above, it can be argued that the findings of the present and other studies discussed here suggest that when the participants' views and experience of the contemporary world are explicitly invited, these views and experience are more likely to be imposed on empathetic explanations, leading to presentist views of the past.

5.3 Explanations of the choice of practice: explanations of major importance

The importance of the types of explanation of the choice of practice used within each completed task varied. Some types of explanations were more prominent than others within a completed task, therefore types of explanations within each task were graded according to their relative importance, major or minor. This allowed for a distinction between the use of types of explanation that had a substantial role within a response (major importance) and the use of types that were mere references that were not developed within the response (minor importance). Since the explanations of major importance were the ones that defined participants' answers, they were the ones taken into consideration for the rest of the analysis in this study. For this reason, references to types of explanation in this study are references to types of explanation that had a major importance in participants response. This process is exemplified below in the example of the response of Barbara (teacher) to the Ancient Maya task.

In her response to this task, Barbara used four types of explanation, the Beliefs, the Available Options type, the Deficit and the Lack of Information types. She used the Beliefs type in her answers in questions 2, 4 and 5.

[The Ancient Maya chose this practice] because they believed that god will send the cure to the sick person, therefore god should be propitiated in order to send the cure. Also, god would decide when the treatment would take place. It is also said that the ceremony helps to cast away the evil spirits which possibly hinder the cure (Barbara, Teacher, Question 2, Ancient Maya).

Based on the knowledge and the beliefs they held, maybe this treatment was the appropriate one. Therefore, I don't find something to be strange (Barbara, Teacher, Question 4, Ancient Maya).

I disagree because their treatment was clearly based on false beliefs (Barbara, Teacher, Question 5, Ancient Maya).

She used the Lack of Information type in her response to question 3, the Available Options type in her response to question 6, the Deficit type in question 7.

Maybe there are other reasons too; however, my knowledge is not adequate to provide further explanations. Also, I cannot identify any further causes in the text, which are possibly related to the selection of this treatment (Barbara, Teacher, Question 3, Ancient Maya).

[If I was an Ancient Maya, I would not choose this treatment] because I suppose that experience would show me that this treatment does not always work. <u>On the other hand, since there isn't another method, I would probably choose it</u> (Barbara, Teacher, Question 6, Ancient Maya).[46]

Because our knowledge today shows that this treatment is not the appropriate one (Barbara, Teacher, Question 7, Ancient Maya).

Despite the fact that Barbara used four different types, only the Beliefs type was deemed to have a major importance in her response. She used the type in three different questions and described in detail how these beliefs worked.

---

[46] When a response does not correspond entirely to the type of explanation in question, the part that corresponds to the type is underlined.

Conversely, the other three types were of minor importance in her response. The Lack of Information type was used merely as a way to say that she was not aware of additional reasons for the choice of practice besides the Ancient Maya beliefs. The Available Option was used only in one response were Barbara responded not as an Ancient Maya (as the question asked) but as a modern-day person who knows that the treatment is not working but choose it in the lack of others. Finally, the Deficit type was used to suggest that the treatment is rejected by contemporary knowledge, without making an explicit reference to it as being inferior to modern day ones.

Table 5.3 shows the frequency with which different students' age groups and the teachers used the types of explanations as explanations that had a major importance in the 93 responses to tasks about past practices (Ancient Greek and Ancient Maya).

Table 5.3 Distribution of the use of types of explanation as explanations of major importance by age group (tasks about past practices) (N= 93)

This table counts the number of occasions (f) each type of explanation was used as explanations of major importance and shows the percentage of completed tasks about past practices that contained them by age group. The totals for each age group and the overall total of occasions do not correspond to the number of completed tasks (93) because most responses used more than one type of explanation.

Types of explanation	Year 3 f	Year 3 %	Year 4 f	Year 4 %	Year 5 f	Year 5 %	Year 6 f	Year 6 %	Teachers f	Teachers %	All Students f	All Students %	All participants f	All participants %
Life Forms	1	3	0	0	2	8	3	12	1	17	6	7	7	8
Beliefs	12	40	5	63	16	67	20	80	5	83	53	61	58	62
Available Options	4	13	5	63	8	33	10	40	0	0	27	31	27	29
Effectiveness	10	33	1	13	7	29	5	20	2	33	23	26	25	27
Deficit	21	70	8	100	14	58	17	68	4	67	60	69	64	69
Pseudo-explanations	6	20	1	13	3	13	1	4	0	0	11	13	11	12
Lack of Information	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Minor Codes	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	54		20		50		56		12				192	

The Deficit type of explanation was the one most frequently used as an explanation of major importance (64 out of 93 completed tasks; 69%). The Beliefs type was also used quite frequently (58 out of 93 completed tasks; 62%). The Available Options and Effectiveness types were used in 27 and 25 completed tasks respectively (29% and 27%). Pseudo-explanations and Life Forms types were far less used with only eight and seven occasions of explanations of major importance respectively (8% and 7%). Finally, Lack of Information and Minor Codes type were not used as explanations of major importance in anyone of the completed tasks.

Looking at the frequency with which the participants used the different types of explanations, one could argue that the frequent use of the Beliefs type by primary ages students deviates from the findings of previous investigations in which these types of explanations were used less frequently by those ages (see for example Dickinson and Lee, 1978; Lee, Dickinson and Ashby, 2001; Perikleous, 2011; Shemilt, 1984). However, research evidence suggest that the religious nature of a practice can prompt participants to use references to the groups' beliefs more often. Students of all ages in CHATA project referred to beliefs more often when they were asked to explain the Saxon Ordeal which was based on religious beliefs (Lee and Ashby, 2001).[47] Also, almost all participants in the study by Berti et. al. (2009), who were also asked to explain the Saxon Ordeal (being explicitly informed by the task about its connection with religious beliefs at the time), referred to beliefs in their explanations.

The prominent presence of explanations that refer to a deficit past are in line with the findings of previous studies and also my own study of primary students in Cyprus. Berti et. al., (2009) claim that this phenomenon is due to the descriptions of the practices provided by the tasks rather than a general way in which students see the past. However, this claim might not be fully supported by the findings of their study itself since when participants were asked about whether the Saxon Ordeal worked,

---

[47] The Anglo-Saxon ordeal was an institution of trial by oath and an ordeal where the accused was required to use their hand to retrieve a stone from the bottom of a vessel filled with hot water. The accused was considered to be innocent if after a certain number of days their wounds were healed. This was based on the idea that innocent would be helped by God who would perform a miracle to cure them.

they tended to refer to the Saxons as lacking the scientific knowledge we have. In other words, when participants were asked to think of the practice in terms of what they know from their own world, they were more likely to refer to the Saxon world as being inferior. This suggests that participants' responses were also influenced by the kinds of questions asked. This is also supported by the fact that, as mentioned in section 5.2 (pp. 161-165), in this study participants provided responses belonging to the Beliefs and the Deficit types with different frequencies according to the questions asked. Questions asked about the practices themselves prompted mostly responses of the Beliefs type while questions asking to compare the practices with what happens in their own world prompted mostly responses of the Deficit type. Therefore, it can be argued here that the references to a deficit past are not, at least not entirely, due to the participants' difficulty in understanding the description of a practice, as Berti et. al., (2009) claim, but also due to questions which asked participants to compare the choice of the groups with choices made by their own (the participants' group).

5.4 A typology of explanations of the choice of practices

Based on the data analysis of the responses of participants so far (sections 5.2 and 5.3), I suggest the following typology of explanations for the choice of practice (Figure 5.1). As discussed in the previous sections these are the types of explanation that emerged from the analysis of the responses of the participants when asked to explain the choice of certain treatments by groups of people in the past and the present. The types of explanation are exemplified in Appendix 5.1 (p. 2). The Lack of Information and Minor Codes types of explanation are not included in this typology since none of the participants used them as an explanation of major importance.

Figure 5.1. Typology of explanations of the choice of practice

Type of explanation	Definition
Life Forms	Explanations that refer to the way of life of people and/or their context.
Beliefs	Explanations that refer to the beliefs held by people.
Available Options	Explanations that refer to the choice made as the best available option.
Effectiveness	Explanations that refer to the practice's effectiveness in terms of contemporary medicinal knowledge.
Deficit	Explanations that refer to people's ideas, knowledge and means as inferior compared to our own ones.
Pseudo-explanations	Use of tautologies and/or descriptions and/or references to preferences that do not constitute explanations

These types of explanation can be understood as ideal types. As discussed in Chapter 4 (pp. 122), ideal types do not describe the data exhaustively, but stress specific elements common in all cases of the use of a type. In this way they allow for simplification and can be used for heuristic purposes; a tool for modelling explanations of choices of practices.

The typology suggested here describes ideas of historical empathy similar to the ones identified in my previous study of students' ideas in Cyprus (Perikleous, 2011). More importantly it also corresponds to ideas identified by previous studies in other educational contexts (see Chapter 3, pp. 89-94). Figure 5.2 presents a comparison of the types of ideas identified by the CHATA project in England (Lee and Ashby, 2001), and the present study. The use of the same color denotes similar ideas. Below, I discuss the correspondence of the suggested typology with the types of explanation identified by the CHATA project.

Figure 5.2 Types of explanation for the choice of practice identified in CHATA project and the present study

	Lee and Ashby (2001)	Perikleous (2022)
	Context	Life Forms
	Beliefs and values	Beliefs
Types of explanations	Explanations in terms of the practice as deterrence.	Available Options
	Assimilation of past institutions to modern-day ones	Effectiveness
	Deficit explanations	Deficit
	Fail to distinguish explanation from description	Pseudo-explanations

As showed in the above figure, the Life Forms type of explanation corresponds to explanations that referred to the wider situational context to explain the choice of practice in CHATA project. In both cases, participants explained the choice of practice by reference to the historical context of the time (people's way of life and their context).

The Beliefs type of explanation corresponds to explanation that referred to the values and beliefs of people in the past in the CHATA project. In both cases participants explained the choice of practice by reference to people's beliefs (religious and other).

The Available Options type corresponds to explanations of the choice of practice as a form of deterrence in the CHATA project. The correspondence between the two types of explanation is not obvious at first glance. However, the Available Options type of explanation is based on the idea that people chose the practice in question for reasons that make sense today (i.e., as people would do today, Ancient Greeks and Ancient Maya chose those healing practices because they were the best available). This is the same idea upon which explanations using the notion of deterrence are described the CHATA project (i.e., as people would do today, the Anglo-Saxons used the ordeal because this was a way to discourage people from committing offences).

The Effectiveness type corresponds to explanations that assimilated practices of the past with modern-day known ones in the CHATA project. In both cases participants explained the choice of practice by assimilating it or aspects of it to modern-day ones. In the case of the use of the Effectiveness type this was the explanation of the choice of practice with references to contemporary medicinal knowledge that is valid today, despite the fact that nothing in the practice's description suggested that such knowledge was involved in it.

The Deficit type of explanation corresponds with explanations of what students perceived as paradoxical behaviour in terms of deficit in CHATA project. In both cases participants explained the choice of practice with references to what people in the past did not have or did not know compared to us.

173

The Pseudo-explanations type corresponds with the explanations which fail to distinguish explanation from description in CHATA project. In both cases, participants provide 'explanations' that are essentially descriptions of the practice and/or tautologies and/or references to likes or dislikes.

This typology does not suggest that each participant's response to a pen and paper task can be categorized as belonging to one type of ideas. As already mentioned above, most of the participants used more than one type as an explanation of major importance. It is an attempt to map the different types of ideas used by the participants when explaining the reasons behind the choice of practice made by the groups in question.

5.5 Types of explanation used during interviews.

As discussed in chapter 4 (pp. 146-148), 30 participants who completed pen and paper tasks were also interviewed. Responses to specific questions during their interviews, which asked about differences in behaviour in the past and present in general, were used as a form of a methodological triangulation (Denzin, 1970) to increase the study's internal validity by providing a more comprehensive picture of the participants' ideas. In this sense, interviews aimed to investigate whether participants used during their interview the same types of explanation they used in their pen and paper tasks. In other words, to check the stability of these types of ideas across my data collection instruments (i.e., pen and paper tasks and interviews). Data from interviews were also used to test the robustness of the typology suggested in section 5.4 as a heuristic for modelling ideas related to explanations of the choice of practice. Therefore, data from interviews were coded using the types of explanation developed during the analysis of the pen and paper tasks.

The interview questions used for this part of the analysis were the following:

> Do people today behave the same way as people in the past did under the same circumstances? Why?

What is more likely for you, to behave as a person in the past behaved under the same circumstance or as another person in the present? Why?

Below, I cite an example of a response to these two questions to exemplify the process of coding the interview data.

In his interview, Ian (teacher) argued that people in the present behave differently, primarily because of their different ways of thinking (first question), and this also applies in the case of comparing the behaviour of people in the past and the present (second question). In the case of the latter, Ian also referred to the different ways of life between people in the present and the past.

Do people today behave the same way as people in the past did under the same circumstances?
Even in the present people are different to each other. They have different ways of thinking…they have different degrees of resilience. They also differ in terms of how they deal with situations that cause anxiety. For example, I could be less resilient than you are. Since people in the same time don't think the same, they also don't think the same as people in the past did

What is more likely for you, to behave as a person in the past behaved under the same circumstance or as another person in the present?
Of course, it is likely that I would behave as another person in the present because we have much more in common in terms of our way of life. We live in the same world and many of our views and beliefs are influenced by common factors. For example, the media. I am much closer to people in the present.

Although he did not refer to religious beliefs, Ian mentioned beliefs in general and different ways of thinking (Beliefs type) as a reason for different behaviour which are influenced by people's way of life (Life Forms).

Analysis of the data from responses to the interview questions revealed that the same types of explanations that emerged from the pen and paper tasks, and included in the typology suggested in section 5.4, were also used by participants

175

during interviews. This was in the sense that the interview data could be coded using the typology suggested in section 5.4. The only exception was the Effectiveness type which was not used by any participant during the interview. Also, one participant referred to people's feelings when explaining differences in behaviour between people in the past and the present. This response was coded under a new type of explanation named Feelings.

Even though participants did not often refer to religious beliefs, during interviews, they did refer to other factors related to how people view the world (i.e., different ideas, perceptions, views and ways of thinking). In this sense references to these factors were treated as similar to references to beliefs for the purposes of comparing pen and paper and interview data.

The above show that the same types of explanation (except for the Effectiveness one) were used across data generation instruments and strengthens a) the validity of the claim about their existence in this sample and b) arguments for the robustness of the suggested typology.

Table 5.4 shows the frequency with which participants who were interviewed used the types of explanations in their interview responses and their pen and paper tasks responses.

Table 5.4 Distribution of the use of types of explanation used by participants, who were interviewed, in their interview and pen and paper tasks responses about past practices (N= 30)

This table counts the number of occasions (f) each type of explanation was used and shows the percentage of responses that contained them in interview responses and pen and paper tasks responses. The overall totals do not correspond to the number of participants (30), because most responses used more than one types of explanation. The table also presents the results of the tests for the statistical significance of the differences between response to the two tasks. [48]

Type of explanation	Interview		Pen and paper tasks		Statistical significance
	f	%	F	%	p-value
Life Forms	9	30	3	10	0.1459
Beliefs	16	53	20	67	0.5049
Available Options	4	13	7	23	0.5487
Effectiveness	0	0	9	30	0.0029
Deficit	9	30	22	73	0.0195
Pseudo-explanations	8	27	3	10	0.2263
Feelings	1	3	-		-
Total	47		64		

As the table indicates the frequency with which participants used the types of ideas in their interviews differs from the one observed in the case of the pen and paper tasks. These differences were not equally prominent in all cases. The most prominent differences were the more frequent use of the Effectiveness and the Deficit types in pen and paper tasks than the interviews. These differences were both statistically significant (p=0.0029 for the Effectiveness type and p= 0.0195 for the Deficit type). Participants were also more likely to use Beliefs and the Available Options types in interviews than the pen and paper tasks. However, these differences were not statistically significant. On the other hand, participants were

---

[48] In the case of comparisons that contain values equal or above 5, the results of chi-square tests are reported. In the case of comparison that contains values lower than 5 the results, Fisher's exact tests are reported. The latter is because for values below 5 Fisher's exact tests are considered to be a more adequate way of testing the statistical significance of differences.

more likely to use the Life Forms and the Pseudo-explanation types in their interviews than their pen and paper tasks. These differences were also not statistically significant.

Furthermore, despite the fact that none of the participants used a reference to feelings in their pen and paper tasks, one participant did so in their interview. Despite this being only one occasion, findings according to which ideas related to affective aspects seem to emerge more readily in some types of tasks than others are reported by other studies (Brooks, 2008; de Leur, van Boxtel and Wilschut, 2017; Wilschut and Schiphorst, 2019).

Twelve participants (out of 30 who were interviewed) used the Beliefs type in both the pen and paper tasks and the interview, six did the same with the Deficit type, two with the Life Forms, one with the Available Options and one with the Pseudo-explanations one. Only three participants were fully consistent in terms of using the same type or types of explanation across tasks (pen and paper tasks and interview). In all three cases, the participants used the Beliefs type as their sole explanation.

The above suggest that the setting of the tasks (pen and paper task vs interview) and/or the questions (explanations of a choice of practices vs explanations of differences in behaviour) and/or the behaviour in question (specific practices vs behaviour in general) affected the frequency with which the types of ideas were used in the sample of this study and the stability of their use for individual participants. It is for example possible that asking participants about the choice of a practice which is considered ineffective today, based on the beliefs of long-gone religion (in pen and paper tasks), prompted them to think about deficits (Deficit type) more readily than in the case of asking them about behaviour in the past in general (in interviews). On the other hand, asking about differences in behaviour in general, without a specific content (in interviews), possibly prompted the participants to think about a more general notion such as people's way of life (Life Forms) more often. It is also possible that such general questions in the interview task baffled participants, who resorted to tautologies and superficial references to wants and likes (Pseudo-explanations) more often than they did in their pen and paper tasks responses.

The comparison of responses between the two different data generation instruments shows that types of explanations proposed by the present study were a) stable across instruments in terms of the same types being used by participants in both cases, b) not stable in terms of how individual participants used them and c) not stable in terms of the frequency with which they were used.

Existing literature on research on ideas of historical empathy does not provide much insight into the stability of use of types of explanations across different types of tasks. This is because a) even though research in students' ideas of historical empathy often employs the use of both kinds of research instruments (pen and paper tasks and interviews), published findings do not compare responses to them and b) previous studies did not ask questions about differences in past and present behaviour in general.

A study that explored students' ideas about variations in historical accounts does suggest that types of responses that emerge from pen and paper tasks are consistent across instruments when identical questions (albeit without specific content) are asked in interviews (Chapman, 2009b). However, in the case of this study identical questions (i.e., why people in the past did what they did), as discussed in Chapter 4 (p. 148), would not make much sense. The findings of the present study suggest that participants responded to the general questions of the interview as different questions. As discussed in section 5.2, the present study and a number of previous studies of students' ideas of historical empathy demonstrated the same effect (i.e., different questions prompting the use of different ideas with different frequency (Berti et. al., 2009; Perikleous, 2011; Brooks, 2008; de Leur, dan Boxtel and Wilschut, 2017; Wilschut and Schiphorst, 2019).

In the light of the above, it can be argued that this study provides evidence for the stability of the use of the same types of explanation of the choice of practice across tasks. The types of explanation that emerged from the analysis of the pen and paper tasks were sufficient in order to also code the responses in the interview tasks. This in turn provides evidence for the robustness of the typology of explanations of the choice of practice suggested in section 5.4 in terms of a heuristic for modelling responses to questions not only about the choice of certain practices (as in the pen

and paper tasks) but also questions about the behaviour of people in the past in a more general sense (as in the case of the interview questions).

The different frequency with which the types of explanation were used in the pen and paper tasks and the interview questions and the lack of consistency in terms of the types used by individual participants do not challenge the above. They do suggest though those different settings, types of questions and content of behaviour to be explained affect the use of types of explanation.

5.6 Conclusion

This chapter responded to the first research question of the study (What kinds of ideas are used by Greek Cypriot primary students and teachers when asked to explain the choice of practices made by people in the past in the past?). The data analysis in this chapter suggests the existence of six main types of explanation of the choice of practices in the past (Life Forms, Beliefs, Available Options, Effectiveness, Deficit and Pseudo-explanations). Based on this, the chapter proposes a typology of explanations. The fact that this typology corresponds to the types of explanation reported by previous studies and also the fact that this typology was efficient in coding the participants' responses to interview questions about differences in behaviour between people in the past and the present in general suggests that it can be used for heuristic purposes; to model explanations of past behaviour.

Even though individual case studies (as the present one) usually cannot make claims for generalizations, the replication of findings of several case studies can support arguments of external validity. These arguments are based on an idea of analytic generalization in terms of 'the extraction of a more abstract level of ideas from a set of case study findings − ideas that nevertheless can pertain to newer situations other than the case(s) in the original case study' (Yin, 2013, p. 325). This is essentially the same idea based on which Lee and Ashby (2001) ask for 'more work across different cultures [which] may shed further light on the currency of similar sets of ideas [to those identified by other research projects], and their stability in different educational and social environments (p. 45).

In this sense, the fact that this study replicates the findings of my previous study with Greek Cypriot students adds to both studies' external validity in terms of the existence of such ideas in this specific educational context. This argument of course will be strengthened if these findings are confirmed by future studies in the Greek Cypriot context by other researchers. Also, the fact that similar ideas are reported by international research contributes to these studies' (and mine) external validity in terms of the stability of these ideas in a variety of contexts. Besides the obvious implications for research these findings also have important implications in terms of education since they suggest that practices and policies in terms of development of curricula, teaching materials, teachers' training etc. can be shared across contexts.

The data analysis in this chapter also showed that participants used the different types of explanation with different frequencies in their responses to different questions in the pen and paper tasks. It also showed that the differences between pen and paper and interview questions affected the types of explanations used by the participants. The phenomenon of different kinds of questions and content of tasks prompting references to certain types of explanations with different frequency is reported in previous studies too. These findings have important implications both for research and teaching practice. In terms of research these findings point out the need for comprehensive approaches that use a variety of ways to prompt participants to think about past behaviour and in this way allow us to look at different aspects of their ideas of historical empathy. In terms of teaching practice these findings stress the importance of using a variety of tasks and approaches which invite students to think about past behaviour and express their views about it in a variety of ways.

This chapter discussed findings in terms of this study's participants' preconceptions of historical empathy. As discussed in Chapter 1 (pp. 17-18), students' preconceptions 'can be helpful to history teachers but they can also create problems because ideas that work well in everyday world are not always applicable in the study of history' (Lee, 2005, p. 31). In the case of historical empathy, the concept is obviously against students' everyday experience of the world since they are asked to deal with people who lived in a very distant temporal and sometimes spatial context and had very different ideas, beliefs and aspirations. Being aware our students'

ideas allow as to develop ways in which we either build on them or overturn them so we can help them to move to more powerful ones.

The above suggests that besides the identification of different types of explanation in participants' responses, we also need to have sense of differences in sophistication of these explanations. Furthermore, as demonstrated in this chapter most of the responses did not conform to ideal types of the suggested typology. Only three of them used a single type of explanation across all tasks (pen and paper tasks and interview). As discussed in this chapter, this can be explained mainly by the fact that different questions prompted the use of types of explanations with different frequency. In this sense, the next chapter (Chapter 6) proposes a model of progression of the types of explanation (in terms of their sophistication) and tests this models' ability to model responses to each completed task as a whole rather than separate answers to a series of questions.

Chapter 6: Data and Discussion: sophistication of explanations of the choice of practice

6.1 Introduction

This chapter provides further insights to research question 1 (What kinds of ideas are used by Greek Cypriot primary students and teachers when asked to explain the choice of practices made by people in the past?) by looking at issues of sophistication of the explanations of the choice of practice. More specifically in this chapter, I propose a model of progression of ideas based on the typology suggested in Chapter 5 (pp. 170-171) and test its ability to model responses to completed pen and paper tasks that asked about choices of practice in the past (section 6.3) and interviews that asked about past behaviour in general (section 6.4) rather than separate answers to individual questions.

Proposing a model of progression, in terms of different degrees of sophistication, is based on the idea that mapping different types of explanation of the choice of practice is of limited pedagogical value in the absence of a suggestion of a possible route from simplistic ideas to more powerful ones. Such a model can be used for diagnostical purposes and can also inform how teaching interventions (for students) and training interventions (for teachers) can support the development of ideas of historical empathy.

Testing the model's ability to model responses as a whole rather than separate answers to individual questions is based on the idea that responses to single questions cannot define the sophistication of the overall response. As discussed in Chapter 5 (pp. 161-165), individual participants in the present study used different types of explanation to answer different questions and this phenomenon was observed in other studies too. This suggests that different questions prompt the use of different ways of thinking about past behaviour. Furthermore, as discussed in Chapter 4 (pp. 137-149), the use of different questions in the pen and paper tasks and the interview aimed to prompt the participants to think about different aspects of the choices made by people in the past and past behaviour in general. In this sense, looking at responses as a whole can arguably provide a more comprehensive view of their sophistication. This also allowed the discussion of differences in

sophistication according to a) the age of the participants in Chapter 7 and b) temporal and cultural distance in Chapter 8.

Data discussion in this chapter shows that the suggested progression model can serve heuristic purposes in terms of its ability to model data from answers to both individual questions and responses as whole in pen and paper tasks and interviews. It also showed that this progression model has the potential to serve diagnostic purposes. This is in the sense that the discussion demonstrates how responses to both pen and paper tasks and interviews revealed lines of thought that could be assigned to different levels of the progression model, which suggest different level of sophistication. Finally, this chapter provides insights of the pedagogical value of the suggested progression model by proposing a possible route from simplistic ideas to more powerful ideas and discussing examples of how students' and teachers' ideas can progress.

6.2 A progression model of explanations of the choice of practice

As discussed in Chapter 3 (pp. 98-108), researched based progression models in the area of history education are attempts to map students' preconceptions of history as a discipline. They 'derive from research employing inductive categories to pick out broad divisions of ideas in children's responses to tasks, but they also owe much to the early days of SHP analysis of examination responses, which added considerably to our knowledge of children's ideas' (Lee and Shemilt, 2003, p. 15). In progression models these typologies describe ideal types related to each other hierarchically in terms of sophistication. In other words, a progression model describes a route from simplistic ideas about history to more powerful ones. As also discussed in Chapter 3, this is not a route that all students have been observed to follow and neither one that they should follow. Progression models map preconceptions and suggest possible paths towards more powerful ideas.

The typology suggested in Chapter 5 also reveals different degrees of sophistication between the ideal types included in it. Below, I suggest a progression model based on this typology and discuss how the different types of explanation that emerged

from my data analysis suggest different degrees of sophistication of explanations of the choice of practice.

Level 1-Pseudo-explanations: The Pseudo-explanations type of explanation is at the first (lower) level of this model. Answers that used this type did not provide any explanations of the choice of practice. Instead, they referred to a general notion of the practices or aspects of them being liked by the people in the past and/or provided descriptions of the practices and/or used tautologies (i.e., the fact that people needed to be cured). Below, I cite some examples of explanations at this level

> *I think [Ancient Greeks chose this treatment because they loved Asclepieon a lot [and] because they liked to sleep. (Teyla, Year 3, Questions 2 and 3, Ancient Greeks)*
> *I think they chose this treatment because after the ceremony they all danced, ate and drunk. (Dean, Year 5, Question 2, Ancient Greeks)*
> *I agree [with the choice of treatments by the Ancient Maya], because everyone wants to be cured from a disease. (Bobby, Year 5, Question 5, Ancient Maya)*

Many answers at this level essentially failed to distinguish between explanations (which was what it was asked) and descriptions (which was what these answers provided). They also did not seem to acknowledge any differences between the perspectives of people in the past or the historical context in which they lived and their own ones.

Level 2-The past as a version of the present often inhabited by inferior people: The Deficit and the Effectiveness types of explanation are at the second level of the model. Answers that used these two types referred to the choice of practice by people in the past using the present as their point of reference. Hence, they argued that people in the past chose the practice in questions because they did not have the rationality, knowledge or means we have to today or because the practice was effective. In the case of the latter, they essentially assimilated the practice to modern day ones and referred to aspects of it that could contribute to healing according to

our own contemporary views of what is beneficial to health. Below, I cite some examples of answers at this level.

> *Ancient Greeks chose this treatment because they didn't have any other choice to fight with diseases because they didn't know how to be cured and, also they didn't have medicines to cure themselves. (Ben, Year 5, Question 2, Ancient Greeks).*
>
> *[Today we do not use chose this treatment], because now technology has evolved, and with machines we know what kind of disease each patient has. (Clark, Year 6, Question 7, Ancient Greeks)*
>
> *I think that there was one more reason. Ancient Maya knew how to use therapeutic medicine [drugs] and herbs. So, because they were good healers cured the patient quite easily. Hence it wouldn't be possible for the cure of the patient to be related with imaginary gods. (Deanna, Year 4, Question 3, Ancient Maya)*

Unlike Level 1 answers, at Level 2 participants were able to suggest explanations for the choices people in the past made. However, in these answers the perspectives of people in the past were viewed as either inferior or identical versions of the ones of people in the present and the different historical context was not acknowledged.

Level 3-The past as a different world, inhabited by modern-day people: The Available Options type is at the third level of this model. Answers at this level acknowledged that people in the past lived in a different situation and referred to their choice of practice as the choice of the best available option at the time. Weaker responses at this level did not disengage completely from the present and described the practice in question as the best available option in the absence of modern medical knowledge and means. Below, I cite some examples of answers at this level.

> *I believe that they chose it because it was the best way to get well and to be cured so they chose this treatment. (Wade, Year 6, Question 2, Ancient Greeks)*
>
> *I agree [with the Ancient Greek's choice of treatment] because it was the most correct at the time, because others were completely random such as oracles. (Leonard, Year 4, Question 5, Ancient Greeks)*

186

[If I was an Ancient Greek], I would choose it [the treatment] despite being unreasonable because it would be the only way to be saved. (Liam, Year 5, Question 6, Ancient Greeks)

At this level, participants seemed to realise that people in the past lived in a different context, so they did not view them as inferior to us and they did not assimilate their practices to known ones. A key difference to the previous level is that at this level participants begun to look for explanations in terms of why the choices made by people in the past were reasonable. However, they still failed to acknowledge their different perspectives. Instead, they explained the choice of practice in terms of what would be reasonable for modern-day people to do; choose the best available treatment.

Level 4-The past as a different world inhabited by different people: The Beliefs type is at the fourth level of this model. Answers at this level acknowledged that people in the past made their choices based on their own beliefs that were different from our own ones. Below, I cite some answers at this level.

They [Ancient Greeks] were faithful to their religion. They believed that they would heal with the help of religion... They were positive that Asclepius would give the correct diagnosis for their disease. (River, Teacher, Question 1, Ancient Greeks)

[Ancient Greeks chose this treatment] because they believed it was probably the only one that could cure them (Ahsoka, Year 5, Question 2, Ancient Greeks).

I believe that Ancient Maya chose this ceremony of therapy because, logically, they were extremely faithful to certain "Maya gods" and they prayed to the "Maya gods" and they cured the patient. (Daisy, Year 6, Question 2, Ancient Maya)

This is a breakthrough, since this kind of responses acknowledged that these choices could not be explained by reference to what is reasonable or rational today. Instead, participants looked for explanations to the different way people in the past viewed their different world. At this level, participants acknowledged the different

187

perspectives of people in the past and looked for answers not to 'what makes sense' but to 'what would made sense' for them.

Level 5-The past as a different world that shaped different people: The Life Forms type is at the higher level of this model. At this level, answers went beyond the acknowledgment that people held their own beliefs which were different and viewed these beliefs and the choice of practice as an intrinsic part of the way of life of the groups in question. Below, I cite some examples of answers at this level.

> *I disagree with the choice of this treatment, although I cannot be objective since the circumstances today are very different from the ones of the Mayan era. Maybe, if I lived at that time, I would consider this treatment to be a rational one. It would be part of my way life. (Ian, Teachers, Question 5, Ancient Maya)*
>
> *[If I was an Ancient Maya] I would choose it [the treatment], because this would be what I learned to do from an early age and the right think for my family. If I was an Ancient Maya I would have got used to this way and I believe that this would have been the only way that all Maya new. (Leia, Year 5, Question 6, Ancient Maya)*
>
> *Maybe the treatment the Ancient Maya chose was related in a way with their way of life or maybe with one of their characteristics. (Kendra, Year 6, Question 2, Ancient Maya)*

At this level, participants not only acknowledged the different perspectives of people in the past and the different historical context but also attempted to relate the latter to the former. At this level, answers began to offer contemplations for the reasons people in the past viewed the world differently and to look for answers to this in the historical context in which their choices were made.

As discussed in Chapter 3, during the last four decades a number of progression models of ideas of historical empathy, and more specifically explanations of past behaviour, based on the work of Peter Lee, Rosalyn Ashby, Alaric Dickinson and Denis Shemilt were proposed (Lee, 1978; Shemilt, 1984; Dickinson and Lee, 1984, Ashby and Lee, 1987, Lee and Shemilt, 2010). Studies by other researchers used the progression models suggested by Lee, Dickinson, Ashby and Shemilt in order to

map the ideas of their participants (see for example, Kourgiantakis, 2005; Rantalla et. al., 2015; Berti et. al. 2009; Rantala, 2011). Other studies, following a similar approach to the one of the present study, attempted to develop their own progression models, which are grounded on the ideas that emerged from their own data. This was the case of a study by Bermudez and Jaramillo (2001) and my previous study in Cyprus (Perikleous, 2011). In both cases, the suggested progression models describe a similar route of as the one described in by the models discussed above.

This is essentially a continuum of different degrees to which the perspective of people in the past and the historical context in which they lived are taken into consideration in explanations of past behaviour. The perspectives of people in the past and their historical context are identified as the two key aspects upon which progress of ideas of historical empathy takes place in the work of other researchers too. For example, as discussed in Chapter 3, Endacott and Brooks (2013) define historical contextualization and perspective taking, along with affective connection, as the key aspects of historical empathy. Also, Hartmann and Hasselhorn (2008), suggested a standardized measure that measures ideas of historical empathy along three aspects. The first one, *contextualization*, corresponds to the historical context, while the other two, *presentist point of view* and *role of the agent*, correspond to the ideas of taking into consideration the perspective of people in the past.

As it can be seen in its description, the progression model suggested by the present study describes a similar route from explanations that fail to provide explanations (Level 1) and view the past as another version of the present where people were inferior (Level 2) to ones that explain past behaviour taking into consideration the different way people in the past viewed the world and the different context in which they lived (Level 5). Furthermore, the different levels of the suggested progression model correspond to similar levels proposed by previous studies. Below I compare the progression model suggested in this chapter with the one proposed by Lee and Shemilt (2011). As discussed in Chapter 3, the latter is based on the previous work of CHATA project and SHP and progression models suggested by Lee (1978), Shemilt (1984), Dickinson and Lee (1984), Lee and Ashby (1987) and Lee,

189

Dickinson and Ashby (2001). Figure 6.1 presents this comparison. The use of the same colour denotes similar ideas.

Figure 6.1: Progression models suggested by the present study and Lee and Shemilt (2011)

Progression model	Perikleous (2022)	Lee and Shemilt (2011)
Levels	Level 1: Pseudo-explanations	Level 1: Explanation by description
	Level 2: The past as a version of the present often inhabited by inferior people.	Level 2: Explanation by assimilation to the known present or by identification of deficits in the past.
		Level 3: Explanation by stereotype.
	Level 3: The past as a different world inhabited by modern day people.	Level 4: Explanations by means of everyday empathy.
	Level4: The past as different world inhabited by different people.	Level 5: Explanations by means of historical empathy
	Level 5: The past as a different world that shaped different people.	Level 6: Explanation with reference to forms of life.

As shown in the above figure, the **Pseudo-explanations** level of the suggested model corresponds to the **Explanations by description** level in Lee and Shemilt (2010). In both cases, responses at this level fail to distinguish between explanations and descriptions and '[r]equests for explanations are met by the reiteration or addition of information' (Lee and Shemilt, 2010, p. 42). **The past as a version of the present often inhabited by inferior people** level corresponds to the **Explanation**

by assimilation to the known present or by identification of deficits in the past level in Lee and Shemilt (2010). In both cases, responses at this level explain past behaviour, by adjusting 'what they read or told about the past to render it as unproblematic as the present' or by citing 'deficits in knowledge, intelligence, sensibility, technology' (Lee and Shemilt, 2010, p. 42). **The past as a different world inhabited by modern day people** level describes ideas similar to the **Explanations by means of everyday empathy** level in Lee and Shemilt (2010). In both cases past behaviour is explained in terms of why 'past practices "were reasonable" [in present day terms, not why they] "were reasonable from the perspective of people in the past"' (Lee and Shemilt, 2010). **The past as a different world inhabited by different people** level corresponds to the **Explanations by means of historical empathy** level in Lee and Shemilt (2010). In both models, responses at this level acknowledge that 'although people in the past had the same capacities for thoughts and feelings as we do, they did not see the world as we see it today' (Lee and Shemilt, 2010, p. 42). Finally, both **The past as a different world that shaped different people** level, in the suggested model, and the **Explanation with reference to forms of life** level, in the model by Lee and Shemilt (2010) model describe responses that 'demonstrate an awareness between perspectives and material conditions of life' (Lee and Shemilt, 2010, p.42).

As showed in the above figure, the progression model suggested by the present study does not contain a level that corresponds to the **Explanation by stereotype** level on Lee and Shemilt (2010). This can be explained by the fact that in previous studies explanations by stereotype often occurred when participants were asked to explain individual behaviour, rather than practices as in the present study. For example, a response at this level would explain 'Custer's actions by pointing out that he was a general and generals are often risk-takers and glory-seekers' (Lee and Shemilt, 2010, p. 42). It can also be explained by the fact that the practices in question might not connect to any stereotypes known to the participants. In other words, it is possible that the level might emerge in a study with different participants and different behaviour (individual or collective) to be explained.

6.3 Sophistication of participants' responses in pen and paper tasks

As discussed, and exemplified in the previous section different types of explanation that emerged from the data analysis suggest different degrees of sophistication of explanations of the choice of practice. The suggested progression model was based on these differences. In this sense, responses to the pen and paper tasks that conformed to an ideal type (only one type of explanation was used in them) could be placed in the level that corresponds to it. For example, a response to a task that conformed to the Available Options ideal type (i.e., a response in which only the Available Options type of explanation was used) could be placed at Level 3 (*The past as a different world inhabited by modern day people*).

However, as discussed in Chapter 5, instead of using a single type of explanation, most of the participants usually used a combination of them to answer different questions and in some case even a single question. Only 21 responses (out of 93 responses to a task about a past practice) conformed to an ideal type. This can be explained by the fact that, as discussed in Chapter 5 (pp. 161-165), different questions prompted the use of different types of explanations with different frequency.

Due to the phenomenon described above, assigning responses as a whole (treating the answers to all seven questions of a task as a single response) to different levels of the suggested progression model was obviously not as straightforward as working with responses to individual questions. However, looking at the sophistication of participants' responses as a whole, rather than answers to individual questions, is a more comprehensive way to map ideas of historical empathy (and more specifically explanations of the choice of practice). The fact that different questions prompted the use of different types of explanation support this argument. Also, such an approach takes into consideration how participants responded to different kinds of questions that, as discussed in Chapter 4 (pp. 140-143), aimed to prompt them to think about different aspects of the choice of practice made by the groups in question. In this sense, a progression model's that can describe responses as a whole allows a more exhaustive a) description of the kinds of ideas used by

participants when asked to explain the choices of practice (Research Question 1), b) exploration of differences according to participants age (Research Question 2) and c) exploration of differences according to cultural and temporal distance (Research Question 3).

In order to assign responses to the levels of the progression model, the 93 responses to tasks about past practices (87 provided by students and six by teachers) were examined separately. The decision for the level to which a response corresponded was based on the line of thought that it was revealed by the way the different types of explanation were used to respond to the tasks questions. As already mentioned, this was not a straightforward task. A criterion was how often a type of explanation was used in a response. It was not the only one though. Another criterion was the line of thought about the choice of practice that was suggested by the different combinations of types of explanations within a response. In this sense, a certain type of explanation could be used in responses of different degrees of sophistication. For example, two responses that used the Deficit type of explanation (along with other types) could be assigned to different levels of the progression model. The combination of types of explanation used in a response proved to be an indication, but not a conclusive way to define a response's level of sophistication. In this sense, responses that used the same combination of types of explanation could also be assigned to different levels of the progression model.

This process is discussed in more detail and exemplified below. In each case I discuss the main characteristics of the responses that corresponded to each level of the progression model and how the use of different types of explanation revealed ideas that matched to the level in question.

6.3.1 Level 1: Pseudo-explanations

Reponses at Level 1 essentially did not provide explanations of the choice of practice. Instead, they used tautologies and/or descriptions and/or references to preferences that do not constitute explanations. At this level, responses did not seem to acknowledge the different perspectives of people in the past or the different historical context in which they lived.

193

Twelve responses out of 93 (13%) were deemed as Level 1 responses. As noted in section 6.2, responses that conformed to an ideal type of the typology suggested in Chapter 5 (i.e., the type was the only one used in them) were assigned to the level of the progression model to which this type corresponded. In the case of Level 1, these were responses that explained the choice of practice made by the groups solely in terms of personal preferences and/or the will of the people to be cured (tautologies) and/or provided descriptions of the practice rather than explanations (Pseudo-explanations type). Five responses fell in this category. Below I discuss the response of Teyla (Year 3) to the Ancient Greeks task.

Teyla used the Pseudo-explanations type to respond to Questions 2, 3 and 6 in the Ancient Greeks task.

> *I think [they chose this treatment because] they loved Asclepieon a lot. (Teyla, Year 3, Ancient Greeks, Question 2)*

> *[They chose this treatment] because they liked to sleep. (Teyla, Year 3, Ancient Greeks, Question 3)*

> *No, [I would not choose this treatment if I was an Ancient Greek], because I get sick all the time and I don't like to sleep. (Teyla, Year 3, Ancient Greeks, Question 6)*

Her answers to the rest of the questions did not comment on the choice of practice. Instead, they expressed her own concern for the practice's duration that might have resulted in the patient's death.

> *[This practice is] not good, because a patient might die until all these things are done. (Teyla, Year 3, Ancient Greeks, Question 1)*
> *I disagree [with the choice of treatment], because someone might die until all these are done. (Teyla, Year 3, Ancient Greeks, Question 5)*
> *[Today we do not choose this treatment], because someone might die until all these are done. (Teyla, Year 3, Ancient Greeks, Question 5)*

Finally, she responded Question 4, by simply stating that she does not see anything strange in the choice of practice.

> *I don't find something strange [about the fact that Ancient Greeks choose this treatment]. (Teyla, Year 3, Ancient Greeks, Question 4)*

Teyla's response essentially did not provide any explanation about the reasons behind the Ancient Greeks' choice of practice. Instead, she focused on two aspect of the practice (the place of the ceremony and the fact that they slept during part of the ceremony) and argues that Ancient Greeks simply liked them. She also expressed her concerns for the long duration of the treatment.

Seven more responses were deemed to belong to Level 1. Unlike the previous five that conformed to the Pseudo-explanations ideal type, these responses also used other types of explanation. The most prominent pattern in this group was the use of the Pseudo-explanations type along with the Deficit type. Five responses used the two types alone or along with one more type. Below I discuss the example of Jean-Luc (Year 4).

In his response to the Ancient Maya task, Jean-Luc used the Pseudo-explanations to answer Questions 2 and 6

> *Because they might like fasting and listening to prayers for the gods. (Jean-Luc, Ancient Maya, Question 2)*
> *Yes, I would choose this treatment because I would have thought it would be nice for all these to happen just for a treatment. (Jean-Luc, Ancient Maya, Question 6)*

He also used the Beliefs type to answer Questions 3.

> *I think they said prayers to send away the evil spirits. (Jean-Luc, Ancient Maya, Question 3)*

He also used the Deficit type in his answer to Question 7.

> *Because we have clinics, hospitals and many many doctors. In this way it is easier to cure people. (Jean-Luc, Ancient Maya, Question 7)*

His answers to Questions 1, 4 and 5 did not provide any explanations for the choice of practice.

> *I believe that the Ancient Mayan were good because they didn't harm other people. ((Jean-Luc, Ancient Maya, Question 1)*
>
> *I don't find anything strange. (Jean-Luc, Ancient Maya, Question 4)*
>
> *I agree [with their choice of treatment], because prayers to send the evil spirits away and prayers to their gods were right. (Jean-Luc, Ancient Maya, Question 5)*

Despite the fact the Jean-Luc used two more types of explanation along with the Pseudo-explanations type, his response was largely a description rather than an explanation of the choice of practice. Although there were clear references to religious beliefs in his answers to Question 3, this was essentially a repetition of the description of the practice provided by the task which mentioned that '[d]uring the ceremony, the healer prayed to the gods. He also made invocations to the gods to send away the evil spirits'.

Furthermore, despite the fact that his reference to our society's superiority in terms of medical means (Question 7), is clearly a claim about a deficit of the people in the past, the answer is essentially a statement about our choices (i.e., today we use this means because they are more effective) rather than the choices of people in the past. This phenomenon of answering Question 7, by essentially explaining the choices of practice most people make today rather than the choices of the groups in question, can be observed in a number of responses. Cases like the one of Jean-Luc, where the Deficit type was only used in Question 7 in the way described above, were not deemed as Level 2 responses (i.e., responses that explain the choices of practice in terms of deficit or by assimilating aspects of the practice to contemporary ones that are considered to be effective).

6.3.2 Level 2: The past as a version of the present often inhabited by inferior people

Responses at Level 2 explained the choice of practice by people in the past using the present as their only point of reference. People in the past chose the practice in

question because they did not have the rationality, knowledge and means we have today or because the practice was effective. In the case of the latter, they refer to aspects of the practice that could contribute to healing according to contemporary views of what is beneficial to health. In some cases, participants referred to beliefs upon which the practice was based. However, they viewed these beliefs as the result of deficits or people misinterpreting the healing properties of the practice as divine intervention. At this level, the perspectives of people in the past were viewed as simply inferior versions of the ones of people in the present and the different historical context was not acknowledged.

Twenty-nine responses out of 93 (31%) were deemed as Level 2 responses. Eight of these were responses that explained the choice of practice made by the groups solely in terms of deficits of people in the past (Deficit type) and/or by referring to the practice's effectiveness (usually assimilating the practice to modern day ones and referring to aspects of it that could contribute to healing according to our own contemporary views) (Effectiveness type). Below, I discuss the response of El (Year 3) to the Ancient Maya task that conformed to the Effectiveness ideal type, the response of Philippa (Year 4) to the Ancient Greek task that conformer to the Deficit ideal type and the response of Danny (teacher) to the Ancient Greeks task who used both the Deficit and the Effectiveness type.

El (Year 3) used the Effectiveness type in her answers to Questions 2, 5 and 6.
> *[They chose this treatment], because this treatment cured all patients. (El, Ancient Maya, Question 2).*
> *I agree [with their choice of treatment], because fasting is the best treatment (El, Ancient Maya, Question 5)*
> *Yes, [I would choose this treatment if I was an Ancient Maya] because fasting is the best treatment. (El, Ancient Maya, Question 6)*

In her responses to Questions 1, 3, 4 and 7, El did not provide any explanations of the choice of practice.
> *My opinion is that they [the Ancient Maya] are good because they visited the healer. (El, Ancient Maya, Question 1)*

197

There is nothing strange in this choice of treatment. (El, Ancient Maya, Question 4)

[Today we do not use this treatment], because they threw seed and today we don't throw seeds (El, Ancient Maya, Question 7)

As can be seen in her answers, for El, Ancient Maya chose the practice in question because it was effective, and this effectiveness was due to the benefits of fasting. In other words, El assimilated the Mayan treatment to fasting which, today, is considered by many as beneficial to health.

Philippa (Year 4) used the Deficit type of explanation to answer Questions 2, 4 and 7.

I think [they chose this treatment] because those days medicines did not exist (Philippa, Ancient Greeks, Question 2).

I don't find it [the choice of treatment] strange because back then they didn't have medicines (Philippa, Ancient Greeks, Question 4)

[We do not choose this treatment today] because today we have medicines and we can cure easier. (Philippa, Ancient Greeks, Question 7)

Her answers to Questions 1, 3, 5 and 6 did not provide explanations of the choice of practice.

I think that naming the treatment Katharsis makes sense because they cure the sick and they did different other things for their health (Philippa, Ancient Greeks, Question 1).

I don't think that there were [additional reasons for their choice of treatment] (Philippa, Ancient Greeks, Question 3).

I disagree [with their choicer of treatment] because it doesn't make sense to have them on a diet (Philippa, Ancient Greeks, Question 5).

No, [I would not choose this treatment if I was an Ancient Maya] because if it was me I wouldn't choose this treatment (Philippa, Ancient Greeks, Question 6).

As evident by her answers, Philippa was consistent in explaining the choice of practice in terms of a deficit of the Ancient Maya. This was the fact that they did not have the pharmaceutical products that are available to us today.

Danny (teacher) used both the Deficit and the Effectiveness type in his answer to Questions 1, 2, 5 and 7 (parts of the answer coded as Deficit type are highlighted in yellow while parts coded as Effectiveness type are highlighted in blue).

> *This process proves once more the cleverness of the ancients and their faith in "axioms" such as "a healthy mind in a healthy body". In this "katharsis" relaxed the patient physically and psychologically and lead him to a kind of self-healing or at least a milder condition…In general, preparations for treatment and the understanding of diseases is a basic principle of medicine today too. The available means back then were of course very limited compared to the modern-day reality. However, the philosophy of healing remains the same. (Danny, Ancient Greeks, Question 1).*
>
> *[They chose this treatment because] psychosomatic treatment is definitely the most comprehensive one and today we know this. Regardless the differences in processes caused by progress the dealing with the problem remains the same, only with more reliable means (Danny, Ancient Greeks, Question 2).*

> *I think that they had bery limited available means. However, I believe that it was very clever because through all these observations they created an archive for diseases and their development taking information (in an elaborate way) from the patients regarding the cure (a saying which does not apply today says the best doctor is ourselves) (Danny, Ancient Greeks, Question 5).*
>
> *[We do not use this treatment today] because today's medical practices and knowledge are far more advanced and provide us with more secure diagnoses and much more accurate treatments. However, in many case we do this process [the Ancient Greek one] subconsciously when we sense that we are not suffering from something serious (Danny, Ancient Greeks, Question 7).*

He also used the Effectiveness type in his answer to Question 6.

As a first approach, yes [I would choose this treatment if I was an Ancient Maya], since it is almost painless and in simple diseases it would be effective (Danny, teacher, Ancient Greeks, Question 6).

Danny also used a Minor Code to answer question 3. This, however, was an explanation of minor importance within Danny's response since it was used only when he was asked to provide possible additional reasons behind the choice of practice and did not re-appear in the answers of any the other questions.

1) The financial aspect always affects every medical trend. The several day treatment income would be sufficient to support the Asclepieon.

2) Controlling people through the presence of greater powers (divine ones) was part of power administration/ preservation (Danny, teacher, Ancient Greeks, Question 3).

Finally, his answer to Question 4 did not provide an explanation of the choice of practice.

I don't find something strange. I would simply like to know the effectiveness of these treatment. Also, the reactions of those who didn't get well (Danny, teacher, Ancient Greeks, Question 4).

Interestingly, Danny, although he deemed the choice of practice as based on the Ancient Greeks' inferior understanding of medicine and means, he still argued that this choice was also based on knowledge that is valid today (i.e., taking into consideration biological and psychological aspects of treatments, collecting data that inform treatments). His references both to deficits of the Ancient Greeks and what he perceived as an advanced understanding of human biology and psychology essentially explained the choice of practice by using the present as their only point of reference. In the case of the former, he discussed the choice of practice in terms of Ancient Greeks' deficits compared to the present. In the case of the later, he assimilated aspects of the Ancient Greek practice to modern-day medical treatments.

In eleven responses that were assigned to Level 2, the Deficit and/or the Effectiveness types were used along the Beliefs type. As demonstrated below in the

discussion of the responses of Deanna (Year 4) to the Ancient Maya task and Clark (Year 6) to the Ancient Greeks task, the use of the Beliefs type was not a sufficient condition for a response to be assigned to the higher levels of the progression model.

Deanna used the Beliefs and the Deficit types of explanation in her answer to Question 2 (parts of the answer coded as Deficit type are highlighted in yellow while parts coded as Beliefs type are highlighted in green).

> *I think that this [the choice of the treatment in question] is because Ancient Maya, as other people in the past, were not as rational as we are today. They believed in gods to explain certain phenomena for which they didn't know the correct answer. So they offered presents-honours to the gods believing that in this way they would heal* (Deanna, Year 4, Ancient Maya, Question 2).

In her answer to Question 7, Deanna also used the Deficit type along with a Minor Code (parts of the answer coded as Deficit type are highlighted in yellow while parts coded as a Minor Code are highlighted in pink). The latter was deemed as an explanation of minor importance in her answer since it was a mere reference to different diseases that it was not developed in her response.

> *Because today we have the means to heal easier. And because we are not used to injuries and diseases like the Ancient Maya were we would suffer to recover.* (Deanna, Year 4, Ancient Maya, Question 7).

She also used the Effectiveness type in her answer to question 3.

> *I think that there was one more reason. Ancient Maya knew how to use therapeutic medicine [drugs] and herbs. So, because they were good healers cured the patient quite easily. Hence it wouldn't be possible for the cure of the patient to be related with imaginary gods (Deanna, Year 4, Question 3, Ancient Maya).*

In her answers to the rest of the question, Deanna did not provide explanations of the choice of practice. Instead, she expressed her disagreement with aspects of the Ancient Mayan treatment (mainly its long duration).

I believe that there was no need for the patient to wait for so many days until the healer decides to treat him. The best thing to do (for the healer) should be to cure the patient as soon as possible. Also, I believe that the patient's fasting before the treatment made the situation worse (Deanna, Year 4, Ancient Maya, Question 1).

I find it strange that the healer used the plaque- calendar and the seeds to decide when to treat the patient. He could treat him a day when they didn't have someone else to treat (Deanna, Year 4, Ancient Maya, Question 4).

I don't agree [with the choice of practice] because if the patient suffered from something serious and the healer found a day that wasn't soon enough the patient might die (Deanna, Year 4, Ancient Maya, Question 5).

[If I was an Ancient Maya] I wouldn't choose this. This is because as I said in my answer to Question 5, I wouldn't risk my life (Deanna, Year 4, Ancient Maya, Question 6).

Here Deanna, although she referred to the beliefs of people in the past, she argued that they held these beliefs because they were less rational than we are today. In other words, their different views of the world were, according to her, due to their deficit in terms of rational thinking. She also seemed to think that these false beliefs were reinforced by the use of herbs and drugs with medicinal qualities. Despite the fact that the description of the Ancient Mayan practice, provided by the task, did not refer to the use of herbs or drugs, Deanna attempted to find an explanation by assimilating the practice with modern day medical practices of pharmaceutical interventions.

Clark (Year 6), in his response to the Ancient Greeks task, used the Deficit type of explanation along with the Beliefs one in his answer to Question 2 (parts of the answer coded as Deficit type are highlighted in yellow while parts coded as Beliefs type are highlighted in green)

[They chose this treatment] because they didn't have the necessary equipment to understand what the patient had, as we do today, and therefore they believed the priests would handle it.

He also used the Deficit type in his answers to Questions 1 and 7.

> *I think that this treatment was a little bit wrong because the patient could think anything irrelevant. At that time, though, there was no technology to know what the patient had, only by instinct. (Clark, Year 6, Ancient Greeks, Question 1)*
>
> *[Today we do not use this treatment] because now technology has evolved and with machines, we know what kind of disease each patient has. (Clark, Year 6, Ancient Greeks, Question 7)*

Clark also used the Beliefs type in his answer to Question 5 and 6.

> *[I do not agree with the choice of treatment because] I think that this religion was a little bit wrong because the patient could dream of anything irrelevant with the situation and that while they were going through these steps the patient might have died (Clark, Year 6, Ancient Greeks, Question 5)*
>
> *I wouldn't choose this treatment because, unlike them, I believe that there is no chance to be cured after the dreams that they give me the solution. (Clark, Year 6, Ancient Greeks, Question 6)*

His answers to Questions 3 and 4 did not provide any explanations of the choice of practice.

> *I don't believe something else. (Clark, Year 6, Ancient Greeks, Question 3)*
>
> *Because they waited for the dreams to find a solution and because there whose a whole process to reach the point where the "father" [pater] blessed them. (Clark, Year 6, Ancient Greeks, Question 4)*

Similarly to Deanna, Clark seemed to think that the beliefs upon which the choice of practice was made by Ancient Greeks, was the result of their deficits. In this case their lack of the technology we have today.

The idea the beliefs of people in the past being the result of their deficits or the misinterpretation of the healing properties of the practice as divine intervention was also present in the rest of the responses that used the Beliefs type of explanation at Level 2. However, the use the Deficit and/or Effectiveness types along with the Beliefs types in a response did not mean that the response was automatically

assigned to Level 2. As will be discussed below, the use of this combination of types of explanation was observed in responses at higher levels of the progression model.

6.3.3 Level 3: The past as a different world inhabited by modern day people

Responses at Level 3 acknowledged that people in the past lived in a different situation and refer to their choice of practice as the choice of the best available option at the time in terms of what would make sense today. In other words, as people do today, people in the past looked for the best available option to treat diseases. Weaker responses at this level did not disengage completely from the present context and described the practice in question as the best available option in the absence of modern medical knowledge and means. When they referred to beliefs, they viewed them as simply the result of the lack of a better option. The fact that people in the past lived in a different context was acknowledged. However, people in the past were viewed as contemporary ones who make choice that would make sense today.

Sixteen responses out of 93 (17%) were deemed as Level 3 responses. None of the responses at this level explained the choice of practice solely in terms of being the best available option. In other words, no response conformed to the Available Options ideal type. The two most prominent combinations of types of explanation used in responses at this level was a) the use of the Available Options type along with the Deficit type and b) the use of the Available Options type along with the Beliefs and the Deficit types. Below I discuss the responses of Wade (Year 6) who used the Available Options and the Deficit type in his response to the Ancient Greeks task and Jean (Year 6) who used the Available Options, the Deficit and the Beliefs type in her response to the Ancient Maya task. These were the two most prominent patterns of use of different types of explanation at this level. Six responses used the Available Options-Deficit combination and eight responses used the Available Options-Deficit-Beliefs combination.

Wade used the Available Options type in his answers to Questions 2, 4, 5 and 6.

I believe that they chose it because it was the best way to get well and be cured so they chose this treatment (Wade, Year 6, Ancient Greek, Question 2).

I don't find it [the choice of treatment] strange because it was the best way to get well (Wade, Year 6, Ancient Greek, Question 4).

I agree [with the choice of treatment] because I think that there wasn't another treatment (Wade, Year 6, Ancient Greek, Question 5).

If I was an Ancient Greek I would choose this treatment, because it was the best available one (Wade, Year 6, Ancient Greek, Question 6).

He also used the Deficit type on his response to Question 7

Because today there are hospitals or you can simply consume a medicine and you are fine (Wade, Year 6, Ancient Greeks, Question 7).

Wade's answers to Questions 1 and 3 did not provide any explanations of the practice.

My opinion is that the Ancient Greeks if they were sick they got in Asclepia there was much toil until you enter to be cured and get well especially if he were very sick and it would be a heavy toil for them to do all this process (Wade, Year 6, Ancient Greeks, Question 1)

I think not because the text mentions that you should stay alone there for a few nights until the cure is revealed to you and describe the dream you had to the priest (Wade, Year 6, Ancient Greeks, Question 3).

For Wade, Ancient Greeks' choice of practice was based on the fact that this was the best/only available option. So as people in the present do, they followed the best available treatment to cure diseases. His reference to the fact that today we do not use this treatment because we have hospitals and drugs, as in the case of Jean-Luc (section 6.3.1, pp. 195-196), is essentially a statement about our choices (i.e., today we use this means because they are more effective) rather than the choices of people in the past. As mentioned in sub-section 6.3.1, cases where the Deficit type was only used in Question 7 in the way described above, were not deemed as Level 2 responses (i.e., responses that explain the choices of practice in terms of deficit or

by assimilating aspects of the practice to contemporary ones that are considered to be effective).

Jean (Year 6), in her response to the Ancient Maya task, used the Available Options along with the Beliefs and the Deficit types in her answer to Question 2 (parts of the answer coded as Available Options are highlighted in grey, as Deficit type in yellow and as Beliefs type in green)

> *I believe that they chose this treatment because they believed in the healer because back then they didn't have what we have. They had only the healer (Jean, Year 6, Ancient Maya, Question 2).*

She also used the Available Options and the Deficit types in her answers to Questions 4 and 5 (parts of the answer coded as Available Options are highlighted in grey and as Deficit type in yellow).

> *I find it [the choice of treatment] strange because now things are very different. Now there are many treatments while [back] then they had only that one (Jean, Year 6, Ancient Maya, Question 4).*
> *[I agree with their choice of treatment] because there weren't any other treatments back then (Jean, Year 6, Ancient Maya, Question 5).*

She finally, used the Deficit type to her answer to Question 7

> *Because now there are hundreds of doctors and treatments (Jean, Year 6, Ancient Maya, Question 7).*

Jean's answers to Questions 1, 3 and 6 did not provide any explanations of the choice of practice.

> *I believe that Ancient Maya were great because they did great things (Jean, Year 6, Ancient Maya, Question 1).*
> *I don't think that there is another reason [for their choice of treatment] (Jean, Year 6, Ancient Maya, Question 3.*
> *Yes, [if I was an Ancient Maya] I would prefer it (Jean, Year 6, Ancient Maya, Question 6).*

As can be observed in her response, Jean explained the choice of practice with reference to the Ancient Maya beliefs. However, these beliefs were primarily the result of the lack of better options, rather than a particular way of viewing the world. For Jean, this was the best option in the absence of modern-day options for treating diseases.

Jean's response is an example of what is described as a weaker response at this level (in the description of the level at the opening paragraph of this sub-section). Despite the fact that she explained the choice of practice in terms of people in the past using the best available option for treatment (as person from the present would do if they found themselves in the context of the Ancient Maya), her response did not completely disengage from the present context. Instead, she repeatedly referred to the fact that back then people did not have what we have today.

6.3.4 Level 4: The past as a different world inhabited by different people

Responses at Level 4 acknowledged that people in the past made their choices based on their own beliefs that were different from our own ones. This was a breakthrough since the fact that people in the past viewed their own world differently was acknowledged. Even when they referred to the past practices as being inferior to our modern ways of treating diseases, they did not claim that beliefs held by people in the past existed due to the absence of modern-day knowledge. At this level participants acknowledged the different perspectives of people in the past.

Twenty-eight responses out of 93 (30%) were deemed as Level 4 responses. Ten of the responses at this level conformed to the Beliefs ideal type; explained the choice of practice solely in terms of the beliefs held by people in the past. Below I discuss the response of Frank (Year 5) in the Ancient Greeks task.

Frank used the Beliefs type of explanations to answers all questions except Question 1.

> *[They chose this treatment] because back then Ancient Greeks believed in the Olympian Gods so they didn't believe that they needed a doctor they could*

simply go to sleep and the god of medicine would speak to them in their dream (Frank, Year 5, Ancient Greeks, Question 2).

[An additional reason is that] they believed that they could as well be cured by the katharsis they did before they entered the Asclepion (Frank, Year 5, Ancient Greeks, Question 3).

I find it [the choice of treatment] strange because without a doctor I don't know many people who get well without a doctor, but they blindly believed in the Twelve Olympian Gods (Frank, Year 5, Ancient Greeks, Question 4).

I disagree [with their choice of practice] because I find this process wrong, because I don't believe in the Gods of Olympus (Frank, Year 5, Ancient Greeks, Question 5).

Yes, [if I was an Ancient Greek] I would choose this treatment because I would believe in the 12 gods of Olympus as well because I wouldn't know about Christ (Frank, Year 5, Ancient Greeks, Question 6).

[Today we do not use this treatment] because we don't believe that the god of medicine, Asclepius, can cure us (Frank, Year 5, Ancient Greeks, Question 7).

In his response to Question 1, Frank did not provide an explanation of the choice of practice by the Ancient Greeks.

My opinion about them I think that is the following without the Ancient Greeks we wouldn't be here today or these didn't happen we would most likely be under occupation. We could also not have the same privileges we have today (Frank, Year 5, Ancient Greeks, Question 1).

Frank is adamant about the reason for which Ancient Greeks chose the practice in question. Ancient Greeks chose this practice because of their religion and any differences with what we do today and how we view their practice are due to the fact that we do not believe in their religion.

Besides, responses that only used the Beliefs type, another prominent combination at this level was the use of the Beliefs types of explanation along with the Deficit one. Eleven responses that used these two types in their responses were deemed as

Level 4 responses. Below, I discuss the response of Olivia (Year 3) to the Ancient Greeks task.

Olivia used the Beliefs type in her answers to Questions 2, 4, 5 and 6.

> *[They chose this treatment because] because they thought that if they believed in god Asclepius who they made with their imagination he would cure them (Olivia, Year 3, Ancient Greeks, Question 2).*
>
> *I find it [the choice of treatment] strange because they had so much faith for this god and they got involved doing this thing (Olivia, Year 3, Ancient Greeks, Question 4).*
>
> *I disagree [with their choice of treatment] because this god is not true (Olivia, Year 3, Ancient Greeks, Question 5).*
>
> *Yes, [if I was an Ancient Greek I would choose this treatment] because I would believe in this god (Olivia, Year 3, Ancient Greeks, Question 6).*

She also used the Beliefs along with the Deficit type in her answer to question 7 (parts of the answer coded as Deficit type are highlighted in yellow and as Beliefs type in green).

> *[Today, we don't use this treatment] because there are medicines and because we don't believe in that god (Olivia, Year 3, Ancient Greeks, Question 6).*

Olivia, as Frank did, referred to the beliefs of people in the past as the reason behind their choice of practice repeatedly. Despite the fact that she considered these beliefs as false ones, she acknowledged that they were different from her own and that if she were an Ancient Greek person, she would share the same beliefs with them. As in the cases of Jean-Luc (Level 1; sub-section 6.3.1) and Wade (Level 3; sub-section 6.3.3) the use of the Deficit type in her answer to Question 7 (where she claimed that today we do not use the Ancient Greek treatment because we have medicines) was rather an explanation of why we do not choose the practice in question today rather than why people in the past did.

Olivia used the same combination of types of explanation as Clark did (Beliefs and Deficit; see sub-section 6.3.2). However, while Clark described these beliefs as the

result of deficits in terms of technology, Olivia did not. She did not connect these beliefs to any kind of deficit, instead she referred to this type (Deficit) in order to explain why people today do not make the same choice of practice. More importantly, she acknowledged that part of the reason of why we do not make the same choice of practice today is that our beliefs differ from the ones of Ancient Greeks.

6.3.5 Level 5: The past as a different world that shaped different people

Responses at Level 5 went beyond acknowledging that people held their own beliefs which were different and view these beliefs and the choices made as an intrinsic part of their way of life. Again, while in some cases referred to past practices as being inferior to our modern approaches of treating diseases, there are no claims that beliefs held by people in the past existed due to the absence of modern-day superior ideas, knowledge or means. At this level, responses not only acknowledged the different perspectives of people in the past and the different historical context but also describe the former as part of the latter.

Four responses out of 93 (4%) were deemed as Level 5 responses. None of the responses at this level conformed to the Life Forms ideal type; explained the choice of practice solely as part of the way of life of people in the past. All responses at this level used the Life Forms types along with the Beliefs and the Deficit types. Below I discuss the response Ian, one of the teachers.

In his response to the Ancient Maya task, Ian (teacher) used the Life Forms type of explanation along with the Beliefs and Deficit types. He used the Life Forms type to respond to Question 5.

> *I disagree with the choice of this treatment although I cannot be objective since the circumstances today are very different from the ones of the Mayan era. Maybe, if I lived at that time, I would consider this treatment to be a rational one. It would be part of my way life (Ian, Ancient Maya, Question 5).*

Ian also used the Beliefs type to respond to Questions 1 and 2

Ancient Maya were very religious people who believed that the cure of diseases (or not) was according to the will of god. (Ian, Ancient Maya, Question 1)

They chose this treatment because they believed that gods decide about people, either for the diseases or their cure. Therefore, by performing the ceremonies and offering honors to the gods they believed that they helped the patients. (Ian, Ancient Maya, Question 2)

Finally, Ian used the Deficit type to answer Question 7.

Today, [we do not use this practice because] the development of science has proven that such methods do not lead to cure of diseases (Ian, Ancient Maya, Question 7).

Ian also used a Minor Code in his answer to Question 3, by mentioning the possibility of the Ancient Maya being influenced by other people at the time. Although, one could argue that this could be a reference to their way of life that was influenced by others, Ian used it only as a possibility for an additional reason for the choice of practice without developing this idea further. Therefore, it was not coded as Life Forms.

Maybe they were influenced by other tribes of that time (Ian, Ancient Maya, Question 3).

His responses to Questions 4 and 6 did not provide any explanations of the choice of practice *(Ian, Ancient Maya, Question 4).*

I consider the way they choose the date and in general the whole process of choosing a date to be strange since in general the delay in treating a disease can cause further problems (Ian, Ancient Maya, Question 4).

Most likely [I would choose this treatment if I was an Ancient Maya], although what would be decisive would be the rest of the choices I would have. In case there were not other choices of treatment then I would choose this one (Ian, Ancient Maya, Question 6).

211

For Ian, the choice of practice by the Ancient Maya was based on their beliefs of divine intervention that could cure diseases. These beliefs were an intrinsic part of their way of life. As in the case of other of the responses of Jean-Luc (Level 1; sub-section 6.3.1), Wade (Level 3; sub-section 6.3.3) and Olivia (Level 4; sub-section 6.3.4) the use of the Deficit type in his answer to Question 7 (where he claimed that this practice has been abandoned due to the development of scientific methods) was rather an explanation of why we do not choose the practice in question today rather than why people in the past did.

The connection of the way of life of people in the past with their beliefs was evident in all four responses at Level 5. These findings suggest a strong relation between the Life Forms type and the Beliefs type when the former is used at this level. However, this is not a two-way relation. As discussed in previous sub-sections the use of the Beliefs type was not usually accompanied by the use of the Life Forms type in responses assigned to lower levels.

Despite the fact that the Deficit type explanation was also used by all four participants at this level, we cannot argue for a connection between this type (Deficit) and the Life Forms one. This is because unlike the case of beliefs, at this level, references to the superiority of the present were only made in answers to Question 7 and were not connected in any way with the beliefs or the way of life of people in the past.

6.3.6 Atypical responses

Eighty-nine out of the 93 responses to pen and paper tasks about past practices conformed to one of the levels of the suggested progression model. Only four responses (4%) were atypical in the sense that they could not be assigned to a single level. Instead, the provided explanations that included responses that could be assigned to more than one level. Below, I discuss the response of Ray (Year 5) to the Ancient Greeks task.

In her response, Ray used the Beliefs, the Available Options, the Effectiveness and the Deficit types of explanation. More specifically, she used the Beliefs, the Available

Options and the Effectiveness types in her answer to Question 2 (parts of the answer coded as Beliefs are highlighted in green, as Available Options in grey and as Effectiveness in yellow).

> *Ancient Greeks chose this treatment for the following reasons:*
>
> <mark style="background-color:#00FF00">*a) They worshiped the gods and they believed that a god would cure them*</mark>
>
> <mark style="background-color:#C0C0C0">*b) Maybe there wasn't another treatment*</mark>
>
> <mark style="background-color:#FFFF00">*c) Maybe it was effective sometimes.*</mark>
>
> <mark style="background-color:#C0C0C0">*d) Maybe this was the fastest and most effective treatment from all treatments Ancients Greeks tested*</mark> *(Ray, Year 5, Ancient Greeks, Question 2).*

She also used the Deficit type in her answer то question 1

> *Ancient Greeks had many strange habits and sometimes unreasonable ones, such as the way they treated people. If the priest of Asclepius couldn't understand the dream described by the patient, how would they cure him? [If?] Katharsis, the process that took place before someone entered the Aslcepieon, was not implemented correctly could that change something? These are questions that concern me, but I cannot answer. Maybe Ancient Greeks didn't think very reasonably because, if something of the above happened I don't think that something would change (Ray, Year 5, Ancient Greeks, Question 1).*

Ray's answer to Question 7 was coded as a Minor Code. She referred to the possibility that the practice has been abandoned, because the place where it was practices does not exist anymore and therefore, we are not aware of it.

> *Maybe this place described in the text does not exist anymore so we can't use it. Also, we might not know about this treatment from the past and we discovered another one (Ray, Year 5, Ancient Greeks, Question 7).*

Her responses to the rest of the question did not provide any explanations of the choice of practice. Instead, she mainly expressed her disagreement and bafflement with the practice by pointing out problems in some of its aspects.

> *In my point of view, there aren't any other reasons [for the choice of practice] (Ray, Year 5, Ancient Greeks, Question 3).*

The strange thing with this treatment is that, if the priest of the Asclepion could not give a treatment or simply didn't understand what kind of disease this, was what would happen? How could the priest tell which treatment the patient needed? (Ray, Year 5, Ancient Greeks, Question 4)

I disagree, because anything can go wrong such us the Katharsis not to be followed correctly or Asclepius not to come to the patients dream. This way of treatment does not sound very quick. Should someone who needs urgent treatment wait for a few days until Asclepius appears in his dreams? (Ray, Year 5, Ancient Greeks, Question 5).

[If I was an Ancient Greek] I might choose it if I wasn't seriously ill, because it sounds entertaining. If there is no other available treatment, I would also have to use this one. However, if I was seriously ill and another treatment was available, I would prefer that one (Ray, Year 5, Ancient Greeks, Question 6).

Ray's response could not be assigned to a single level. Unlike responses at the different levels discussed above, Ray used the different types of explanation as possible explanations of the choice or practice that were unrelated to each other. For her, the choice of practice could be due to the Ancient Greeks beliefs or due to the fact that this was their best option or due to the fact that for some reason it worked in some cases. In addition to the above, the fact that there are a number of questions about the practice that she cannot answer, made her also think about the possibility of the Ancient Greeks being unreasonable.

6.3.7 Conclusion

The above discussion (sub-sections 6.3.1 to 6.3.6) supports the claim that the progression models' heuristic value extends beyond modeling answers to single questions (as demonstrated in section 6.2), but also to responses that attempt to explain a choice of practice more comprehensively by answering a variety of questions about this choice. Despite the fact that in most responses to pen and paper tasks, more than one types of explanations were used, the above discussion demonstrates that, in most of the cases (96%), responses followed a specific line of thought throughout all their answers that allowed for their assignment to single level of the progression model.

The findings in this section also caution against diagnoses of sophistication based on answers on single questions because these can be misleading. Despite the fact that answers to single questions, and the identification of specific types of explanation in them, can provide some indications about the ideas held by students or teachers, constructing a comprehensive picture of these ideas and their sophistication demands to ask different kinds of questions and to take into consideration how the answers to these questions relate to each other. For example, Ian's (teacher) answer to Question 2 (which was the one directly asking about why Ancient Greeks chose the practice in question) only referred to their beliefs. His view that these beliefs were an intrinsic part of their way of life (which suggests that in this response he operated in a higher level) was revealed in Question 5 (which asked whether he would make the same choice if he was an Ancient Greek).

The above claim is strengthened by the comparison between the distribution of participants' responses as a whole to the levels of the suggested progression model (levels of sophistication) with the frequency of the use of types of explanations in these responses (Chapter 5, p.168).[49] Table 6.1 presents this comparison.

---

[49] As discussed in section 6.2, the progression model suggested in this chapter was based on the typology suggested in Chapter 5. In this sense, Level 1 in the progression model contained ideas related primarily to the Pseudo-explanations type in the suggested typology, Level 2 contained ideas related to the Deficit and Effectiveness types, Level 3 contained ideas related to the Available Options type, Level 4 contained ideas related to the Beliefs type and Level 5 contained ideas related to the Life Forms type. Table 6.1 presents this comparison.

Table 6.1 Distribution of responses to pen and paper tasks to the levels of the suggested progression model and frequency of use of types of explanation used by participants in these responses (Ancient Greek and Ancient Maya tasks) (N=93).

This table counts the number of responses to the pen and paper tasks (f) and shows the percentage of them that corresponded to each level of the suggested progression model. It also counts the number of occasions each type of explanation was used and shows the percentage of responses that contained them in the pen and paper tasks.

	Distribution of responses to the levels of the suggested progression model			Frequency of use of types of explanation	
Level	f	%	Type of explanation	F	%
Level 5	4	4	Life Forms	7	8
Level 4	28	30	Beliefs	58	62
Level 3	16	17	Available Options	27	29
Level 1	12	13	Pseudo-explanations	11	12
Level 2	29	31	Deficit- Effectiveness	72	77
Atypical responses	4	4			

As can be observed in Table 6.1, the frequency of use of the types of explanations in pen and paper tasks responses is not identical to the distribution of these responses to levels of sophistication in the progression model. For example while 77% of the responses used the Deficit and/or the Effectiveness type of explanation, only 31% of the responses were deemed as Level 2 of the progression model (the level which contained ideas related to the Deficit and Effectiveness ideal types; explanations of the choice of practice with references to perceived deficits of people in the past or explanations that considered the practice effective by assimilating aspects of it to modern day approaches to medicine). Similarly, while the Beliefs type of explanation was used in 62% of the responses, only 30% of the responses were assigned to Level 4 of the progression model (the level which contained ideas related to the Beliefs type of explanation; explanations of the choice of practice that referred to the beliefs of the people in the past).

6.4 Sophistication of participants responses in interviews

As discussed in Chapter 4 (pp. 146-148), 30 participants who completed pen and paper tasks were also interviewed. Responses to interview questions, which asked about differences in behaviour in the past and present in general, were used to investigate the occurrence of the types of explanations that emerged from the pen and paper tasks. This was a form of a methodological triangulation (Denzin, 1970) to increase the study's internal validity by providing a more comprehensive picture of the participants' ideas. In other words, to check the stability of these types of ideas across data collection instruments (i.e., pen and paper tasks and interviews) and also the robustness of the typology suggested in Chapter 5 as a heuristic for modelling ideas not only related to explanations of the choice of practice but also behaviour in the past in general.

Similarly, to the case of the pen and paper tasks discussed in section 6.3 of this chapter, this section explores the ability of the suggested progression model to model the participants' responses to interview questions as a whole rather than answers to the individual questions.

In order to assign interview responses to the levels of the progression model, the 30 responses to the two questions about differences in behaviour in the past and present in general (26 provided by students and four by teachers) were examined separately. The decision for the level to which an interview response corresponded was made following the same process as in the case of the responses to pen and paper tasks (section 6.3)

The interview questions used for this part of the analysis were the following:

> Do people today behave the same way as people in the past did under the same circumstances? Why?

> What is more likely for you, to behave as a person in the past behaved under the same circumstance or as another person in the present? Why?

This process is discussed in more detail and exemplified below. In each case I discuss the main characteristics of the responses that corresponded to each level of the progression model and how the use of different types of explanation revealed ideas that matched to the level in question.

6.4.1 Level 1: Pseudo-explanations

Reponses in interview question at Level 1 essentially did not provide explanations about the differences in behaviour between people in the present and the past. Instead, they used tautologies and/or descriptions. At this level responses did not seem to acknowledge the different perspectives of people in the past or the different historical context in which they lived.

Seven responses out of 30 (23%) were deemed as Level 1 interview responses. All responses at this level conformed to the Pseudo-explanations ideal type (only used this type of explanation) Below, I discuss the interview response of Kathryn (Year 4).

Kathryn used the Pseudo-explanations type of explanation to answer both interview question. Kathryn was also the one participant who referred to feelings in her

response. However, this reference, as the rest of her response did not provide any explanation about the difference in behaviour between people in the present and the past.

> Do people today behave the same way as people in the past did under the same circumstances? Why?
> *I think not. Maybe, some people were sad and the others were happy. We don't behave the same because we are different people. People in the past did different things.*

> What is more likely for you, to behave as a person in the past behaved under the same circumstance or as another person in the present? Why?
> *To behave as another person in the present. Because we are both in the present. I believe people in the past behaved differently. They did things differently.*

In her response, Kathryn essentially repeated parts of the question and used tautologies. Besides acknowledging the fact that people in the present and the past behave differently she did not provide any explanations about this phenomenon. For Kathryn, people in the past behaved differently because they did things differently. Similar responses were provided by the rest of the participants whose responses were deemed as Level 1 responses.

6.4.2 Level 2: The past as a version of the present often inhabited by inferior people

Interview responses at Level 2 explained differences in behaviour between people in the present and the past using the present as their only point of reference. People in the past behaved differently because they did not have the rationality, knowledge and means we have today. In all cases, they also referred to the different way of life of people in the past and/or the beliefs upon which their behaviour was based. However, they viewed this way of life and beliefs as the result of deficits. At this level the perspectives of people in the past were viewed as simply inferior versions of the

ones of people in the present and the different historical context is viewed as also an inferior version of the present.

Ten interview responses out of 30 (33%) were deemed as Level 2 responses. None of them conformed to the Deficit ideal type of explanation. Almost all participants, at this level (eight out of nine), used the Deficit type of explanation along with either the Life Forms or the Beliefs type of explanation. Below, I discuss the interview responses of Nyota (Year 4) and Mary (Year 5).

Nyota used the Deficit and the Beliefs type in both answers to interview (parts of the answers coded as Deficit type are highlighted in yellow while parts coded as Beliefs type are highlighted in green).

> Do people today behave the same way as people in the past did under the same circumstances?
>
> *No, because humankind has developed* and *maybe people in the past probably believed different things about their time or anything else*.
>
> What is more likely for you, to behave as a person in the past behaved under the same circumstance or as another person in the present?
>
> *With a person in the present because we think the same. I know people in the present. We have the same mind which is more developed now than it was in the past. That's why we behave differently.*

In her interview, Nyota acknowledged that people in the past held different beliefs and thought in different ways. However, she clearly considered these beliefs and ways of thinking inferior to our own ones. This deficit is, for her, the main reason behind these differences in ways of thinking and consequently different behaviour.

Mary (Year 5) used the Deficit type of explanation along with the Life Forms one in her answers to interview questions interview (parts of the answers coded as Deficit type are highlighted in yellow while parts coded as Life Forms type are highlighted in red).

220

Do people today behave the same way as people in the past did under the same circumstances?

No because we have different habits. If we lived in the past we would have different habits. We would have a different way of life.

What is more likely for you, to behave as a person in the past behaved under the same circumstance or as another person in the present?

I would behave similarly to the second one [a person in the present]. In the past people lived very differently. Now we have evolved. For example, back then people were all dressed the same. Maybe because they had kings and because of this maybe they didn't have their own character as we do today. So, they didn't develop their own personalities as we do today and remained the same like other people. For these reasons, they did things differently.

Similarly to Nyota, Mary acknowledged that people in the past had a way of life different to our own. However, she considered this way of life as inferior to our own one and explicitly claimed that this was the reason people in the past behaved differently to us.

6.4.3 Level 3: The past as a different world inhabited by modern day people

None of the interview responses was deemed as a Level 3 response. Interview responses at Level 3 would acknowledge that people in the past lived in a different situation and refer to their different behaviour as the result of the different options available to them. In other words, as people do today, people in the past behaved according to the options available to them. At this level the fact the that people in the past lived in a different context would be acknowledged. However, people in the past would be viewed as contemporary ones who made choice that would make sense today.

Below, I cite the answer of Sam (Year 5) to one of the interview questions as an example of the use of the Available Options type in interview responses.

Do people today behave the same way as people in the past did under the same circumstances?

I think we behave differently. Maybe because in the past people did not have so many ways to deal with things as we do today.

6.4.4 Level 4: The past as a different world inhabited by different people

Interview responses at Level 4 acknowledged that people in the past behaved differently to people in the present because of their beliefs and/or perspectives and/or ways of thinking that were different from our own ones. As in the case of pen and paper tasks, this was a breakthrough since the fact that people in the past viewed the world differently was acknowledged. At this level, participants acknowledged the different perspectives of people in the past.

Seven interview responses out of 30 (23%) were deemed as Level 4 responses. Five of the responses at this level conformed to the Beliefs ideal type; explained the choice of practice solely in terms of the beliefs held by people in the past. The other two used the Beliefs type of explanation along with the Pseudo-explanations type. Below, I discuss the cases of Kara (Year 6) who used only the Belief type of explanation and Dale (Year 3) who used the Beliefs type along with the Pseudo-explanation one.

As already mentioned, Kara (Year 6) during the interview, used only the Beliefs type of explanation to answer both questions.

Do people today behave the same way as people in the past did under the same circumstances?

No, because people have different ways of thinking and they perceive things differently. They view situations differently.

What is more likely for you, to behave as a person in the past behaved under the same circumstance or as another person in the present?

As another person in the present. Today there is a common way of thinking even though we think differently to each other. The way of thinking of people in the past was different from our own.

For Kara, people in the past behaved differently because they thought in different ways, perceived things and view situations differently. She explained differences in behaviour between people in the past and the present again with references to factors related to the different perspectives of people in the present and the past.

Dale (Year 3) used the Beliefs type of explanation in his answers to the first interview question and the Pseudo-explanations type in his answer to the second one.

Do people today behave the same way as people in the past did under the same circumstances?

No, because we are not the same people. Back then they thought in ways different to the ones we think today. They believed different things.

What is more likely for you, to behave as a person in the past behaved under the same circumstance or as another person in the present?

I would behave in the same way as another person in the present. Today we behave differently. It's not the same as in the past.

Despite the fact that in his answer to the second question, Dale does not provide an explanation for the difference in behaviour between people in the present and the past, his answer to first question explicitly refers to the different perspectives of people in the past. For Dale, people in the past were different because they thought differently and also believed different things.

6.4.5 Level 5: The past as a different world the shaped different people

Interview responses at Level 5 explained the differences in behaviour between people in the present and the past in terms of their different ways of life. Unlike responses in the pen and paper tasks, not all responses at this level referred to the

223

beliefs held by the people in the past. However, those who did not, also described a mechanism of how the context affects people by referring to the shared experiences of people who live in the same time. At this level, responses not only acknowledged the different perspectives of people in the past and the different historical context but also describe the former as part of the latter.

Six responses out of 30 (20%) were deemed as Level 5 responses. Four of the responses at this level conformed to the Life Forms ideal type; explained the choice of practice solely as part of the way of life of people in the past. Two responses used the Life Forms type of explanation along with the Beliefs type. Below, I discuss the response of Jessica (Year 6) who used only the Life Forms type of explanation in her response to interview questions and Ian, one of the teachers, who used both the Life Forms and the Beliefs types.

Jessica used the Life Forms type in her answer the first interview question. The second question was not posed to her since she answered it in her answer to the first question. In other words, she responded to it without a prompt.

> Do people today behave the same way as people in the past did under the same circumstances?
>
> *No, we behave differently. We live in different times. It is more likely to behave the same way as other people in our time. This is because we have the same experiences from home, school, friends, television because we live in the same environment.*

For Jessica, people in the past behaved differently to people in the present because they lived in different times. People in the same time behave in the same way because living in the same world provided them with shared experiences.

Ian (teachers) used the Beliefs type in his answer to the first interview question and both the Life Forms and Beliefs types in his answer to the second questions (parts of the answers coded as Deficit type are highlighted in red while parts coded as Beliefs type are highlighted in green).

Do people today behave the same way as people in the past did under the same circumstances?

Even in the present people all different to each other. They have different ways of thinking…they have different degrees of resilience. They also differ in terms of how the deal with situations that cause anxiety. For example, I could be less resilient than you are. Since people in the same time don't think the same, they also don't think the same as people in the past did.

What is more likely for you, to behave as a person in the past behaved under the same circumstance or as another person in the present?

Of course, it is likely that I would behave as another person in the present because we have much more in common in terms of our way of life. We live in the same world and many of our views and beliefs are influenced by common factors, for example the media. I am much closer to people in the present.

In his interview, Ian argued that people in the present behave differently primarily because of their different ways of thinking and this also applies in the case of comparing the behaviour of people in the past and the present. He also explicitly claimed that views and beliefs are influenced by the context in which people live.

6.4.6 Conclusion

The above discussion demonstrates that in all cases responses in interview questions about differences in behaviour between people in the past and the present followed a specific line of thought that allowed for their assignment to a single level of the progression model. As in the case of the responses in the pen and paper tasks, this supports the claim that the progression models' heuristic value extends beyond modeling answers to single questions, but also responses that attempt to explain a choice of practice more comprehensively by answering a variety of questions about this choice.

As in the case of section 6.3, the findings in this section also caution against diagnoses of sophistication based on answers on single questions because these can be misleading. Despite the fact that answers to single questions, and the

identification of the types of explanations used in them, can provide some indications about the ideas held by students or teachers, constructing a comprehensive picture of these ideas and their sophistication demands different kinds of questions and to take into consideration how the answers to these questions relate to each other. For example, Ian's (teacher) answer to the first interview questions only referred to the different ways of thinking as a reason behind differences in behaviour between people in the past and the present. His view that these beliefs and views are influenced by the context in which people live (which suggests that in this response he operated in a higher level) was revealed in his answer to the second question of the interview.

The above claim is strengthened by the comparison between the distribution of participants' interview responses as a whole to the levels of the suggested progression model (levels of sophistication) with the frequency of the use of types of explanations in these responses. Table 6.2 presents this comparison. The sample for this comparison consisted of the 30 participants (26 students and four teachers) who were interviewed.

Table 6.2 Distribution of interview responses to the levels of the suggested progression model and frequency of use of types of explanation used in interview responses (N=30).

This table counts the number of responses (f) to interviews, and shows the percentage of them, that corresponded to each level of the suggested progression model. It also counts the number of occasions each type of explanation was used and shows the percentage of responses that contained them in the pen and paper tasks. In the case of the frequency of use of types of explanation the total (47) does not correspond to the number of responses (30) since most of the participants used more than one type of explanation in their responses.

	Distribution of responses to the levels of the suggested progression model			Frequency of use of types of explanation	
Level	**F**	**%**	**Type of explanation**	**f**	**%**
Level 1	7	23	Pseudo-explanations	8	27
Level 2	10	33	Deficit- Effectiveness	9	30
Level 3	0	0	Available Options	4	13
Level 4	7	23	Beliefs	16	53
Level 5	6	20	Life Forms	9	30
Atypical responses	0	0	Feelings	1	3
Total	30	100	Total	47	

As can be observed in Table 6.2 the frequency of use of the types of explanations in interview responses is not identical to the distribution of these responses to levels of sophistication in the progression model. For example, while in 53% of the responses the Beliefs type of explanation were used at least once only 23% of the responses were deemed as Level 4 of the progression model (the level which contained ideas related to the Beliefs type of explanation; explanations of differences in behaviour between people in the past and the present that referred to the different views, perspectives, ways of thinking or beliefs between the past and the present).

The sophistication of participants responses to interviews was not identical to the one of their responses to the pen and paper tasks. Table 6.3 shows the distribution of participants interview responses and in pen and paper tasks responses to the levels of the suggested progression model. The sample for this comparison consisted of the 30 participants (26 students and four teachers) who completed pen and paper tasks and were also interviewed.

Table 6.3 Distribution of participants' interview responses and pen and paper task responses to the levels of the suggested progression model (N= 30)

This table counts the number (f) and shows the percentage of responses that corresponded to each level of the suggested progression model in interview and in pen and paper tasks.

Level	Interview		Pen and paper tasks	
	F	%	f	%
Level 5	6	20	2	7
Level 4	7	23	12	40
Level 3	0	0	5	17
Level 2	10	33	7	23
Level 1	7	23	3	10
Atypical	0	0	1	3
Total	30	100	30	100

As the table indicates the distribution of the interview responses to the levels of the progression model differs from the one of the pen and paper tasks. Interview responses were deemed as Level 1, Level 2 and Level 5 more often than pen and paper task responses. The opposite applied in the case of Levels 3 and 4 were pen and paper responses were assigned to these levels more often than interview responses. Furthermore, only ten participants (out of 30 who were interviewed) provided interview and pen and paper responses at the same level. Ten participants provided interview responses at a higher level than their pen and paper task responses. Conversely, eleven participants provided pen and paper task responses at a higher level than their interview responses. In the light of this, it cannot be argued that one of the tasks prompted participants to provide more sophisticated responses than the other.

The above suggest that the setting of the tasks (pen and paper task vs interview) and/or the questions (explanations of a choice of practice vs explanations of differences in behaviour) and/or the behaviour in question (specific practices vs behaviour in general) affected the sophistication of individual participants' responses. It is for example possible that asking participants about the choice of a practice with explicit references to its religious aspects prompted participants to provide responses the took into consideration the different perspectives of people in the past

(more specifically religious beliefs; Level 4) more often than asking general questions about differences in behaviour between people in the past and the present. In contrast, asking about differences in behaviour in general (without a specific content) possibly prompted the participants to think about a more general notion such as people's way of life (Level 5).

As mentioned in Chapter 5 (p. 179), in Chapman's (2009b) study of students' ideas about variations in historical accounts, it is suggested that types of responses that emerge from pen and paper tasks are consistent across instruments when identical questions (albeit without specific content) are asked in interviews. However, in the case of this study identical questions (i.e., why people in the past did what they did), as discussed in Chapter 4 (pp. 147-148), would not make much sense. Also, the use of different questions in terms of asking for explanations for behaviour in general aimed to test the typology's and the progression model's ability to model response not only about explanations of the choice of practice, but also behaviour in the past in general. The findings of the present study suggest that participants responded to the general questions of the interview as different questions. As discussed in section Chapter 5 (pp. 161-165), the present study and a number of previous studies of students' ideas of historical empathy demonstrated the same effect (i.e., different questions prompting the use of different ideas with different frequency- Perikleous, 2011; Brooks, 2008; De Leur, Van Boxtel and Wilschut, 2017; Wilschut and Schiphorst, 2019).

6.4.5 Conclusions

This chapter provided further insights to the first research question of the study (What kinds of ideas are used by Greek Cypriot primary students and teachers when asked to explain the choice of practices made by people in the past?), by suggesting a progression model based on the typology introduced in Chapter 5 and by testing its ability to model responses to pen and paper tasks and interviews as a whole rather than separate answers to individual questions.

The progression model suggested by the present study describes a route similar to the one proposed by previous studies (Lee, 1978; Shemilt, 1984; Dickinson and Lee,

1984, Lee and Ashby, 1987, Lee and Shemilt, 2010, Perikleous, 2011; Bermudez and Jaramillo, 2001). This is a continuum of ideas of historical empathy from ones that fail to provide explanations of past behaviour (Level 1) and view the past as another version of the present (Level 2) to ones that explain past behaviour taking into consideration the different way people in the past viewed the world and the different context in which they lived (Level 5).

As discussed in Chapter 5, the correspondence of types of explanation suggested by the present study to types of explanations identified by previous studies and their efficiency of modelling the data from the responses of the participants to interview questions indicate the heuristic potential of the suggested typology; a means to model explanations of choices of practice. As discussed and exemplified in this chapter, the suggested progression model also has a heuristic value in the sense that it was efficient in terms of modeling participants' answers to individual questions and also responses as a whole in both the pen and paper tasks and interviews.

As also pointed out in Chapter 5, students' preconceptions can be helpful or hinder the development of historical knowledge and understanding. As demonstrated here, and discussed further in the next Chapter 7, the same applies in some cases for teachers too. In the case of teachers, understanding their preconceptions about history as a discipline is obviously essential for the design of training in history education. The fact that, as demonstrated in this chapter, the suggested progression model describes different levels of sophistication, suggests that this model can also serve such diagnostic and pedagogical purposes. This is in the sense that it allows for the identification of different ideas in explanations about past behaviour and suggests a possible route from simplistic ideas to more powerful ones. This can inform how teaching interventions (for students) and training interventions (for teachers) can support the development of ideas of historical empathy. For example, for students that fail to provide any explanations (Level 1), teaching might focus on how behaviour is guided by motives. For students and teachers who explain behaviour without taking into consideration the different views of people in the past (Levels 1, 2 and 3), teaching and training might focus on how the way people in the past view the world affected their behaviour.

Furthermore, this chapter provided insights into how the suggested progression model can serve such diagnostic and pedagogical purposes not only when it comes to answers to individual questions but also complicated responses that answer a variety of questions about a choice of practice (pen and paper tasks) or past behaviour in general (interviews). It can serve diagnostic purposes in the sense that the discussion in the chapter demonstrated how these responses revealed lines of thought about the choice of practice or past behaviour in general that could be assigned to different levels of the progression model, which suggest different levels of sophistication. It has the potential to also serve pedagogical purposes in the sense that it suggests a possible route to more powerful ideas. For example, as demonstrated, in responses to both pen and paper tasks and interviews, a number of participants, despite the fact that they referred to the beliefs held by the people in the past, they viewed them as the result of irrational thinking or lack of modern-day knowledge or means. This suggest that these participants still operated at Level 2 of viewing the past as a version of the present only with inferior people. Teaching (for students) or training (for teachers) that focus on why people in the past were as rational as we are and how their beliefs existed independently from how we view the world today (i.e., the held the beliefs in question because this was the way they view their world and not because they did know or have what we have today) has the potential to help them move to a higher level.

Findings reported in Chapter 5 (pp. 161-165) showed that different questions prompted the use of different types of explanation of the choice of practice. In this chapter this phenomenon was exemplified with the discussion of a number of responses to both the pen and paper tasks and interviews. This chapter also demonstrated how diagnoses of sophistication based on answers in individual questions can be misleading. The comparison of the level of sophistications between responses to pen and paper task and interviews also suggests that the setting of the tasks (pen and paper task vs interview) and/or the behaviour in question (specific practices vs behaviour in general) affects the sophistication of responses.

As also discussed in Chapter 5, these findings have important implications both for research and teaching practice. In terms of research these findings point out the need for comprehensive approaches that use a variety of ways to prompt

participants to think about past behaviour and in this way allow us to look at different aspects of their ideas of historical empathy. In terms of teaching practices and teachers' training these findings stress the importance of using a variety of tasks and approaches which invite students and teachers to think about past behaviour and express their views about it in a variety of ways.

Finally, as also discussed in Chapter 3 (pp. 98-108), progression models are not meant to be used as assessment schemes and do not claim to predict progress in a Piagetian way of stages of development where all students follow the same route and every subsequent level replaces the previous one (Lee and Shemilt, 2003; Lee, 2006). The latter was demonstrated in this chapter with the differences in terms sophistication between participants responses to pen and paper tasks and interviews. As Lee (2006) describes 'they are like the trails left by sheep on a mountainside, which show as the way most of the sheep happen to go, not the paths they must take' (p. 138). Progression models map preconceptions and suggest possible paths towards more powerful ideas. In this sense, this progression model provides suggestions of what preconceptions we are likely to encounter in a history class (or among teachers) and what we can expect to achieve by developing students' and teachers' ideas. More detailed suggestions for the use of this model in teaching and teachers' training will be discussed in the conclusions of this thesis.

Chapter 7: Data and discussion: Differences according to participants' age in explanations of past practices

7.1 Introduction

This chapter responds to research question 2 (Do the ideas used by Greek Cypriot primary students and teachers when asked to explain the choice of practices made by people in the past differ according to their age?). More specifically, here, I discuss differences according to age in terms of the level of sophistication of participants' responses; the level of the progression model suggested in Chapter 5 to which participants' responses corresponded. An important aspect of the discussion of these findings is the degree to which any differences between age groups described here are statistically significant (i.e., there is a meaningful and non-random relationship). In order to test the statistical significance, as discussed in Chapter 4 (pp. 154-156), chi-square and Fisher's exact tests of significance were employed.

As discussed in Chapter 3 (pp. 94-98), differences in ideas of historical empathy according to students' age is a relatively under-researched area while in the case of the teachers, research evidence is scarce. Besides a small number of studies which explore pre-service teachers' ideas of historical empathy, only some research evidence from Shemilt's (1980) Evaluation Study exists on how in-service teachers explain past behaviour. None of the previous studies compared students' and teachers' ideas in the same settings.

Data analysis in this chapter showed a number of age-related trends in terms of the attainment of different levels of sophistication. Furthermore, an overall picture of progress by age in terms of the sophistication of participants' responses is also suggested by the findings of this chapter. Participants' responses that corresponded to higher levels of the progression model increased by age and responses that corresponded to lower levels decreased by age. The sophistication of explanations varied within each age group. Furthermore, some younger students provided sophisticated explanations at the higher levels of the progression model, while some teachers provided explanations that corresponded to the lower levels. These findings have a number of important implications both in terms of research of ideas of historical empathy and teaching for the development of these ideas.

7.2 Differences according to participants' age in terms of the level of sophistication of their responses

The sophistication of a response in a pen and paper task was judged in terms of the level of the progression model (suggested in Chapter 6) to which each response (completed task) corresponded. The suggested progression model is based on the typology (suggested in Chapter 5) that emerged from the analysis of the participants responses to pen and paper tasks. As discussed and exemplified in Chapter 6 (pp. 191-216), each response was assigned to a level of the suggested progression model on the basis of the degree of sophistication revealed by types of explanations of the choice of practice used in it. As demonstrated in Chapter 6, when it comes to analysing responses in terms of the sophistication of their ideas, examining them as a whole is a more comprehensive approach than merely identifying the different types of explanation used in individual questions within them. As also demonstrated in Chapter 6, different patterns of use of types of explanations within responses revealed lines of thinking of different sophistication in terms of explaining the choice of practice by people in the past. Figure 7.1 presents the levels of the suggested progression model.

Figure 7.1: Progression model suggested by the findings of this study

Level of progression	Description
Level 1: Pseudo-explanations	Reponses essentially do not provide explanations of the choice of practice. Instead, they use tautologies and/or descriptions and/or references to preferences that do not constitute explanations. At this level, responses do not seem to acknowledge the different perspectives of people in the past or the different historical context in which they lived.
Level 2: The past as a version of the present often inhabited by inferior people	Responses refer to the choice of practice by people in the past using the present as their only point of reference. People in the past chose the practice in questions because they did not have the rationality, knowledge and means we have today or because the practice was effective. In the case of the latter, they refer to aspects of the practice that could contribute to healing according to contemporary views of what is beneficial to health. In some cases, they refer to beliefs upon which the practice was based, however the view these beliefs as the result of deficits or people misinterpreting the healing properties of the practice as divine intervention. At this level, the perspectives of people in the past are viewed as simply inferior versions of the ones of people in the present and the different historical context is not acknowledged.
Level 3: The past as a different world inhabited by modern day people	Responses acknowledge that people in the past lived in a different situation and refer to their choice of practice as the choice of the best available option at the time in terms of what would make sense today. Weaker responses of this level do not disengage completely from the present context and describe the practice in question as the best available option in the absence of modern medical knowledge and means. When they refer to beliefs, they view them as

	simply the result of the lack of a better option. The fact that people in the past lived in a different context is acknowledged. However, people in the past are viewed as contemporary ones who make choice that would make sense today.
Level 4: The past as a different world inhabited by different people	Responses acknowledge that people in the past made their choices based on their own beliefs that were different from our own ones. This is a breakthrough since the fact that people in the past viewed their different world differently is acknowledged. Even when they refer to the past practices as being inferior to our modern ways of treating diseases, they do not claim that beliefs held by people in the past existed due to the absence of modern-day knowledge. At this level participants acknowledged the different perspectives of people in the past.
Level 5: The past as a different world that shaped different people	Responses go beyond acknowledging that people held their own beliefs which were different and view these beliefs and the choices made as an intrinsic part of their way of life. Again, while in some cases they refer to past practices as being inferior to our modern approaches of treating diseases, there are no claims that beliefs held by people in the past existed due to the absence of superior modern-day ideas, knowledge or means. At this level, responses not only acknowledged the different perspectives of people in the past and the different historical context but also describe the former as part of the latter.

This sample for this part of the analysis consisted of 93 pen and paper tasks, that asked participants to explain the choice of a certain practice in the past for treating diseases (Ancient Greek practice or Ancient Mayan practice), completed by the 73 participants of the study (68 students and five teachers). As noted in Chapter 4 (pp. 143-145), twenty participants (19 students and one teacher) completed both tasks about practices in the past and 53 (49 students and four teachers) only one of them.

The second task given to these 53 participants was one that asked them to explain the choice of a practice in the present (Orthodox Christian or Muslim practice).[50] This was in order to explore differences in terms of temporal distance (discussed in Chapter 8). Table 7.1 shows the distribution of completed tasks about past practices among participants' age groups.

---

[50] Despite the fact that tasks about present practices were given to 53 participants, one of them returned it without any answers while a second one was absent on the day their class completed the task.

Table 7.1 Distribution of tasks about past practices among participants' age groups[51]

Age group	Ancient Greeks (tasks completed)	Ancient Maya (tasks completed)	Total tasks	Participants who completed one task	Participants who completed two tasks	Total of participants
Year 3	15	15	30	12	9	21
Year 4	4	4	8	4	2	6
Year 5	13	11	24	18	3	21
Year 6	13	12	25	15	5	20
Teachers	3	3	6	4	1	5
Total	48	45	93	53	20	73

---

[51] As explained in Chapter 4 (p.133), the sample for Year 4 was smaller due to the small size of the class and the small number of parents/guardians that provided consent.

Table 7.2 presents the distribution of participants' responses to the levels of the suggested progression model by age group. As can be observed in the table, 89 responses corresponded to the different the levels of the progression model (83 completed tasks by students and six by teachers). Four responses did not correspond to any of the levels of the progression model (atypical responses). Table 7.3 presents the results of the tests for the statistical significance of the differences between age groups in terms of attainment of each level of the progression model. [52]

---

[52] In the case of comparisons that contain values equal or above 5, the results of chi-square tests are reported. In the case of comparison that contains values lower than 5 the results, Fisher's exact tests are reported. The latter is because for values below 5 Fisher's exact tests are considered to be a more adequate way of testing the statistical significance of differences (Chapter 4, pp. 154-156). In order to help the reader to distinguish between the different claims for significance, I make claims for statistical significance in the cases in which the significance tests returned p-values lower than 0.05, marginal significance in the cases in which significance tests returned p-values lower than 0.10 and near-marginal significance in the cases in which tests returned p-values lower than 0.18 (Chapter 4, pp. 155-156). Values that indicate statistical significance of $p < 0.05$ are highlighted with yellow colour. Values that indicate marginal statistical significance of $p < 0.10$ are highlighted with blue colour. Values that indicate near-marginal statistical significance of $p < 0.18$ are highlighted with green colour.

Table 7.2 Distribution of responses in pen and paper task by level of progression and by age group (Ancient Greek and Ancient Maya tasks) (N=93)

This table counts the number (f) and presents the percentage of responses that corresponded to each level of the suggested model of progression by age group.

Level	Year 3 f	Year 3 %	Year 4 f	Year 4 %	Year 5 f	Year 5 %	Year 6 f	Year 6 %	Teachers f	Teachers %	All students f	All students %	All participants f	All participants %
Level 5	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	8	1	17	3	3	4	4
Level 4	7	23	0	0	8	33	10	40	3	50	25	29	28	30
Level 3	1	3	5	63	4	17	6	24	0	0	16	18	16	17
Level 2	15	50	2	25	5	21	5	20	2	33	27	31	29	31
Level 1	7	23	1	13	4	17	0	0	0	0	12	14	12	13
Atypical responses	0	0	0	0	2	8	2	8	0	0	4	5	4	4
Total	30	100	8	100	24	100	25	100	6	100	87	100	93	100

Table 7.3 Tests for the statistical significance of differences between age groups in attainment of levels of progression (Ancient Greeks and Ancient Maya tasks).

The table presents the results of the tests for the statistical significance of differences in terms of correspondence to levels of the model of progression between adjacent age groups, oldest and youngest students (Year 3 and Year 6), oldest and youngest participants (Year 3 students and teachers), and students and teachers for all tasks.

Level of progression model	Year 3 & Year 4 (p-value)	Year 4 & Year 5 (p-value)	Year 5 & Year 6 (p-value)	Year 6 & Teachers (p-value)	Year 3 & Year 6 (p-value)	Year 3 & Teachers (p-value)	Students & Teachers (p-value)
Level 5		1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	0.3999	1.0000	1.0000
Level 4	0.2436	0.1194	0.7060	0.7287	0.1993	0.2908	0.4018
Level 3	0.0025	0.0631	0.7544	0.1981	0.0239	1.0000	0.2822
Level 2	0.5454	1.0000	0.9440	0.5727	0.0969	0.7452	0.9734
Level 1	1.0000	1.0000	0.0300		0.0111	0.4909	0.3517

Age-related trends in terms of attainment can be observed in the cases of all levels of the suggested progression model. However, tests for statistical significance show that not all of them were equally prominent. The trends in the cases of Level 3 and Level 1 were more prominent than the ones in the cases of Levels 2, 4 and 5.

Responses that corresponded to **Level 3 (The past as different world inhabited by modern day people)**, when the small Year 4 sample is excluded, increased by age until Year 6 and then disappear in the teachers' age group. The difference between Year 3 (3%) and Year 6 (20%) was statistically significant (p=0.0239), while the differences between Year 3 and Year 5 (18%) and between Year 5 and Year 6 were not statistically significant. This provide strong evidence of a significant change of an increase by age in the attainment of Level 3 between the youngest and the oldest of the students which was gradual. Teachers, as already mentioned, did not provide responses that corresponded to this level.

Responses that corresponded to **Level 1 (Pseudo-explanations)** decreased by age. Differences between Year 3 (23%) and Year 4 (13%) and between Year 4 and Year 5 (18%) were not statistically significant. The difference between Year 5 and Year 6 (0%) was statistically significant (p=0.0300) and the same applied in the case of the difference between Year 3 and Year 6 (p=0.0111). As Year 6 students, teachers also did not provide answers at this level. The fact that the difference between teachers and Year 3 students was not statistically significance was clearly due to the small teachers' sample. These results provide strong evidence of a rapid decline by age in terms of attainment of this level which happened between Year 5 and Year 6.

Responses that corresponded to **Level 2 (The past as a deficit version of the present)** also decreased by age among students. The difference between Year 3 (50%) and Year 6 students (20%) was marginally significant (chi square p=0.0969). Differences between adjacent groups were not statistically significant. In the light of these results, it can be argued that this study provides some evidence for the existence of a gradual decrease of attainment of this level

243

by age among students. Despite the fact that teachers provided responses (33%) at this level more often than all year groups, except Year 3, differences between this and the other groups were not statistically significant.

Responses that corresponded to **Level 5 (The past as a different world that shaped different people)** increased by age. Year 3 and Year 4 students did not provide any responses at this level while one teacher out of six (17%) did. Only four responses (out of 89) corresponded to this level, therefore statistical significance of this trend could not be established. In this sense, the argument of the existence of a trend of increase by age of attainment of this level in terms of percentages is weakened by the lack of statistical significance.

Responses that corresponded to **Level 4 (The past as a different world inhabited by different people)** also followed a trend of increase by age, when the Year 4 sample is excluded. The largest difference was the one between Year 3 students (23%) and the teachers (50%). Despite the fact this was a relatively large difference, and participants in general provided responses at this level quite often (28 out of 89 responses), it was not statistically significant. This was possibly due to the small sample of teachers' responses (3 out of 28). As in the case of Level 2, the argument of the existence of an age-related trend of decrease in terms of the attainment of this level is weakened by the lack of statistical significance.

In the light of the above, this study provides strong evidence for the existence of two phenomena. The first is a tendency, which increased by age among students when the small Year 4 sample is excluded), to explain the choice of practices in the past as decisions made by people who lived in a different world but thought as their modern-day counterparts do (Level 3). The second is a steep decline by age, which happened between Year 5 and Year 6, of responses that essentially fail to provide explanations of the choice of past practices and instead resort to pseudo-explanations (Level 1). The study also provides some evidence for the existence of a trend of decline by age among students of explanations that view the choice of past practices as decisions made by people who lived in a world similar to the contemporary one, but often lacked in terms of

knowledge or means (Level 2). Finally, this study provides evidence, albeit weaker, for the existence of two more phenomena. The first is an increase by age (among all participants) of explanations of choices of past practices that view these choices as integral to the way of life of people in the past (Level 5) and explanations that take into consideration the fact that people in the past held beliefs that were different to our own contemporary ones (Level 4).

The above paint a general picture of progress by age in terms of ideas of historical empathy among the participants of this study. Explanations that corresponded to the lower levels of the model of progression (Level 1 and 2), failing to acknowledge the different views held by people in the past and the different world in which they lived, declined by age. On the other hand, explanations that acknowledge these differences in various degrees (Level 3, 4 and 5) increased by age. The fact that the trend of increased attainment by age of Level 3 is reversed with the teachers does not necessarily suggest that progress stopped, but rather that teachers did not use explanations that despite being more sophisticated than some (Level 1 and 2) are still problematic compared to others (Level 4 and 5). The only finding that challenges this picture of progress was the fact that teachers' responses corresponded to Level 2 in higher percentage than most of the students' groups (Year 4, 5 and 6). Teachers' responses at this level explained the choice of practice by assimilating aspects of it to modern day medical approaches. A possible explanation of this phenomenon is that the teachers' knowledge of modern-day medicine prompted them to see similarities between modern day practices and the ancient practices they were asked to explain.

The argument for the existence of progress is strengthened when we look at the levels which the majority of responses of each age group attained. The majority of responses by Year 3 students (50%) corresponded to Level 2, the ones by Year 4 (63%) to Level 3, and the ones by Year 5 (36%), Year 6 (40%), and the teachers (50%) to Level 4.

As discussed in Chapter 3 (pp. 94-98), the few studies that attempted to explore the relation between attained levels of understanding of historical empathy and age among primary students (Knight, 1989; Lee and Ashby, 2001; Lee and Shemilt, 2010; Perikleous, 2011; Huijgen, van Boxtel, van de Grift and Holthuis, 2014) report findings that suggest a progression by age. Two of them used

methodology similar to the one used in the present study (analysed responses to open ended questions about the choice of practices in the past with the aim to identify types of explanation and compare different age groups in terms of the sophistication of their ideas of historical empathy) and a sample that included age groups employed in the present study's sample. These were the CHATA project (Lee and Ashby, 2001; Lee and Shemilt, 2010) in England and my earlier study with primary students in Cyprus (Perikleous, 2011). CHATA project publications report the same age-related trends, as in the present study, in terms of the sophistication of the responses of the participants by age. More specifically, they report a rise by age in explanations that refer to the way of life of people in the past (Level 5 in the present study) and their different beliefs (Level 4 in the present study) (Lee and Ashby, 2001; Lee and Shemilt, 2010). They also report a rise by age of explanations that while they acknowledge differences in the situation of people in the past, still explain their choices in present terms (Level 3 in the present study) (Lee and Ashby, 2001; Lee and Shemilt, 2010). The findings of the CHATA project also suggest a decline by age of explanations of the choice of practice in terms of deficits or explanations that assimilate the practice to ones recognizable in the present (Level 2 in the present study) (Lee and Ashby, 2001; Lee and Shemilt, 2010) and also a decline in pseudo-explanations that essentially fail to explain the choices made by people in the past and instead provide descriptions or tautologies (Level 1 in the present study) (Lee and Shemilt, 2010).

In my previous study (Perikleous, 2011), progression by age was observed only in the responses to one of the two tasks that were used in that investigation. In that case responses that provided pseudo-explanations (Level 1 in the present study) or explained the choice of practice by assimilating them to modern day ones (Level 2 in the present study) declined by age while responses that explained the choice of practice in terms of what contemporary people would do in a similar situation (Level 3) rose by age. Despite the fact that none of the responses was deemed as corresponding to a level of sophistication where explanations take into consideration the different views of people in the past (Level 4 in the present study) some of the Year 6 participants used references to different ideas, albeit tentatively.

Evidence of progression by age among primary age students can also be found in studies that measure sophistication of ideas of historical empathy quantitively. Huijgen, van Boxtel, van de Grift and Holthuis (2014) report that pre-defined explanations of an individual behaviour that take into consideration the historical agent's point of view were considered more appropriate by older students. The opposite applied in the case of explanations that used present oriented perspectives. In this case these explanations were favored more by younger students. An earlier study by Knight (1989b), which assessed sophistication in terms of a single score that measured the plausibility of explanations of the behaviour of groups and individuals in the past and the present, also reports a progress by age. In the light of the above, the findings of the present study contribute to research evidence that suggest that the phenomenon of progress in ideas of historical empathy by age in primary students is one the exists across educational contexts.

Although no previous studies exist in terms of comparisons between teachers and students of any age, available research evidence suggests the existence of progression by age in terms of sophistication of ideas of historical empathy in ages between 12 and 18 (Huijgen, van Boxtel, van de Grift and Holthuis, 2014; Dickinson and Lee, 1978). The fact that in the present study progress continued with the teachers, provides some initial indications that teachers ideas are usually more sophisticated than the ones of their primary age students. However, despite this being a logical assumption, the very small sample of responses provided by teachers (six responses) and the lack of findings from other studies does not allow claims for generalisations.

7.3 Conclusion

This chapter responded to the second research question of this study (Do the ideas used by Greek Cypriot primary students and teachers when asked to explain past practices differ according to their age?), by exploring the possibility of age-related trends in terms of the sophistication of participants' responses to the pen and paper tasks.

The findings of this study suggest that students' responses that explain the choice of practice in ways that acknowledge the different way of life, beliefs and situation of people in the past (Level 5, 4 and 3) increase by age, while responses that view people in the past as inferior, assimilate the practices in questions to modern day ones and provide pseudo-explanations (Levels 1 and 2) decline by age. This overall picture of progression of ideas of historical empathy by age is also reported by studies in different educational contexts and with different methodologies. This is an indication that this is a phenomenon that possibly exists across different cultures and educational systems. However, the small number of available studies does not allow, at the moment, the formation of strong arguments of generalisations.

Furthermore, the fact that studies in the field of psychology report findings according to which Theory of Mind (the ability to recognise different perspectives held by others and their situation) develops from childhood at least until adolescence (see for example the systematic review of longitudinal studies of theory of mind by Derksen et. al., 2018) provides evidence that progression in terms of ideas of historical empathy is not something that is solely defined by the teaching of history or education in general. Although we should be careful when comparing ideas of historical empathy and related ideas studied in psychology, these findings might suggest that this kind of progression is at least partly due to maturation (both in terms of biology and the experience of the social world).[53] This argument is strengthened by the fact the studies discussed above (Lee and Shemilt, 2001; Knight, 1989 Perikleous, 2010; Huijgen, van Boxtel, van de Grift and Holthuis, 2014) took place in educational contexts where teaching did not explicitly aim to develop students' understanding of people in the past. The same applied in the case of the present study. As discussed in Chapter 1 the Greek Cypriot educational system, despite the detailed references to historical empathy in the Primary History Curriculum 2016, does not provide substantial opportunities for the development of ideas of historical empathy.

---

[53] For a discussion of the differences in terms of exploring ideas of historical empathy and related ideas studied in psychology see Chapter 1 (pp. 17-18).

The fact that progression can be observed even in the absence of teaching that aims to develop ideas of historical empathy, does not mean that such teaching is not important. A plethora of research findings show that teaching can prompt students to use more sophisticated ideas of historical empathy (see for example Shemilt, 1980; Yeager and Doppen, 2001; Brooks, 2008, 2011; Endacott, 2010; Perrotta, 2018; Wilschut and Schiphorst, 2019). In this sense, it can be argued that while older students are likely to operate in higher levels than younger ones by default, teaching with the explicit aim to develop ideas of historical empathy can help students to respond in ways that are more sophisticated than the ones they already use.

This study also confirms previous findings about primary age students' ability to understand past behaviour at some level. As in a number of previous studies (see for example Lee and Ashby, 2001; Cooper, 2007; Knight, 1989a; Barton and Levstik, 2004; Perikleous, 2011), in this study, in a number of occasions primary students provided responses that explained past behaviour in sophisticated ways that acknowledged the different views and beliefs of people in the past and the different context in which they lived (responses that corresponded to Levels 3 and 4) and even, albeit rarely, acknowledged that the latter might shaped the former (responses that corresponded to Level 5). Such findings challenge older claims based on Piagetian oriented studies (Coltham, 1960; Hallam, 1970, 1975) and even voiced occasionally in the 21st century (see discussion in Chapter 2, pp. 45-46) according to which younger students cannot think in sophisticated ways about the past. Furthermore, these findings   suggest that teaching with the aim to develop sophisticated ideas of historical empathy can be effective even with younger students. Moreover, as showed by this and other studies (Lee and Ashby, 2001; Lee and Shemilt; 2010; Knight, 1989b; Perikleous, 2011), some younger students can hold more sophisticated ideas than older ones and that a variety of ideas can exist within the same age group. This demands for a teaching of history that takes into consideration that in any classroom we can find a variety of ideas of different sophistication.

In terms of differences between primary students and teachers, an aspect that is explored for the first time in research of ideas of historical empathy, this study

suggests that progression of ideas of historical empathy continues with teachers. However, the small teachers' sample and the lack of similar studies does not allow strong claims of generalisation. Stronger arguments exist about the claim, made by this and other studies, that problematic ideas of historical empathy can exist even among teachers (see for example, Shemilt, 1980; Wineburg, 2001; Carril-Merino, Sánchez-Agustí and Muñoz-Labraña, 2020). This is confirmed by the findings of these study were two teachers provided responses that explained the choice of practice made by people in the past in terms of deficit and by assimilating aspects of the practice to modern day treatments (Level 2). In fact, the present study suggests that the "seven-year gap", the phenomenon of some students holding ideas more sophisticated than the ones held by some students that are seven years older (Lee, Dickinson and Ashby, 2001), can be a bigger one. In this study, some Year 3 students exhibited ideas more sophisticated than the ones exhibited by some of the teachers. An also important finding of this study was that only one of the teachers' responses attained the highest level of the progression model (Level 5). Taking into consideration that teachers are not just a group of adults, but also the ones responsible for developing students' ideas, such findings stress the importance of providing teachers with training that not only helps them to develop their teachings skills and pedagogical knowledge, but also subject oriented knowledge (substantive and disciplinary). As pointed out in Chapters 1 and 4, none of the teachers who participated the present study reported that they had any substantial training in either history teaching or history.

Besides the implications of the findings of this study for teaching and teachers training (briefly pointed out in the previous paragraphs), these findings have implications for research in ideas of historical empathy too. Implications for research are related to the limitations of this study and also limitation in terms of the limited available research of age differences in ideas of historical empathy in general and support the claim for more research both at the local level of Greek Cypriot education and globally. At the local level, for example, more research with larger and more representative sample is needed before claims about the whole population of Greek Cypriot primary students and teachers can be made. Larger samples will also answer questions in terms of the prominence of some of

the age-related trends observe in the present study. More specifically, studies with larger samples can answer the questions of whether the lack of statistical significance of differences that point to age-related trends in this study was due to a small sample or due to a lack of a meaningful relationship (i.e., the differences are random and the age-related trend does not exist).

At a global level, as already mentioned, the topic of differences according to age among students is an under-researched area and the same applies in the case of teachers' ideas of the concept. Furthermore, beyond this study, no research evidence exists about comparisons between students and teachers. It is therefore clear that more research is needed in order to be able to provide valid descriptions of these phenomena. Also, more research, both at the local and the global level, is needed in order to understand what can support progression by age. Although we have a plethora of studies that suggest ways to prompt students to use more sophisticated explanations of past behaviour in short periods of time, we do not know much about how teaching can support genuine progression of ideas across ages in terms of students using more powerful ideas steadily.

Chapter 8: Data and discussion: Differences according to temporal and cultural distance between the participants and the groups that held the practices in question

8.1 Introduction

This chapter aims to respond to the third, and last, research question of this study (Do the ideas used by Greek Cypriot primary students and teachers to explain the choice of practices differ according to their temporal and cultural distance from the people who made them?). More specifically, this chapter explores differences in participants' responses in pen and paper tasks between a) explanations of the choice of practices made by groups of people in the past (Ancient Greeks and Ancient Maya) and practices made by groups of people in the present (modern-day Orthodox Christians and modern-day Muslims) (temporal distance; section 8.2) and b) explanations of the choice of practices made by in-groups (Ancient Greeks) and out-groups (Ancient Maya) (cultural distance; section 8.3) in the past.[54] In both cases, I look at differences in terms of the level of sophistication in participants' responses (levels of the progression model suggested in Chapter 6).

Differences in empathetic explanations, according to temporal and cultural distance between the participants and the historical agents, have never been explored in previous empirical studies in the field of history education. As discussed in Chapter 3 (pp. 110-113), despite the fact that research evidence for related phenomena and theoretical assumptions provide some indications, no evidence exists at the moment that can inform us about the effect of temporal

---

[54] The term *in-groups* is used to describe groups to which people belong or believe they belong. The term *out-groups* is used to describe groups to which people do not belong or they believe they do not belong (Tajfel, 1970). As discussed in Chapter 4, for the purposes of the present study the Ancient Greeks and modern-day Orthodox Christians were considered to be in-groups for the participants since they were all Christian Orthodox Greek Cypriots. Conversely, the Ancient Maya and modern-day Muslims were considered to be out-groups for the participants. The term cultural distance is used in this thesis to describe the relationship of the participants with in-groups and out-groups.

and cultural distance when these are the only differences between actions, institutions or practices to be explained.

The issue here is not only how temporal and cultural distance affect empathetic explanations, but it is also related to a wider issue of the transferability of ideas of historical empathy across tasks and topics. As discussed in Chapters 5 and 6, tasks (pen and paper tasks vs interview) and different types of question affected the explanations provided by the participants in the present study. By answering the above question, this chapter also investigates the effect of different topics on the transferability of ideas.

The findings of this study suggest the existence of differences according to temporal distance in terms of the sophistication of students' responses. On the contrary, the findings of this study suggests that there are no differences according to cultural distance in students' responses. The very small sample of teachers (only four) did not allow any meaningful comparisons within this group.

8.2 Differences according to temporal distance: explanations of the choice of past and present practices

This section discusses differences between explanations of the choice of past and present practices. The Ancient Greek and the Ancient Maya tasks asked participants to explain the choice of religious healing practices that happened in the past; practices that are temporally distant from the participants. The Orthodox Christians and the Muslims tasks asked about religious healing practices that are still happening today, albeit not used by the participants; practices held by groups that are temporally close to the participants. As discussed in Chapter 4, in order to avoid the effect of factors beyond temporal and cultural distance, the four practices were selected on the basis that a) they were all used for the same purpose (treating diseases), b) they were all based on the same idea of divine intervention on the physical world (god or gods intervene to heal people from diseases), c) they all described procedures that were religious ceremonies instead of medical interventions and d) they were all

253

unknown to the participants.[55] The latter also meant that participants have never been affected by the practice in question in any way.

The sample for this section of the analysis consisted of the 102 responses to pen and paper tasks provided by the 51 participants (47 students and 4 teachers) who completed a pen and paper task about a past practice (Ancient Greeks or Ancient Maya) and a task about a present practice (Orthodox Christians or Muslims).[56] Table 8.1 shows the distribution of the different combinations of past-present tasks completed by the participants.

Table 8.1 Distribution of combinations of past-present tasks completed

Combinations of tasks	Students	Teachers	Total
Ancient Greeks- Orthodox Christians	12	1	13
Ancient Greeks- Muslims	13	1	14
Ancient Maya- Orthodox Christians	11	1	12
Ancient Maya- Muslims	11	1	12
Total	47	4	51

Differences between responses to tasks about past practices and responses to tasks about present practices existed in terms of attainment of the different

---

[55] This was established by asking participants before the submission of the pen and paper tasks whether they were aware of the practice. Teachers were aware of the existence of the Orthodox Christian practice. However, none of them had a personal experience of it and none of them was aware that this practice is being used by some as a treatment for diseases.
[56] Despite the fact that tasks about present practices were given to 53 participants, one of them returned it without any answers while a second one was absent on the day their class completed the task.

levels of the progression model suggested in Chapter 6 (differences in terms of sophistication).[57]

Table 8.2 presents the distribution of participants' responses (to tasks about past and present practices) to the levels of the progression model. Table 8.3 shows the results of the tests for the statistical significance of differences in the attainment of the levels of the progression model between responses to tasks about practices in the past and responses to tasks about practices in the present.

Table 8.2 Distribution of responses to pen and paper tasks about past practices and practices in the present to the progression model levels (N= 102)

This table counts the number (f) and shows the percentage of responses to pen and paper tasks about past and present practices that corresponded to each level of the suggested progression model.

Levels	Students				Teachers				All participants			
	Past		Present		Past		Present		Past		Present	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Level 5	3	6	7	15	1	25	0	0	4	8	7	14
Level 4	11	23	22	47	2	50	2	50	13	25	24	47
Level 3	10	21	3	6	0	0	1	25	10	20	4	8
Level 2	14	30	5	11	1	25	1	25	15	29	6	12
Level 1	8	17	7	15	0	0	0	0	8	16	7	14
Atypical responses	1	2	3	6	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	6
Total	47	100	47	100	4	100	4	100	51	100	51	100

---

[57] For the progression model see Chapter 7 (pp. 236-237). Responses to pen and paper task about practices in the present (Orthodox Christians and Muslims) were assigned to the different levels of the progression model following the same process as in the case of responses to tasks about past practices demonstrated in chapter 6 (pp. 192-214).

Table 8.3 Tests for the statistical significance of the differences in the distribution of responses to the progression models level between tasks about past practices and tasks about present practices

The table presents the results of the tests for the statistical significance of differences between the distribution of responses to task about past practices and responses to tasks about present practices to the progression model levels.[58]

Types of explanation	Students Tests for significance (p-value)	Teachers Tests for significance (p-value)	All participants Tests for significance (p-value)
Level 5	*0.3434*	*1.0000*	*0.5487*
Level 4	0.0555	*1.0000*	0.0705
Level 3	*0.0922*	*1.0000*	*0.1795*
Level 2	0.0389	*1.0000*	0.0495
Level 1	0.7963	-	0.7963
Atypical response	*0.6129*	-	*0.6129*

Only 18 out of 47 students (38%) provided responses at the same level in both tasks. Furthermore, their responses to tasks about past practices were more likely to correspond to Level 2 (30%) and Level 3 (21%) than responses to tasks about present practices (11% and 6% respectively). As indicated by the tests of significance the difference in the attainment of Level 2 was statistically significant (p=0.0389) while the difference in the attainment of Level 3 was marginally significant (p=0.0922). In contrast, responses to tasks about present practices

---

[58] In the case of comparisons that contain values equal or above 5, the results of chi-square tests are reported. In the case of comparison that contains values lower than 5 the results, Fisher's exact tests are reported. The latter is because for values below 5 Fisher's exact tests are considered to be a more adequate way of testing the statistical significance of differences (Chapter 4, pp. 154). In order to help the reader to distinguish between the different claims for significance, I make claims for statistical significance in the cases in which the significance tests returned p-values lower than 0.05, marginal significance in the cases in which significance tests returned p-values lower than 0.10 and near-marginal significance in the cases in which tests returned p-values lower than 0.18 (Chapter 4, pp. 155-156). Values that indicate statistical significance of p< 0.05 are highlighted with yellow colour. Values that indicate marginal statistical significance of p< 0.10 are highlighted with blue colour. Values that indicate near-marginal statistical significance of p< 0.18 are highlighted with green colour

were more likely to correspond to Level 4 (47%) and Level 5 (15%) than responses to tasks about past practices (23% and 6% respectively). Only the difference in the attainment of Level 4 was deemed as marginally significant (chi-square p=0.0555). Students' responses corresponded to Level 1 with similar frequency in tasks about past practices and tasks about present practices (17% and 15% respectively).

The above findings support the claim about a *temporal distance effect* in students' responses. Students' responses were more likely to explain the choice of practice primarily in terms of deficits of the people who held them or by assimilating the practice to known ones (Level 2) when they responded to tasks about past practices. When they responded to a task about temporally distant (past) practices, they were also more likely to explain the choices made in terms of the practice being the best available one in the context of the groups that held them (Level 3). On the contrary, they were more likely to explain the choice of practice as a result of people's different beliefs (Level 4) and different way of life (Level 5) when they responded to tasks about practices that were temporally close to them (present).

Despite the fact that the latter (responses at Level 5) was not a statistically significant difference, it can be argued that, overall, temporal distance between the students and the groups the held the practice in question affected the sophistication of their responses. Students provided in general more sophisticated responses when they explained the choice of practices in the present. This is evident by the fact that 62% of their responses to tasks about present practices corresponded to Levels 4 and 5 while only 39% of their responses to tasks about past practices corresponded to the same level. This was a statistically significant difference (p= 0.0222). Also 68% of their responses about past practices corresponded to Levels 1, 2 and 3, while only 29% of their responses to present practices corresponded to these levels. This difference was also statistically significant (p=0.0131). The claim about students providing more sophisticated responses to tasks about present practices is supported further by the fact that out of the 26 students, who provided responses at

different levels in their two tasks, 20 of them (77%) provided answers at a higher level in their responses in the present ones.

As can be observed in table 8.3, teachers' responses did not differ substantially. Also, half of them provided responses at the same level in both tasks. One of the two teachers who provided responses at different levels attained a higher level in their response to the task about a past practice, while the other did the same in their response to a task about a present practice. However, the small sample (four participants) in this case does not allow any claims for teachers being unaffected by temporal distance.

Differences were also observed in the comparisons of explanations of past and present practices within each combination of tasks. Tables 8.4, 8.6, 8.8 and 8.10 compare the sophistication (attainment of the different levels of the suggested progression model) of participants' responses in each of the above combinations of tasks about past and present practices (Ancient Greeks- Orthodox Christians, Ancient Greeks- Muslims, Ancient Maya- Christians, Ancient Maya- Muslims). Tables 8.5, 8.7, 8.9 and 8.11 report the results of the tests for the statistical significance of the differences observed between responses, in each combination of tasks, in terms of their sophistication. In this case, the small sample of teachers (one teacher in each combination) does not allow any discussions of findings regarding this group. Therefore, below I discuss only the responses of students.

Table 8.4 Distribution of responses to pen and paper tasks about the Ancient Greeks' and the Orthodox Christians' practices to the progression model levels (N=28)

This table counts the number (f) and shows the percentage of responses to pen and paper tasks about the Ancient Greeks' and the Orthodox Christians' practices that corresponded to each level of the suggested progression model.

Levels	Students				Teachers				All participants			
	Past Ancient Greeks		Present Orthodox Christians		Past Ancient Greeks		Present Orthodox Christians		Past Ancient Greeks		Present Orthodox Christians	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Level 5	0	0	1	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	8
Level 4	4	33	6	50	1	100	0	0	5	38	6	46
Level 3	2	17	1	8	0	0	1	100	2	15	2	15
Level 2	3	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	23	0	0
Level 1	2	17	2	17	0	0	0	0	2	15	2	15
Atypical responses	1	8	2	17	0	0	0	0	1	8	2	15
Total	12	100	12	100	1	100	1	100	13	100	13	100

Table 8.5 Tests for the statistical significance of differences in the distribution of responses to the progression model's level between tasks about the Ancient Greeks' and tasks about the Orthodox Christians' practices

The table presents the results of the tests for the statistical significance of differences between the distribution of responses to tasks about the Ancient Greeks' and tasks about the Orthodox Christians' practices to the progression model levels.[59]

Types of explanation	Students	Teachers	All participants
	Tests for significance (p-value)	Tests for significance (p-value)	Tests for significance (p-value)
Level 5	1.0000	-	1.0000
Level 4	0.7538	1.0000	1.0000
Level 3	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Level 2	0.2000	--	0.2000
Level 1	1.0000	-	1.0000
Atypical response	1.0000	-	1.0000

---

[59] See note 58.

Table 8.6 Distribution of responses to pen and paper tasks about the Ancient Greeks' and the Muslims' practices to the progression model levels (N=28)

This table counts the number (f) and shows the percentage of responses to pen and paper tasks about the Ancient Greeks' and the Muslims' practices that corresponded to each level of the suggested progression model.

Levels	Students				Teachers				All participants			
	Past Ancient Greeks		Present Muslims		Past Ancient Greeks		Present Muslims		Past Ancient Greeks		Present Muslims	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Level 5	0	0	2	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	14
Level 4	3	23	8	62	0	0	0	0	3	21	8	57
Level 3	4	31	1	8	0	0	0	0	4	29	1	7
Level 2	5	38	1	8	1	100	1	100	6	43	2	14
Level 1	1	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	0	0
Atypical responses	0	0	1	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	7
Total	13	100	13	100	1	100	1	100	14	100	14	100

Table 8.7 Tests for the statistical significance of differences in the distribution of responses to the progression model's level between tasks about the Ancient Greeks' and tasks about the Muslims' practices

The table presents the results of the tests for the statistical significance of differences between the distribution of responses to tasks about the Ancient Greeks' and tasks about the Muslims' practices to the progression model levels.[60]

Types of explanation	Students Tests for significance (p-value)	Teachers Tests for significance (p-value)	All participants Tests for significance (p-value)
Level 5	0.4286	-	0.4286
Level 4	0.2264	-	0.2264
Level 3	0.3651	-	0.3651
Level 2	0.2126	1.0000	0.2877
Level 1	1.0000	-	1.0000
Atypical response	1.0000	-	1.0000

[60] See note 58.

Table 8.8 Distribution of responses to pen and paper tasks about the Ancient Maya's and the Orthodox Christians' practices to the progression model levels (N=24)

This table counts the number (f) and shows the percentage of responses to pen and paper tasks about the Ancient Maya's and the Orthodox Christians' practices that corresponded to each level of the suggested progression model.

Levels	Students				Teachers				All participants			
	Past Ancient Maya		**Present** Orthodox Christians		**Past** Ancient Maya		**Present** Orthodox Christians		**Past** Ancient Maya		**Present** Orthodox Christians	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Level 5	0	0	1	9	1	100	0	0	1	8	1	8
Level 4	3	27	6	55	0	0	1	100	3	25	7	58
Level 3	2	18	1	9	0	0	0	0	2	17	1	8
Level 2	3	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	25	0	0
Level 1	3	27	3	27	0	0	0	0	3	25	3	25
Atypical responses	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	11	100	11	100	1	100	1	100	12	100	12	100

Table 8.9 Tests for the statistical significance of differences in the distribution of responses to the progression model's level between tasks about the Ancient Maya's and tasks about the Orthodox Christians' practices

The table presents the results of the tests for the statistical significance of differences between the distribution of responses to tasks about the Ancient Maya's and tasks about the Orthodox Christian's practices to the progression model levels.[61]

Types of explanation	Students	Teachers	All participants
	Tests for significance (p-value)	Tests for significance (p-value)	Tests for significance (p-value)
Level 5	*1.0000*	*1.0000*	*1.0000*
Level 4	*0.5073*	*1.0000*	*0.3434*
Level 3	*1.0000*	*-*	*1.0000*
Level 2	*0.2000*	*-*	*0.2000*
Level 1	*1.0000*	*-*	*1.0000*
Atypical response	*-*	*-*	*-*

---

[61] See note 58.

Table 8.10 Distribution of responses to pen and paper tasks about the

Ancient Maya's and the Muslims' practices to the progression model levels

(N=24)

This table counts the number (f) and shows the percentage of responses to pen and paper tasks about the Ancient Maya's and the Muslims' practices that corresponded to each level of the suggested progression model.

Levels	Students				Teachers				All participants			
	Past Ancient Maya		Present Muslims		Past Ancient Maya		Present Muslims		Past Ancient Maya		Present Muslims	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Level 5	3	27	3	27	0	0	0	0	3	25	3	25
Level 4	2	18	3	27	1	100	1	100	3	25	4	33
Level 3	2	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	17	0	0
Level 2	3	27	3	27	0	0	0	0	3	25	3	25
Level 1	1	9	2	18	0	0	0	0	1	8	2	17
Atypical responses	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	11	100	11	100	1	100	1	100	12	100	12	100

Table 8.11 Tests for the statistical significance of differences in the distribution of responses to the progression model's level between tasks about the Ancient Maya's and tasks about the Muslims' practices

The table presents the results of the tests for the statistical significance of differences between the distribution of responses to tasks about the Ancient Maya's and tasks about the Muslims' practices to the progression model levels.[62]

Types of explanation	Students	Teachers	All participants
	Tests for significance (p-value)	Tests for significance (p-value)	Tests for significance (p-value)
Level 5	1.0000	-	1.0000
Level 4	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Level 3	0.4286	-	0.4286
Level 2	1.0000	-	1.0000
Level 1	1.0000	-	1.0000
Atypical response	-	-	-

As in the case of the comparison of all the responses provided by the students who completed one task about a past practice and one about a present practice, the comparisons in the different combinations of tasks also suggest that temporal distance affects the sophistication of students' responses. The findings presented in the above tables suggest that the effect of temporal distance in the sophistication of participants responses existed in the case of almost all combinations of past-present tasks. In all cases, less than half of the students provided responses at the same level in both tasks. With the exception of the Ancient Maya- Muslims combination, in all other combinations, students' responses corresponded to Level 2 (explained the choice of practice with references to deficits of people in the past or by assimilating the practice to known ones) more often in tasks about past practices and to Level 4 (explained the choice of practice with reference to people's beliefs) in tasks about present practices. In the case of the Ancient Maya- Muslims combination students' responses corresponded to Level 2 with the same frequency. The fact that in some cases these differences were not as prominent, in terms of percentages,

[62] See note 58.

can be explained with reference to differences between the participants of each sample. The fact that statistical significance could not be established was in most cases possibly due to the small size of the samples. For example, the difference in the attainment of Level 2 between responses to past and present practices in the case of the total sample (30% to 11%; table 8.2) was deemed to be statistically significant (p=0.0389; table 8.3). Instead, the larger difference observed in the case of the smaller sample of participants who responded to the Ancient Greeks- Muslims combination of tasks (38% to 8%; table 8.6) was not deemed as statistically significant (p=0.2126; table 8.7).

Furthermore, in all cases, including the Ancient Maya- Muslims combination, the majority of students' responses to tasks about present practices corresponded to the higher levels of the progression model (Levels 4 and 5), while the majority of the responses to tasks about past practices corresponded to the lower levels of the model (Levels 1,2 and 3). As in the case of the total sample, the claim about students providing more sophisticated responses in tasks about present practices is also supported by the fact that in all the cases the majority of students, who provided answers at different levels between the two tasks, provided more sophisticated responses in the case of the task about a present practice.

The findings discussed in this section provide strong evidence for the existence of a *temporal distance effect* in the sophistication of students' responses (in terms of attainment of the levels of the progression model suggested in Chapter 6). The most prominent example of this effect was students' tendency to refer to a deficit past or assimilate the practice to modern ones (Level 2) more often when they explained practices in the past. In this sense, this section provides empirical evidence that support earlier claims about students' explanations of past behaviour demonstrating presentist views of the past and its people (see for example Wineburg, 2001; Barton and Levstik, 2004; Lee and Ashby, 2001; Lee and Shemilt, 2011). These claims are also supported by the fact that in this study students were more likely to refer to people's beliefs (Level 4), when asked to explain the choice of practices in the present. It is possible that what made students to refer more often to people's beliefs in the case of present practices,

was the fact that a) they did not view people of their own time (the present) as inferior and b) they acknowledged that these people have the same options as the rest of us do. Therefore, students looked for explanation of the unfamiliar behaviour to the different ways the groups in question viewed the world. This in turn possibly prompted them to provide more sophisticated explanations.

8.3 Differences according to cultural distance: explanations of in-group and out-group practices

This section discusses differences between explanations of the choice of practices by in-groups and out-groups. The Ancient Greek and the Orthodox Christian tasks asked participants to respond to practices that were held by groups with which the participants identify as their own group or their ancestors (in-groups). These groups were considered as culturally close to the participants. The Ancient Maya and the Muslim tasks described practices held by groups which are foreign to the participants (out-groups). These groups were considered as culturally distant from the participants.

The sample for this section of the analysis consisted of the 40 responses to pen and paper tasks provided by the 20 participants (19 students and one teacher) who completed a pen and paper task about the Ancient Greeks' practice (a practice in the past held by an in-group) and a task about the Ancient Maya practice (a practice in the past held by an out-group). None of the participants completed the combination of Orthodox Christians-Muslims' combination. As discussed in Chapter 4, this was because this study explores ideas in terms of explanations of the choice of past practices (historical empathy). In this sense exploring differences according to cultural distance between modern-day practices was beyond the scope of this study.

The sophistication of responses to the Ancient Greeks task (in-group) and responses to the Ancient Maya task (out-group) did not differ significantly in terms of attainment of the different levels of the progression model suggested in Chapter 6.

Table 8.12 presents the distribution of participants' responses (to the Ancient Greek and the Ancient Maya tasks) to the levels of the progression model. Table 8.13 shows the results of the tests of significance for differences in the attainment of the levels of the progression model between responses to the Ancient Greeks and the Ancient Maya tasks.

Table 8.12 Distribution of responses to pen and paper tasks about the Ancient Greeks' practice and the Ancient Maya's practice to the progression model levels (N= 40)

This table counts the number (f) and shows the percentage of responses to pen and paper tasks about the Ancient Greeks' and the Ancient Maya's practices that corresponded to each level of the suggested progression model.

Levels	Students				Teachers				All participants			
	Ancient Greeks		Ancient Maya		Ancient Greeks		Ancient Maya		Ancient Greeks		Ancient Maya	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Level 5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 4	5	26	8	42	0	0	1	100	5	25	9	45
Level 3	2	11	4	21	0	0	0	0	2	10	4	20
Level 2	7	37	5	26	1	100	0	0	8	40	5	25
Level 1	3	16	1	5	0	0	0	0	3	15	1	5
Atypical responses	2	11	1	5	0	0	0	0	2	10	1	5
Total	19	100	19	100	1	100	1	100	20	100	20	100

Table 8.13 Tests for the statistical significance of differences in the distribution of responses to the progression models level between tasks about the Ancient Greeks' practice and tasks about the Ancient Maya practice

The table presents the results of the tests for the statistical significance of differences between the distribution of responses to tasks about the Ancient Greeks' practice and tasks about the Ancient Maya practice to the progression model levels.[63]

Types of explanation	Students Tests for significance (p-value)	Teachers Tests for significance (p-value)	All participants Tests for significance (p-value)
Level 5	-	-	-
Level 4	0.4054	*1.0000*	0.2850
Level 3	*0.6850*	-	*0.6850*
Level 2	0.5637	1.0000	0.4054
Level 1	*0.6129*	-	*0.6129*
Atypical response	*1.0000*	-	*1.0000*

Fourteen out of 19 students (74%) provided responses at the same level in both tasks. Students' responses to Ancient Greeks task (in-group) were more likely to correspond to Level 2 (37%) and Level 1 (16%) than their responses to the Ancient Maya task (out-group) (26% and 5% respectively). On the other hand, responses to the Ancient Maya task were more likely to correspond to Level 4 (42%) and Level 3 (21%) than responses to the Ancient Greeks task (26% and 11% respectively). None of these differences was deemed as statistically significant. Furthermore, they were smaller than most of the differences identified in all the combinations of past-present tasks discussed in section 8.2 (see tables 8.4, 8.6, 8.8 and 8.10).

The findings of this section do not support any claims for a *cultural distance effect* in terms of the sophistication of students' responses. Students' responses did not differ substantially in terms of their sophistication between the in-group (Ancient Greeks) and the out-group (Ancient Maya) tasks.

---

[63] See note 58.

As discussed in Chapter 3 (p. 112), the findings of previous studies in the field of psychology according to which people (adults and children) tend in many cases, but not always, to judge in-groups more favourably than out-groups (see for example Tajfel, 1970; Bennett et. al., 2004; Appiah, Knobloch-Westerwick, and Alter, 2013) in the present. The findings of this study do not suggest that in all cases cultural distance did not affect responses. In fact, as can be seen in tables 8.14 and 8.15 below, when we look at the comparison between the responses to the Orthodox Christian practice and the Muslim one (an in-group practice and an out-group practice in the present) differences did exist.

Table 8.14 Distribution of responses to pen and paper tasks about the Orthodox Christians' practice and the Muslims' practice to the progression model levels (N= 51)

This table counts the number (f) and shows the percentage of responses to pen and paper tasks about the Orthodox Christians and the Muslims' practices that corresponded to each level of the suggested progression model.

Levels	Students				Teachers				All participants			
	Orthodox Christians		Muslims		Orthodox Christians		Muslims		Orthodox Christians		Muslims	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Level 5	2	9	5	21	0	0	0	0	2	8	5	19
Level 4	12	52	11	46	1	50	1	50	13	52	12	46
Level 3	2	9	1	4	1	50	0	0	3	12	1	4
Level 2	0	0	4	17	0	0	1	50	0	0	5	19
Level 1	5	22	2	8	0	0	0	0	5	20	2	8
Atypical responses	2	9	1	4	0	0	0	0	2	8	1	4
Total	23	100	24	100	2	100	2	100	25	100	26	100

Table 8.15 Test for statistical significance of differences in the distribution of responses to the progression models level between tasks about the Orthodox Christians practice and tasks about the Muslims' practice.

The table presents the results of the tests for the statistical significance of differences between the distribution of responses to tasks about the Orthodox Christians' practice and tasks about the Muslims' practice to the progression model levels.[64]

Types of explanation	Students Tests for significance (p-value)	Teachers Tests for significance (p-value)	All participants Tests for significance (p-value)
Level 5	*0.4510*	-	*0.4510*
Level 4	0.7561	*1.0000*	0.7656
Level 3	*1.0000*	1.0000	*0.6129*
Level 2	*0.0968*	1.0000	*0.0476*
Level 1	*0.4510*	-	*0.4510*
Atypical response	*1.0000*	-	*1.0000*

As can be seen in the above tables, students' explanations of the choice of the Muslim (out-group in the present) practice corresponded to Level 2 (17%) more often than explanations of the choice of the Orthodox Christian (in-group) practice (0%). In other words, while four responses out of 26 explained the choice of the Muslim practice with references to deficits of Muslim people or by assimilating it to a known one (Level 2), none of the 23 responses about the Orthodox Christian practice did so. This was a marginally significant difference (p= 0.096). This was likely due to the small simple since when the responses of the two teachers are added the difference becomes statistically significant (p=0.0476).

Of course, as already mentioned in this section, none of the participants responded to this combination of tasks (Orthodox Christians- Muslims). The findings reported in tables 8.14 and 8.15 is the comparison of all the responses to the Orthodox Christian and Muslim practices that were provided by the participants. In other words, while the responses used for each of the previous

---

[64] See note 58.

comparisons were provided by the same participants (e.g., the responses used for the comparison between the Ancient Greeks and the Ancient Maya tasks were provided by participants who completed both these tasks), the responses used for this comparison were provided by different participants (i.e., the responses were provided by participants who completed either the Orthodox Christians or the Muslims task). This means that the differences discussed above could also be due to individual differences between the participants. Despite this important limitation, this is still an indication for the existence of a cultural distance effect when it comes to comparing responses to the choice of in-group and out-group practices in the present which is in agreement with research findings in the field of psychology.

8.4 Conclusion

This chapter responded to the last research question of this study (Do the ideas used by Greek Cypriot primary students and teachers to explain the choice of past practices differ according to their temporal and cultural distance from the people who held them?), by exploring differences in participants' responses in pen and paper tasks a) between explanations of the choice of practices made by groups of people in the past and choices made by groups of people in the present and b) between explanations of the choice of practices made by in-groups and choices made by out-groups in the past. In each case, differences in terms of the level of sophistication in participants' responses were investigated.

The findings of this chapter provide strong evidence for the existence of a *temporal distance effect* in the sophistication of students' responses (in terms of attainment of the levels of the progression model suggested in Chapter 6). The small size of the teachers' group did not allow for any meaningful comparisons within that group. More specifically, these findings suggest that, students are more likely to explain a choice of practices in the past (than a choice of practice in the present) in terms of a) what people did not have compared to us or by assimilating the practice or aspects of it to known ones (Level 2) and b) the practice in question being their best available option (Level 3). On the contrary, they are more likely to explain the choice of present practices (than the choice of

past practices) in terms of people's beliefs that differ from our own (Level 4). These findings also suggest that students provide more sophisticated responses when they explain the choice of practices in the present than the choice of practices in the past.

The above provide empirical evidence for theoretical assumptions about differences between explaining past and present behaviour (Knight, 1989; Wilschut and Schiphorst, 2019) and the existence of presentism (Wineburg, 2010; Barton and Levstik, 2004) and the tendency to see people in the past as inferior (Lee and Ashby, 2001; Lee and Shemilt, 2011) as phenomena related to these differences. This is in the sense that these differences suggest the existence of presentist views (thinking about the past from the point of view of the present). These views seem to prompt students to think about strange practices in the past as the result of deficits or other versions of known practices or as the best available options for the people who held them. When it comes to the explanation of the choice of present practices students are more likely to acknowledge that the people who choose them are as clever, as knowledgeable and have access to the same means and options as the rest of us. In other words, in this case, explaining the choice of practice in terms of deficits or by assimilating to a known one (Level 2) or in terms of being the best available option (Level 3) do not seem as viable answers. This in turn seems to prompt students to think about different beliefs/views (Level 4) as possible explanations for the choice of what seems as a strange practice.

This study suggests that the *cultural distance effect* does not occur when it comes to students explaining the choices of practices in the past. The findings discussed in this chapter suggest that students explain the choice of in-group and out-group practices in the past in similar ways in terms of the sophistication of their explanations. One could say that this contradicts the findings of previous studies according to which students are more likely to favour their in-group in the past (Barton, 1999 cited in Barton and Levstik, 2004; Barton and Levstik, 2004; Goldberg, 2013). However unlike these cases the present study used topics (healing practices) that did not have a personal effect on the students. Therefore, a possible explanation for these differences in terms of findings, is that what

caused the difference observed in previous studies was not the cultural distance but the involvement of other factors such as personal interest and identity issues.

Although the comparison of explanations of choices of practice between in-groups and out-groups in the present was not part of this study, findings discussed in section 8.3 provide some indications that the *cultural distance effect* exists in this case. In this study, students were more likely to explain the choice of practice of Muslims in terms of deficit than the one of Orthodox Christians.

The findings of this study provide some indications for the existence of another phenomenon. This is the suppression of the *cultural distance effect* by the *temporal distance effect.* This argument is supported by the fact that as mentioned in the previous paragraph, in this study, the cultural distance effect was only present in the comparison of explanations of the choice of in-group (Orthodox Christians) and out-group (Muslim) practices in the present. It is also supported by the fact that as demonstrated in section 8.2, the temporal distance effect was observed in all combinations of tasks, including the case of the Ancient Greeks (in-group in the past) and the Muslims (out-group in the present). In this case, the students were more likely to explain the choice of Ancient Greeks in terms of deficits than the choice of modern-day Muslims. This is a particularly interesting finding if we take into consideration the fact that in Greek Cypriot history education and education in general the Ancient Greeks are viewed as 'our' glorious ancestors who developed an important civilisation while Muslims are usually the Other that is 'our' enemy usually presented as barbaric. A possible explanation is that the *cultural distance effect* that prompted students to explain the choice of practice of modern-day Muslims in terms of deficits or assimilation more often than the choice of modern-day Orthodox Christians, in the case of the comparison between responses to the Ancient Greeks and Muslim tasks was supressed by the *temporal distance effect.* Students' encounter with the strange world of the past seemed to have a more powerful impact on them than their encounter with the different world in which the Muslim practice takes place in the present. As a result, the choice of practice of the Ancient Greeks (in- group in the past) was more likely to be explained in terms of deficits or assimilation than the choice of practice of modern-day Muslims (out-

group in present). Furthermore, students seemed to be more willing to take into consideration the different view of the Other in the present (modern-day Muslims) than the ones held by 'our ancestors' (Ancient Greeks).

These findings have important implications both in terms of research and teaching history. Implications for research are related to the limitations of this study and also limitations in terms of the lack of research evidence (beyond the ones reported in this study) about the effects of temporal and cultural distance in general and support the claim for more research both at the local level of Greek Cypriot education and globally. At the local level, for example, more research with larger and more representative samples is needed before claims about the whole population of Greek Cypriot primary students and teachers can be made. Larger samples will also answer questions in terms of the prominence of the differences reported in this study which had marginal statistical significance in small samples. More specifically, studies with larger samples can answer the questions of whether the lack of statistical significance in some of these cases was due to a small sample or due to a lack of a meaningful relationship (i.e., the differences are random and the not due to an effect related to the practices to be explained). Finally, investigations with larger samples of teacher can provide answers that this study was not able to provide.

As already mentioned, the topic of temporal and cultural distance effects on ideas of historical empathy is an under-researched one. Beyond this study, no research evidence exists about comparisons of explanations of past and present behaviour or comparisons of explanations of in-group and out-group practices in the past. It is therefore clear that more research is needed in order to be able to provide valid descriptions of these phenomena.

The findings of Chapters 5 and 6 pointed out the need for more comprehensive approaches to research of ideas of historical empathy in terms of using a variety of ways to prompt participants to think about past behaviour and in this way allow us to look at different aspects of their ideas of historical empathy. The findings of this chapter demonstrate that explanations of past behaviour are in some occasions also affected by the specific behaviour participants are asked to

explain. This phenomenon should also be taken into consideration when ideas of historical empathy are investigated.

In terms of teaching practices, these findings stress the importance of using a variety of tasks and approaches which invite students to think about a variety of past behaviours and warn us against drawing conclusions about ideas of historical empathy held by them from their responses in some occasions. As demonstrated in this and previous chapters, explanations of past behaviour are affected by a variety of factors (i.e., type of questions, type of task, behaviour to be explained, temporal distance between us the behaviour we attempt to explain). This suggests that the ideas of historical empathy held be students are not fixed and their sophistication may vary between different occasions of explaining past behaviour. At the same time this study suggests that in some occasion, students' ideas are transferable from one context to others. This is the case, when the cultural distance is the only factor that distinguishes behaviours in the past.

Finally, the temporal distance effect identified in this study also stresses the need for teaching that goes beyond developing ideas of historical empathy strictly in terms of providing opportunities to students to move from more simplistic ideas to more powerful ones. As Lee and Ashby (2001) point out, the idea of a deficit past (that in this study was significantly more prominent in explanations of past practices), is the result of how differences between the past and the present are taught. In many cases, this can be the result of causal language. As demonstrated in this study, even 'our glorious ancestors' (Ancient Greeks) were viewed as inferior to 'our enemies' (Muslims). Both in school and their everyday life, participants of this study are likely to have been taught or told at some point that people in the past did things because they did not have what we have, while the most appropriate statement is that 'people in the past did what they did because they had what they had' (Lee and Ashby, 2001). For example, the Ancient Greeks and the Ancient Maya did not follow the practices in question because they did not have our modern-day knowledge and means. They followed these practices because they had specific views of the world, which were different to the ones we hold today. These views of the past,

believed to be inferior than the present, are also often reinforced by stories (in classrooms, families, social encounters) of how difficult the past was compared to the present and how life today is easier because of technological advancement. As discussed in Chapter 1 (p. 39) even history textbooks contain such references. In this sense, teaching and training also need to provide opportunities to view the differences between the present and the past, in fact, in ways that do not rely exclusively on what the past did not have compared to the present and in order to avoid presentism in general.

Chapter 9. Conclusion

> developing students' understanding of history is worthwhile without
> implying any grandiose claims (Lee, 2005: 40)

9.1 Introduction

Students come to history classes carrying their own ideas about the past (Lee, 2005; Chapman, 2021a), which are shaped by their own experiences of the present social world and by the way that this world and the one of the past are mediated to them inside and outside the classroom (by education, family, social groups, media etc.). These ideas develop from a very young age and have a powerful effect on the integration of new concepts and understandings (Bransford, Brown and Cocking, 2000; Lee, 2005; VanSledright and Maggioni, 2016). Students' preconceptions can be helpful on many occasions. However, these same preconceptions can also be problematic, since ideas of everyday life cannot always be applied in the study of history (Lee, 2005; Chapman, 2011; Epstein, 2012). In this case, preconceptions become 'bottlenecks' (Middendorf and Pace, 2004 cited in Ní Cassaithe, 2020) that obstruct historical understanding (see for example Ní Cassaithe, 2020; Cercadillo, Chapman, and Lee, 2017; Lee and Ashby, 2000). The idea that disciplinary concepts are counter-intuitive has led many authors to argue for the importance of identifying students' preconceptions (Lee, 2005; Lee and Shemilt, 2003; Wineburg, 2001; Chapman and Perikleous, 2011). Failing to identify and understand students' existing ideas and assumptions may distort the historical knowledge we offer and students 'may fail to grasp the new concepts and information that are taught, or they may learn them for purposes of a test but revert to their preconceptions outside the classroom' (Bransford et, al., 2000 pp. 14-15). In this sense, it is essential to be aware of our students' ideas in order to be able to either build on them or overturn them so we can help them to move to more powerful ones.

Teachers also hold different ideas of history (Cunningham, 2003; Wineburg and Wilson, 2001); Husbands, Kitson and Pendry, 2003; Evans, 1994), which in some case can also be problematic (Shemilt, 1980; Wineburg, 2001). The latter does not refer to different ideas of history which is a phenomenon that can be observed

even among expert historians, but to ideas that do not seem to take into consideration basic aspects of the method and logic of the discipline, which are a matter of general consensus. Taking into consideration that teachers' ideas of the discipline influence their teaching (Evans, 1994; Husbands, Kitson and Pendry, 2003), suggests that knowing these preconceptions is also important for history education, since it can inform pre-service and in-service teachers' training.

Based on the above assumptions, this thesis attempted to explore Greek Cypriot primary students' and teachers' ideas of historical empathy in terms of the ideas they use to explain the behaviour of people in the past. More specifically, this thesis explored the different types of explanation students and teachers use for the choice of practices in the past and looked at differences according to the participants' age and differences according to the participants' temporal and cultural distance from the people who chose the practices in question.

Despite the fact that there is a substantial body of research on students' ideas of historical empathy at international level, similar research at the local level (Greek Cypriot educational system) is scarce. In this sense, as also discussed in Chapter 1, this study responds to the expressed need for 'more work across different cultures [which] may shed further light on the currency of similar sets of ideas [to those identified by other research projects], and their stability in different educational and social environments' (Lee and Ashby, 2001, p. 45). The topic of differences according to students' age is an under-researched one, and therefore this study attempted to contribute with much needed new data on this area. Very little research evidence exists on teachers' ideas of historical empathy, while the comparison between students' and teachers' ideas and differences to participants explanations of behaviour according to temporal and cultural distance are completely unexplored. In the light of this lack, this study is an original contribution to research in the sense that it explored issues that were not explored by previous studies.

This final chapter provides brief responses to the study's research questions (discussed in detail in Chapter 5, 6, 7 and 8). It also discusses the study's contribution to research and the implications of its findings for different aspects

of history education. The study's limitations and their effect on its findings are also discussed here. Finally, this chapter provides suggestions for future research based on the findings reported in this thesis.

9.2 Responding to the research questions

This study attempted to provide answers to the following research questions:

a) What kinds of ideas are used by Greek Cypriot primary students and teachers, when asked to explain the choice of practices made by people in the past?

b) Do the ideas used by Greek Cypriot primary students and teachers, when asked to explain the choice of practices made by people in the past, differ according to their age?

c) Do the ideas used by Greek Cypriot primary students and teachers to explain the choice of practices differ according to their temporal and cultural distance from the people who made those choices?

This section summarizes the key findings that provided the answers to the above questions.

9.2.1 What kinds of ideas are used by Greek Cypriot primary students and teachers, when asked to explain the choice of practices made by people in the past?

Participants' responses to the pen and paper tasks, which asked them to explain the choice of practice of Ancient Greeks and Ancient Maya for the treatment of diseases, and to interview questions, which asked them about possible differences in behaviour of people in the past and the present, provided the data for the exploration of the first research question. The findings of this part of the analysis are discussed in Chapters 5 and 6.

The discussion of data analysis in Chapter 5 suggests the existence of six main types of explanation of the choice of practices in the past (Life Forms, Beliefs, Available Options, Effectiveness, Deficit and Pseudo-explanations). Based on this, this study proposes a typology of explanations of the choice of practices in

the past that a) corresponds to the types of explanation reported by previous studies, and b) was efficient in coding the participants' responses both in pen and paper tasks and to interview questions. These suggest that this typology can be used for heuristic purposes; to model explanations of past behaviour.

Data analysis also showed that participants used the different types of explanation with different frequencies in their responses to different questions in the pen and paper tasks. It also showed that the differences between pen and paper and interview questions affected the types of explanations used by the participants. Both findings confirmed previous ones about differences in questions and types of tasks affecting participants' explanations (see for example Perikleous, 2011; Berti, Baldin and Toneatti, 2009; Brooks, 2008; de Leur, van Boxtel and Wilschut, 2017; Wilschut and Schiphorst, 2019).

This thesis (in Chapter 6) also suggests a progression model based on the above typology. This model describes a continuum of ideas of historical empathy, held by students and teachers in this study, from ones that fail to provide explanations of past behaviour (Level 1) and view the past as another version of the present (Level 2) to ones that explain past behaviour taking into consideration the different way people in the past viewed their world (Level 4) and how the different context in which they lived shaped these views (Level 5). Progression models that describe a similar route were also suggested by previous studies (Lee, 1978; Shemilt, 1984; Dickinson and Lee, 1984, Lee and Ashby, 1987, Lee and Shemilt, 2010, Perikleous, 2011; Bermudez and Jaramillo, 2001).

As discussed and exemplified in Chapter 6, the suggested progression model also has a heuristic value in the sense that it was efficient in terms of modelling participants' answers to individual questions and also responses as a whole in both the pen and paper tasks and interviews. Furthermore, the fact that the suggested progression model describes different levels of sophistication, suggests that this model can also serve diagnostic and pedagogical purposes. This is in the sense that the suggested progression model allows for the identification of different ideas in explanations about past behaviour and

suggests a possible route from simplistic ideas to more powerful ones. This means that the model can also inform how teaching interventions (for students) and training interventions (for teachers) can support the development of ideas of historical empathy.

The discussion of findings in Chapter 6 also warns us about the fact that diagnoses of sophistication based on answers in individual questions can be misleading. As demonstrated, participants' responses to individual questions did not define the sophistication of the overall response. Finally, the comparison of the level of sophistications between **responses to pen and paper task and interviews also suggests that the setting of the tasks (pen and paper** task vs interview) and/or the behaviour in question (specific practices vs behaviour in general) affects the sophistication of responses.

9.2.2 Do the ideas used by Greek Cypriot primary students and teachers, when asked to explain the choice of practice made by people in the past, differ according to their age?

The second research question of this study was investigated by exploring the possibility of age-related trends in terms of the sophistication of participants' responses to the pen and paper tasks (attainment of the different levels of the suggested progression model). The findings of this part of the analysis are discussed in detail in Chapter 7.

The findings discussed in Chapter 7 suggest that the sophistication of students' responses, when explaining past behaviour, increase by age. Responses to pen and paper tasks, which corresponded to the higher levels of the suggested progression model, (Levels 3, 4 and 5) increased by age, while responses that corresponded to the lower levels (Levels 1 and 2) decreased by age. These age-related trends were not all equally prominent. The trends in the cases of Level 3 and Level 1 were more prominent than the ones in the cases of Levels 2, 4 and 5. The fact that this progression of ideas of historical empathy by age is also reported by previous studies (Knight, 1989b; Lee and Ashby, 2001; Lee and Shemilt, 2010; Perikleous, 2010; Huijgen, van Boxtel, van de Grift and Holthuis,

2013) suggests that this is a phenomenon that exists in other educational contexts too.

This study also confirms previous findings about primary age students' ability to understand past behaviour at some level (see for example Lee and Ashby, 2001; Cooper, 2007; Knight, 1989b; Perikleous, 2011). It also confirms the phenomena of a) younger students, in some cases, expressing more sophisticated ideas than older ones, and b) a variety of ideas being expressed within the same age group (see for example Lee and Ashby, 2001; Lee and Shemilt; 2010; Knight, 1989; Perikleous, 2010; Huijgen, van Boxtel, van de Grift and Holthuis, 2013).

This study suggests that progression of ideas of historical empathy continues with teachers. However, the small teachers' sample and the lack of similar studies do not allow strong claims for generalization. What is probably more important is that as in other studies of teachers' ideas of history (see for example Shemilt, 1980;) and in studies of pre-service teachers' ideas of historical empathy (Wineburg, 2001; Carril-Merino, Sánchez-Agustí and Muñoz-Labraña, 2020; Rantala, 2011; Carril-Merino, Sánchez-Agustí and Miguel-Revilla, 2018), some of the teachers in the present study expressed problematic ideas in the sense that they provided responses that corresponded to the lower levels of the progression model. Also, in this study, only one teacher provided a response that corresponded to the highest level of the progression model. Furthermore, taking into consideration that some Year 3 students provided more sophisticated responses than some of the teachers, this study suggests a gap bigger than the 'seven-year gap' (the phenomenon of some students holding ideas more sophisticated than the ones held by some students that are seven years older; Lee, Dickinson and Ashby, 2001)

9.2.3 Do the ideas used by Greek Cypriot primary students and teachers to explain the choice of practices differ according to their temporal and cultural distance from the people who made those choices?

The third research question was investigated by exploring differences in participants' responses to pen and paper tasks between a) explanations of the choice of practices made by groups of people in the past and choices made by groups of people in the present and b) between explanations of the choice of practices made by in-groups and choices made by out-groups. In each case, differences in terms of the level of sophistication in participants' responses were investigated. The findings of this part of the analysis are discussed in detail in Chapter 8.

This study provides strong evidence for the existence of a *temporal distance effect* in terms of the sophistication of their responses (attainment of the levels of the progression model suggested in Chapter 6). In their responses to tasks about past practices, students were more likely to explain the choice of practice primarily in terms of a) what people did not have compared to us or by assimilating the practice or aspects of it to known ones (Level 2), and b) the practice in question being their best available option (Level 3). In contrast, when they responded to tasks about present practices, they were more likely to explain the choice of practice in terms of the different views of these people (Level 4). Furthermore, students provided more sophisticated responses, when they explained the choice of practices in the present (the majority of their responses corresponded to Levels 4 and 5). Their responses were less sophisticated, when they explained practices in the past (the majority of their responses corresponded to Levels 1, 2 and 3). These findings suggest that students provide more sophisticated responses, when they explain the choice of practices in the present than the choice of practices in the past. These findings provide empirical evidence for theoretical assumptions related to differences between explaining past and present behaviour (Knight, 1989a; Wilschut and Schiphorst, 2019), presentist views of the past (see for example Wineburg, 2010; Barton and

Levstik, 2004) and the ideas about the past being inferior to the present (see for example Lee and Ashby, 2001; Lee and Shemilt, 2011).

This study also provides evidence for the absence of a *cultural distance effect*, when it comes to students explaining the choices of practices in the past. Students explained the choice of in-group and out-group practices in the past in similar ways both in terms of the sophistication of their explanations. The phenomenon of students being more willing to take the perspective of in-groups in the past than the one of out-group in the past (Barton, 1999 cited in Barton and Levstik, 2004; Barton and Levstik, 2004; Goldberg, 2013) did not arise in this study. This can be explained by the fact that unlike previous studies, where the behaviour students were asked to explain had a personal effect on them and their identity (usually perceived as threatened), in this study the practices in question did not. In other words, in this study the only difference between practices was the cultural distance between the students and the people who held them.

Finally, this study also provide some indications for the existence of another phenomenon. This is the suppression of the *cultural distance effect* by the *temporal distance effect.* In this study, the cultural distance effect was only present in the comparison of explanations of the choice of in-group (Orthodox Christians) and out-group (Muslim) practices in the present. The students explained the latter (choice of practice of modern-day Muslims) more often in terms of deficit or assimilation (Level 2), than they did in their explanations of the former (choice of practice of modern-day Orthodox Christians). Conversely, the temporal distance effect was observed in all combinations of tasks, including the case of the Ancient Greeks (in-group in the past) and the Muslims (out-group in the present). Students were more likely to explain the choice of Ancient Greeks in terms of deficits or assimilation (Level 2) than the choice of modern-day Muslims. They were also more likely to explain the latter (choice of practice of modern-day Muslims) in terms of their different beliefs (Level 4) than they did in the case of the former (choice of practice of Ancient- Greeks). These findings suggest that the students' encounter with the strange world of the past have a

more powerful impact on them than their encounter with a different world in the present.

9.3 Contribution to research

This study contributes to research in the field of history education both at the local and the international level. At the local level this study contributes to the under-researched field of students' and teachers' ideas of history in Greek Cypriot primary education. As discussed in Chapter 3, besides the present study only three more studies report findings that describe primary students' ideas of history (Perikleous, 2011; Efstathiou et. al, 2018; Chapman and Georgiou, 2021). Furthermore, this is only the second study that reports on ideas of history held by teachers in the Greek Cypriot educational context (Psaltis, Lytras and Costache, 2011).

At the international level, this study contributes to history education research in terms of confirming previous findings and in terms of providing insights for aspects that were not explored before. In the case of the former, this study confirms the findings of previous studies by providing evidence that:

a) Primary students (ages 8 to 12) use specific types of explanations, when they attempt to explain past behaviour. This is in the sense that the typology suggested in Chapter 5 describes ideas similar to the ones identified by previous studies.

b) The different types of explanation used by primary students are related to each other hierarchically in terms of sophistication. This is the sense that the progression model suggested in Chapter 6 describe similar levels of sophistication with progression models suggested by previous studies (Lee, 1978; Shemilt, 1984; Dickinson and Lee, 1984, Lee and Ashby, 1987, Lee and Shemilt, 2010; Perikleous, 2011; Bermudez and Jaramillo, 2001).

c) Primary students' ideas of historical empathy progress by age. As in previous studies, (Lee and Shemilt, 2001; Knight, 1990; Perikleous, 2010; Huijgen, van Boxtel, van de Grift and Holthuis, 2013) older students in this study provided more sophisticated explanations than younger ones.

d) Primary age students are able to explain past behaviour at some level. As in previous studies (see for example Lee and Ashby, 2001; Cooper, 2007; Knight, 1989b; Perikleous, 2011; Berti et. al. 2009), in the present study even a number of younger students (Year 3) provided explanations of the choice of practice beyond pseudo-explanations and explanations that explained the past from an exclusively presentist point of view.

e) Some students can hold more sophisticated ideas than some older ones and students of the same age can hold different ideas. In this study, some younger students provided explanations of the choice of practice that were more sophisticated than the ones provided by some older students. Also, students within the same group provided explanations at different levels. The same phenomena were identified by previous studies (see for example Lee and Ashby, 2001; Lee and Shemilt; 2010; Knight, 1990; Perikleous, 2010; Huijgen, van Boxtel, van de Grift and Holthuis, 2013; Berti et. al., 2009; Perikleous, 2011).

f) Differences in terms of types of questions and types of tasks affect the way students explain past behaviour. This is in the sense that the phenomenon of students' explanations of the choice of practice varying between different questions and tasks also confirms the findings of previous studies (Perikleous, 2011; Berti et. al., 2009; Brooks, 2008; de Leur, van Boxtel and Wilschut, 2017; Wilschut and Schiphorst, 2019).

g) Teachers can hold problematic ideas of historical empathy. As suggested by previous studies of teachers (Shemilt, 1980) and pre-service teachers (Wineburg, 2001; Carril-Merino, Sánchez-Agustí and Muñoz-Labraña, 2020; Rantala, 2011; Carril-Merino, Sánchez-Agustí and Miguel-Revilla, 2018), some teachers in this study provided explanations that corresponded to the lower levels of the progression model, while no one of them provided an explanation that corresponded to the highest level.

 As discussed in Chapter 3, the vast majority of studies in history education (including the ones cited above) are localized in the sense that they report findings about individual educational contexts. Also, a number of them are small-scale case studies. One could argue that even studies with large samples that report findings about individual educational context are case studies in the sense that they explore the single case of an educational context. In this sense, these

studies cannot claim for general application of their findings at global level. For example, the CHATA project (Lee and Ashby, 2001), which reports findings from England, despite its large sample, cannot support claims for external validity in terms of its findings being generalised for other educational contexts. As mentioned earlier in this and other chapters, Lee and Ashby (2001) stress the need of more studies in different contexts. The replication of findings of several case studies can support arguments of external validity. This is based on an idea of analytic generalization in terms of 'the extraction of a more abstract level of ideas from a set of case study findings − ideas that nevertheless can pertain to newer situations other than the case(s) in the original case study' (Yin, 2013, p. 325). In this sense, the present study contributes to external validity of previous studies at global level by replicating the findings cited above with a sample from a different educational context. It also contributes to the external validity of my previous study within the context of Greek Cypriot primary education (Perikleous, 2011), by replicating its findings with a different sample of students and different data generations tools.

This study also contributes to research in the sense that it reports findings on aspects that are investigated for the first time. These aspects are the comparison of students' and teachers' ideas of historical empathy and the effect of temporal and cultural distance on students' explanations. More specifically, the present study suggests, for the first time, that:

a) Primary teachers use the same ideas as their students when they explain past behaviour. In this study, teachers and students used the same types of explanation in both their pen and paper tasks and interview responses.

b) Primary teachers, in general, use more sophisticated ideas than their students. In this study, teachers' responses, most of the times, corresponded to higher levels of the progression model than the ones of their students.

c) Occasionally primary teachers exhibit ideas of historical empathy that are less sophisticated than the ones used by some of their students. In this study, some the teachers' responses corresponded to lower levels of the suggested progression model than the ones of some of their students.

d) Students' explanations of behaviour are affected by the temporal distance between them (the students) and the historical agents. In this study, students'

explanations of the choice of practices made by people in the past differed to their explanations of the choices of practices made by people in the present.

e) Students' explanations of past behaviour are not affected by the cultural distance between them (the students) and the historical agents. In this study, students' explanations of the choice of in-group practices in the past did not differ from their explanations of the choice of out-group practices in the past.

f) The temporal distance effect suppresses the cultural distance effect in students' explanations of past behaviour. In this study, students explained the choice of out-group practice in the present (Muslims) in terms of deficit or assimilation (Level 2) more often than they did in their explanations of the choice of in-group practice in the present (Orthodox Christians). On the contrary, they explained the choice of out-group practice in the present (Muslims) in terms of deficit or assimilation (Level 2) less often than they did in their explanations of the choice of in-group practice in the past (Ancient Greeks). Furthermore, they explained the former (choice of practice of Muslims) in terms of the group's different beliefs (Level 4) more often than they did in the case of the latter (choice of practice of Orthodox Christians).

Of course, the findings of a case study on aspects that were not explored before cannot pose claims of external validity in terms of generalisations either at the local or the international level. However, we can claim that it can be a 'selected observation point for an object of study' (Hamel et al, 1993: 44). Gerring (2007) claims that in-depth knowledge of one case can potentially be more enlightening than lower resolution knowledge of a larger number of cases, since we can gain a better understanding of the whole by carefully examining a part of it. In this sense, although these findings cannot be generalised, they are a detailed view of the phenomena they describe and provide insights that inform suggestions for further research. The latter will be discussed in section 9.6 of this chapter.

9.4 Implications for history education

The findings of this study have important implications for history education both in terms of teaching and teachers' training. The fact that this study confirms the findings of previous studies, in terms of the types of explanations used by

students and teachers, suggests that these are stable across different educational contexts. In other words, students and teachers in different educational contexts are likely to hold similar ideas of historical empathy and face similar problems in terms of making sense of past behaviour. This means that also interventions that aim to contribute to the development of ideas of historical empathy can be shared between different educational systems. In other words, the stability of these ideas across educational contexts allows for cooperation between educational systems and educationalists across these contexts in terms of teaching practices, educational policies, curricula development, teaching materials, teachers' training programs (both pre-service and in-service) etc.

As discussed in Chapter 6, the progression model suggested by this study has a heuristic value and can serve both diagnostic and pedagogical purposes. This is in the sense that it can model explanations of past behaviour (heuristic value), which in turn allows for the identification of different ideas in explanations about past behaviour (diagnostic purposes). The model's pedagogical value stems from the fact that it can inform how teaching interventions (for students) and training interventions (for teachers) can support the development of ideas of historical empathy, by suggesting a possible route from simplistic ideas to more powerful ones.

An important consideration when it comes to using progression models in teaching is that a progression model is not 'a list of ideas that must be taught one after the other' (Lee and Shemilt, 2003). The aim of teaching should not be to teach a problematic idea just because it is the next level on the list (Lee and Shemilt, 2003). On the contrary, levels in a progression model show us the key problems in students' (or even teachers') understanding at each level and inform us about what can be considered as progress in their explanations of past behaviour. For example, for students that explain past behaviour from an exclusively presentist point of view (Level 2), teaching should focus on how the past was different from the present. The focus on differences between the past and the present does not aim to take students from Level 2 to Level 3 (which is still problematic in the sense that at this level the different views of people in the

past are not recognized), but to help them overcome the problem of viewing the past as another version of the present. Some students might move to Level 3, but others could move to Level 4 because escaping from the view of the past as another version of the present might also help them to think about the different views of people in the past.

The latter points out to another important aspect of using progression models for diagnostic and pedagogical purposes. This is the fact that, as in the example cited above, a progression model cannot predict the development of an individual's ideas. As Lee (2006) points out, progression models 'are like the trails left by sheep on a mountainside, which show us the way most of the sheep happen to go, not the paths they must take' (p. 138). In this sense, this progression model provides suggestions of the kinds of ideas of historical empathy (in terms of explaining past behaviour) we are likely to encounter in a history class (or among teachers) and of that which we can expect to achieve by developing our students' ideas (Ashby and Lee, 1987; Lee and Shemilt, 2003; Lee, 2006).

One of the most important findings of this study in terms of its implications for education is that primary age students can provide explanations of past behaviour at some level. As discussed in Chapter 6, such findings challenge older claims based on Piagetian oriented studies (Hallam, 1967; Stones 1955 cited in Steele 1976; De Silva, 1972) and even voiced until today (which consider primary age students to be unable to develop any kind of disciplinary understanding in history. Furthermore, these findings suggest that teaching in ways that seek to develop students' disciplinary understanding can be effective even with younger students.

The phenomena of students of the same age holding ideas of different sophistication and younger students holding more sophisticated ideas than older ones also have implications for education. Besides the importance of education (in terms of teaching practices, teaching materials and curricula) that take into consideration this variety of ideas, it is also important to take these phenomena into consideration when it comes to assessing students' progress. These

findings and also the different ways in which students' ideas might develop (as suggested by the above discussion of progression models) suggests that students' progress should be assessed individually and not in terms of goals that should be achieved by the whole class.

The fact that, as also discussed in Chapter 6, progression can be observed even in the absence of teaching that aims to develop ideas of historical empathy, does not mean that teaching to develop ideas of historical empathy is redundant. It means that students' experiences of the world (inside and outside education) seem to contribute to the development of these ideas. However, today, it is well established that teaching can prompt students to use more sophisticated ideas of historical empathy (see for example Shemilt, 1980; Yeager and Doppen, 2001; Brooks, 2008, 2011; Endacott, 2010; Wilschut and Schiphorst, 2019). While older students are likely to operate in higher levels than younger ones by default, teaching with the explicit aim to develop ideas of historical empathy can help students of all ages to move to ideas that are more sophisticated than the ones they already use.

As demonstrated in Chapters 5, 6, and 8, explanations of past behaviour are affected by a variety of factors (i.e., types of questions, types of tasks, behaviour to be explained, temporal distance between us and the historical agents). This suggests the ideas of historical empathy held by students (and also teachers) are not fixed and their sophistication may vary between different occasions of explaining past behaviour. In other words, students and teachers (pre-service or in-service) might express different ideas of historical empathy and explain behaviour in the past differently in different occasions. This warns us against diagnoses based on their responses in one or two occasions. It also stresses the importance of providing teaching and training interventions that offer participants opportunities to explore past behaviour using a variety of tasks and prompt them to think about a variety of past behaviours. Furthermore, this points out that developing ideas of historical empathy cannot happen with only a few classroom discussions and examples. Teaching must return to these ideas again and again when appropriate and with suitable materials.

The fact that students' responses are affected by these factors also draws attention to the need for teaching that aims to increase the stability of sophisticated explanations across tasks and across time. Helping, for example, students to provide explanations that take into consideration the different views of people in the past when explaining a specific behaviour can be achieved by informing them about these different views. Teaching, however, should also aim to help students realize the importance of taking into consideration the different ideas, views and beliefs of people in the past, as a general principle, when attempting to make sense of their behaviour.

The above also highlight the need of employing teaching methods that 'allow children to bring out their misconceptions and false assumptions, without fear of adverse reaction from peers or teachers' (Dickinson and Lee, 1978, p.108). Traditional approaches that seek definite answers from students, based on their ability to recall information or comprehend written or oral narratives, are unlikely to bring students' preconceptions out. Students must be given ample opportunities to explore the life of people in the past and to express their own point of view about their behaviour. When ideas, which are considered to be problematic, are expressed they should not become simply a target for correction by the teacher but a topic of discussion in order to help students to move to more powerful ones. Furthermore, these exchanges should not be limited to ones between the teacher and the class (or the teacher and individual students), but also include discussions and even debates between students. Ashby and Lee (1987) claim that 'children often reach higher levels of understanding when arguing a problem among themselves' (p.86). A necessary condition for this is that the teacher is prepared to contribute to the discussions in constructive ways and that they avoid early interventions that 'correct' students. The latter also means that the teacher is aware of the fact that (as demonstrated in this study) the kind of questions they ask can provoke or inhibit some kinds of ideas. In this sense, teachers should aim for diversity in the ways they provide guidance and stimulation to the discussion with and between students.

Finally, as discussed in Chapter 8, the temporal distance effect identified in this study warns us that ideas of historical empathy are not by definition transferable

between topics. Especially between topics in the past and the present. It also stresses the need for teaching that goes beyond developing ideas of historical empathy strictly in terms of providing opportunities to students to move from more simplistic ideas to more powerful ones. As Lee and Ashby (2001) point out, the idea of a deficit past (that in this study was significantly more prominent in explanations of past practices), is, at least partly, the result of how differences between the past and the present are taught, in history and in other subjects too. In this study, the choice of practice of 'our glorious ancestors' (Ancient Greeks) were more likely to be explained in terms of deficit than the one of 'our enemy' (modern-day Muslims). Lee and Ashby (2001) argue that this is, in many cases, the result of causal language. Both in school and their everyday life, participants of this study are likely to have been taught or told at some point that people in the past did things because they did not have what we have. While the most appropriate statement is that 'people in the past did what they did because they had what they had' (Lee and Ashby, 2001). Lee and Ashby (2001) also point out that these views of the past as inferior are also often reinforced by stories (in classrooms, families, social encounters) of how difficult the past was compared to the present and how life today is easier because of technological advancement (for similar examples from history textbooks in Greek Cypriot education see Chapter 3, p. 39). In this sense, teaching and training also need to provide opportunities to view the differences between the present and the past in ways that do not rely exclusively in what the latter did not have compared to the former. Also, teaching materials should obviously be reviewed in order for such references, that reinforce misconceptions, to be amended.

This idea of an inferior past is also related to presentist views. Presentism was a prominent phenomenon in this study, as in previous studies. Teaching in history should acknowledge this and help students think about how the past was different and how its people were thinking differently. For Foster (2001) and Seixas (1993) empathy exercises work well in situations which are unfamiliar (and even seem puzzling or paradoxical) to students. Such approaches make differences between the historical period they study and the present world more obvious for students and also initiates curiosity (Foster, 2001). In a similar vein, Seixas (1993) suggests that students are more likely to understand historical distance in encounters with

situations that differ radically from their own. Wineburg (2001) argues that a benefit of acknowledging the unfamiliarity of past (a world distant in thought and social organization and time) is the realization of our limitations in understanding it.

The above claims about the importance of helping students to realize the distance between their present and people in the past, highlight the fact that historical distance is a necessary condition which should be taken into consideration when trying to make sense of the past. This distance and the fact that our explanations of past behaviour are affected by 'our prior involvement in the world' (Retz, 2015: 224), should not be viewed as merely an obstacle to be overcome, but also 'as the very factor that enables us to understand the historical other' (Retz, 2015: 224). As Hans-Georg Gadamer's (2004) argues, this is the idea that historical understanding occurs when our own prejudices, which are the result of our prior involvement in the world (our historicity), are taken into consideration and become part of a conversation between us and the historical other.

The phenomenon of cultural distance not affecting students' explanations of past practices in this study, also has important implications for the teaching of history. This is in the sense, that these findings suggest that ideas of historical empathy expressed on one topic in the past, can be transferable to other similar ones when other factors (e.g. personal interest, issues of identity) do not interfere.

Teachers are not just a group of adults, but also the ones responsible for developing students' ideas. Research indicates that teachers' ideas of the discipline of history affect their teaching of the subject (Evans, 1994; Wineburg and Wilson, 1987; Husbands et al., 2003). As Maggioni, VanSledright and Alexander (2009) remind us 'one can teach only what one know' (p. 210). The present study suggests that even teachers can express problematic explanations of past behaviour. Such findings stress the importance of providing teachers with training (pre-service and in-service) that not only helps them to develop their teachings skills and pedagogical knowledge in general, but also subject oriented knowledge. In terms of the latter, this is not only substantive knowledge, but also disciplinary knowledge of history.

As discussed in Chapter 1, at the moment, despite the fact that research does not provide us with much empirical evidence of what happens in history classrooms, a number of characteristics of the Greek Cypriot education and anecdotal evidence, suggest that primary students do not get substantial opportunities to develop their ideas of historical empathy. Despite the fact that the curriculum for history in primary education contains specific and detailed references to historical empathy in terms of methodological suggestions, a number of other factors pose important obstacles in its implementation in history classrooms (dominance of traditional approaches, textbooks, lack of pre- and in-service training training). The phenomenon of a history curriculum focused on the development of disciplinary understanding not being translated into teaching practices is not a phenomenon localized in the Greek Cypriot context. Ní Cassaithe (2020), for example, describes a similar situation in Ireland were teacher surveys and official reports suggest that teaching practices do not implement the guidelines of the history curriculum for primary education. Rantala (2012) also reports that in Finland, despite the changes in history curricula for comprehensive schools that moved towards disciplinary approaches, textbooks and teaching practices remained traditional.

The findings of the present study have a number of implications for Greek Cypriot education. The first one, has to do with admitting that my own work for the primary history curriculum for Greek Cypriot public education needs to me amended. The progression model suggested by this study can inform a revision of the Attainment and Adequacy Targets for historical empathy I developed for the Primary History Curriculum 2016. Despite the fact that these are based on research evidence, in their current form they are strictly hierarchical and not developmental. They are hierarchical in the sense that they describe what students should be able to do at different ages following a logical order in terms of what makes an explanation of past behaviour more sophisticated; from suggesting possible reasons for past behaviour (Target for Year 1-2) to providing reasons for past behaviour with reference to the views of people in the past and the historical context (Target for Year 7-9). A progression model, as the one suggested by this study, is still hierarchical but it is also developmental. It is

developmental in the sense that it describes the key changes in understanding between the different levels and therefore highlights 'the watersheds (or crisis points) in learning that teachers must plan to negotiate and which assessments should seek to register' (Lee and Shemilt, 2003).

Furthermore, the study's findings about students within each age group using explanations that correspond to different levels of sophistication points out another weakness in the current Attainment and Adequacy Targets. This is the current scheme's division of different levels (Targets) according to different age groups. This can lead teachers to emphasize on pushing students to meet the year's Targets, rather than focusing on individual progress based on each student's level of understanding.

The suggested progression model can also inform the development of new teaching materials that will replace the current history textbooks which are focused on conveying a substantive knowledge in the form of a single authoritative narrative. This is in the sense that, as mentioned above, it highlights the key changes in understanding for which teaching must plan. Such material can also be informed by this study's findings about how different types of questions, tasks and content of practices prompt different explanations of past behaviour and in this sense provide a variety of activities that accommodate for this phenomenon.

The need for new teaching materials that will aim to contribute to the development of primary students disciplinary understating (along with development of substantive knowledge), is also highlighted by the present study's findings about the ability of even younger students to provide explanations of past behaviour at some level. These findings challenge, as mentioned earlier, assumptions about younger students' inability to think historically.

As pointed out earlier in this section, teaching materials that describe differences between the past and the present mainly in terms of what people in the past did not have compared to us are likely to reinforce views of the past in terms of

deficit. This can be at least one of the reasons for the phenomenon of temporal distance affecting students' explanations of behaviour identified by this study. As pointed in Chapter 1, there are a number of examples where teaching materials promote this problematic view of the past. In this sense, the findings of this study point out the need of reviewing these materials in order to avoid reinforcing simplistic views of the past.

Finally, the findings of this study suggest that teachers are also likely to provide less sophisticated explanations of past behaviour. This highlights the need for pre-service and in-service training that, besides the much-needed training in enquiry based disciplinary approaches in the teaching of history, will also provide opportunities for teachers to develop their own understanding of the discipline. In the lack of sophisticated disciplinary knowledge, it is unlikely that teachers will be able to help their students develop their own understanding.

9.5 Limitations

Research endeavours always have their limitations. These are usually methodological limitations and limitations related to the researchers themselves. These should be acknowledged, since in their absence possible exclusions and biases that may affect the results of a study remain hidden (Ross and Bibler Zaidi, 2019; Greener, 2018). Perhaps more importantly, pointing out the limitations of a study also allows to think about the potential of improvements and opportunities for further research (Ross and Bibler Zaidi, 2019; Greener, 2018). The present study has its own limitations which are acknowledged and discussed in this section.

The sample of this case study (68 students and 5 teachers that provided 145 pen and paper tasks responses and 30 interview responses) of one school is a not representative of the primary students' and teachers' Greek Cypriot population and, obviously, not representative of the primary students' and teachers' population at the global level. In this sense, the present study cannot make any claims for generalizations of its findings. However, as discussed earlier in this chapter (section 9.3), many of its findings replicate ones reported

by previous studies (findings related to students' ideas of historical of historical empathy and differences according to students' age). This contributes to this study's external validity. This, however, does not apply in the case of the present study's findings on aspects that were not investigated before (comparison of teachers' and students' ideas of historical empathy and differences according to temporal and cultural distance). In the case of these findings, claims for generalizations can only be voiced after future studies will provide similar findings. This does not mean that these findings are not important since as discussed in section 9.3 they provide a detailed view of the phenomena not investigated before and provide insights that can inform further research.

Another limitation related to the sample of this study was the absence of students with immigrant background. At the time of the data collection, 16.2% students in primary education students were not Greek Cypriots of Greeks (Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports and Culture, n.d.b). This obviously affects the study's ability to generalise for the student population of Greek Cypriot primary schools, especially when it comes to the issue of the issues of the effect of temporal and cultural distance which were investigated based on assumptions of students' in-groups and out-groups.

A further limitation, related to the issue of in-groups and out-groups, is that students' participation in a group was based upon the assumption that Greek Cypriot students (who were Orthodox Christians) consider the Ancient Greeks and Orthodox Christians as their in-group and the Ancient Maya and Muslims as out-groups. These assumptions were based on students' background and characteristics of the school and the education system. Not an explicitly expressed identification with the in-groups by students. As discussed in Chapter 4, this decision was based on fact that this was a time-effective approach adopted by previous studies, as opposed to an additional investigation of students' self-identification (or not) with the groups in question which have its own complexities (see for example Milanov, Rubin and Paolini, 2014) and one that would increase the demands in terms of participants' time.

Sample size also affected the degree to which statistical significance could be established for some of the differences (according to participants age and according to temporal and cultural distance) explored in this study. A larger sample could clarify the significance of those differences (discussed in Chapters 7 and 8).

Subject bias (participant bias), the phenomenon of participants' responses being affected by the knowledge of their participation in a study poses a limitation for many studies (e.g., they provide responses that they believe that the researcher expects to receive from them). In this study, both students and teachers were informed about their participation in the study and about the aim of the study to explore how the explain human behaviour in the past and the present. It is therefore possible that their answers were be affected by this knowledge. In order to mitigate subject bias effect, participants were assured on more than one occasions that they participate anonymously and that their names or other information that can identify them will not appear in any of the study's reports. They were also assured that the study did not assess the historical knowledge of the topics included in their pen and paper tasks and that there were no right and wrong answers in either the written tasks or the interview questions.

This study attempted to explore participants' ideas by studying their responses to pen and paper tasks and interviews. This kind of research on conceptual understanding is working with the assumption that participants conceptualizations can be manifested in their written or verbal responses to certain tasks. Of course, one could argue that since meaning has no natural structure it cannot be adequately represented (language cannot provide us with exact copies of ideas). Therefore, such an enterprise poses considerable limitations. In addition, researchers themselves and their methods also affect what it is being seen in data, since 'what we [the researchers] bring to the study also influences what we can see' (Charmaz, 2006: 15). Such concerns are not unwarranted and any attempt to interpret such data should take these into consideration. However, as discussed in Chapter 4, this study approached the issue through an 'experientialist account of understanding and truth' (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980: 192) in which, although there are no claims for absolute

understanding, there is the idea that we can aim for 'a kind of objectivity relative to the conceptual system of a culture' (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980: 192). This means that although we cannot claim to be able to read other people's minds in their words, we can try to give meaning to these words by using our common social and cultural experiences. Furthermore, in order to increase objectivity in terms of identifying participants ideas in their written and verbal responses, as discussed in Chapter 4, a sample of these were also coded by a second coder. Although, coding of all data by two coders would increase objectivity further, this was not possible due to the large amount of qualitative data that demanded a substantial amount of time to be coded.

9.6 Suggestions for further research

The limitation of this study (discussed in the previous section) and the fact that some phenomena investigated in this study are either under-researched or not researched before point towards a number of possible routes for further research both at the local level of Greek Cypriot education and at a global level.

At the local level, for example, more research with larger and more representative samples is needed before claims about the findings of the present study are valid for the whole population of Greek Cypriot primary students and teachers can be made. Larger samples can also answer questions in terms of the prominence of some of the age-related trends and differences according to temporal distance observed in the present study. More specifically studies with larger samples can answer the questions of whether the lack of statistical significance of differences, that point to some age-related trends and the effect of temporal distance in this study, was due to small samples or due to a lack of a meaningful relationship (i.e., the differences are random and the age-related trend or differences in question do not exist).

Also, future research in the Greek Cypriot context should extend in order to also include secondary education students and teachers. As in the case of primary education, research findings for these two groups are scarce. This kind of research, for example, will shed light to issues related to the progress of ideas in

ages beyond primary school. It can also inform, for example, whether problematic ideas of historical empathy are also expressed by secondary education history teachers. My personal experience, as a trainer for pre-service secondary education history teachers, suggests that problematic ideas in terms of disciplinary understanding are also exhibited even by teachers with degrees in history. Roy Wake, the man who according to David Sylvester was probably 'the prime mover to get a history project' (Sylvester and Sheldon, 2009, p.6) for the Schools Council in England, argued that history departments, at the time, failed to train their graduates in historical scholarship (Wake, 1970 cited in Retz, 2018). Although a claim about the English context in the 1970s does not provide arguments for history graduates that teach history in Cyprus in 2022, it is an indication that a degree in history is not by definition a proof of sophisticated disciplinary understanding.

At a global level, as discussed previously in the study, the topic of differences according to age among students is an under-researched area and the same applies in the case of teachers' ideas of the concept. Furthermore, beyond this study, no research evidence exists about comparisons between students and teachers. Research evidence besides the ones provided by the present study also do not exist in the case of the effect of temporal and cultural distance in explanations of past behaviour. There is a need for research that by building on these initial findings about the effect of temporal and cultural distance on empathetic explanations will provide more comprehensive explorations of these phenomena.

Also, more research, both at the local and the global level, is needed in order to understand what can support conceptual development in terms of ideas of historical empathy. As pointed out in previous chapters (Chapter 3 and Chapter 7), so far there is abundant research on of how to prompt students to use more sophisticated explanations of past behaviour in the context of short period interventions. However, we do not know much about how teaching can support genuine progression of ideas in terms of students and teachers using more powerful ideas steadily across different types of tasks and topics. At the moment, only a few studies explored how specific teaching interventions can contribute to

the development of idea of historical empathy across different topics (Shemilt, 1984; Cooper, 2007; Wilschut and Schiphorst, 2019).

As evident by the references and the studies discussed in this thesis, research in the area of historical empathy is, until now, mainly about Europe and North America. Taking into consideration that these two geographical areas share many cultural characteristics, it is important, for example, to investigate whether the types of ideas of historical empathy that seem to be common within the European and the North American contexts also exist in different cultural contexts. For example, do students in China and Japan use the same types of explanations of past behaviour as students in Cyprus and England? Research evidence from social psychology suggests, for example, that people from Western cultures explain individual behaviour with references to personal dispositions while people from East Asian cultures tend to refer to emphasize social situations (Morris, Chiu and Hong, 1999; Morris and Peng, 1994). This suggests that differences in terms of explanations of past behaviour could also exist between students and teachers in Western cultures and students and teachers in East Asian cultures.

Finally, despite the ample evidence about students' ideas of historical empathy in the contexts of Europe and North America, evidence that can inform comparisons between contexts within these areas and the world in general are scarce. This is because in most of the cases studies that explore such ideas use different methods and data generation instruments. It also due to the fact that a large number of these studies are case studies in individual age groups that do now allow for generalizations and comparisons. For example, the findings of a case study of 10-year-olds in a school in England and the ones of a case study at the same age in a school in Cyprus, that used different methods and instruments, cannot support any arguments about differences in levels of sophistication at that age between the two contexts. The claim for the need for research that responds to such questions is not one based on the assumption that the educational systems' effectiveness should be compared with the purpose of providing ranking tables as in the case of the current public use of international large-scale studies (e.g., PISA or TIMMS). The need for such kind

of investigations is based on the assumption that their findings can provide valid comparisons about how different social and educational contexts affect students' ideas of historical empathy and inform discussions about the development of teaching interventions that can be transferable across contexts.

9.7 Conclusion

This chapter attempted to summarize the findings of this thesis and to discuss their implications for research and practice, acknowledge its limitations, and suggest possible paths for further research. As in any other study in education, its ultimate aim is to contribute to the education of children. In many cases, children themselves contribute to this by taking part in our studies. This was the case of this study too. However, the children who participated both the pilot and the main study were not the only ones who contributed to this project. My students in primary history classes for the last four years also played an important role in this study. This was in the sense that what they had to say every time our lessons involved the understanding of people in the past tested my assumptions about their ideas and the ideas I was seeing in my data.

In the light of the above, I believe that it is only appropriate to finish this thesis with their voices. Below I cite two 10-year-old students, Deanna (who was one of the study's participants) and Liam (who is currently a student of mine. Both cases prove that even younger children can think in sophisticated ways about how we understand people in the past.

In my last meeting with Deanna's class, after the data collection, I asked about the possibility of feeling what people in the past felt and, in this way, understand them better. Deanna responded by saying: 'We might understand what happened, but we don't feel the same emotions as in that moment. Erm.. because it didn't happen to us… you might feel sadness for something that happened to someone, but you don't feel the same as they did, you don't go in their place'. One can only hear here the arguments (discussed in Chapter 2) voiced by Peter Lee and Rosalyn Ashby, Keith Barton and Linda Levstik, and also the philosophers Max Scheler and Robin George Collingwood who argued

about the impossibility of sharing the feelings of people in the past and the illusion of understanding that feelings can create.

During a history lesson, a few weeks ago before I finished the writing of this thesis, in a lesson about the customs of people in Cyprus during the Geometric Era, many of my Year 4 students commented on Ancient Cypriot 'stupidity' and 'nonsenses'. Liam, however, disagreed with his classmates and said: 'No, they were not stupid. They look stupid to us because we live in a different time. People in the future might also think of us and our habits as stupid'. Again, here Liam voices arguments similar to ones used by Denis Shemilt, Arthur Chapman, Sam Wineburg, Keith Barton and Linda Levstik, and also the philosopher Hans Georg Gadamer who remind us about the dangers of presentism and that our views of the people in the past are conditioned by our own contextuality (also discussed in Chapter 2).

Deanna and Liam are not ready, of course, to teach history or philosophy of history. In a number of occasions, they exhibited problematic ideas of historical empathy themselves. However, they 'teach' us that even children as young as them can think in sophisticated ways about people in the past. They are two of the numerous examples from research and everyday classroom experience that support Peter Lee's argument that 'developing students' understanding of history is worthwhile without implying any grandiose claims' (Lee, 2005: 40).

References

Achniotis, C. (2009) SOS, kindynévei ī ellīnikótītá mas [SOS, our greekness is in danger]. http://platformaenomenikipros.blogspot.com/2009_02_01_archive.html. (accessed 22 February 2022)

Aggelidou, K. (2009) Ī poreía epílysīs tou Kypriakoý Provlímatos kai oi kíndynoi gia Kýpro kai Elláda [The road to the solution of the Cyprus Problem and the dangers for Cyprus and Greece]. http://greekamericannews.blogspot.com/2009/01/blog-post_15.html. (accessed 22 February 2022)

Aldrich, R. E. (1984). New History: An Historical Perspective. In K. Dickinson, P. J. Lee and P. J. Rogers (Eds). *Learning History*. Heinman Educational Books.

Angvik, M., and Von Borries, B. (1997). *Youth and history: A comparative European survey on historical consciousness and political attitudes among adolescents*. Körber-Stiftung.

Ankersmit, F. R. (1994). *History and Tropology: The Rise and Fall of Metaphor*. University of California Press.

Appiah, O., Knobloch-Westerwick, S., and Alter, A. (2013). Ingroup favoritism and outgroup derogation: effects of news valence, character race, and recipient race on selective news reading. *Journal of Communication, 63*(3), pp. 517–534. https://doi.org/10.1111/jcom.12032

Ashby, R. (2005). Developing a Concept of Historical Evidence: Students' Ideas about Testing Singular Factual Claims. *International Journal of Historical Learning, Teaching and Research, 4*(2).

Ashby, R. and Edwards, C. (2010). Challenges facing the disciplinary tradition. In I. Nakou and I. Barca (Eds), *Contemporary Public Debates Over History Education* (pp. 27-46). The Information Age Publishing, Inc.

Ashby, R., and Lee, P. J. (1987). Children's concepts of empathy and understanding in history. In C. Portal (Ed.), *The History Curriculum for Teachers*. Falmer Press.

Atkinson, A. (2004). "Do good historians have feelings?". In S. Macintyre (Ed.), *The historian's conscience: Australian historians on the ethics of history*. Melbourne University Press.

Barca, I. (2004) A view from Portugal: research on learning and teaching history. In G. Kokkinos and I. Nakou (Eds), *Approaching History Education at the Beginning of the 21st century*. Metaixmio

Barca, I. (2005). Till new facts are discovered: students' ideas about objectivity in history. In R. Ashby, P. Gordon and P.J. Lee (Eds), *International review of history education, vol. 4: understanding history: recent research in history education.* Routledge Falmer

Bartelds, H., Savenije, G. M. and van Boxtel, C. (2020) Students' and teachers' beliefs about historical empathy in secondary history education. *Theory and Research in Social Education, 48*(4), pp. 529-551. https://doi.org/10.1080/00933104.2020.1808131

Barton, K. C. (1996) Narrative simplifications in elementary students' historical thinking. In J. Brophy (ed.), *Advances in research on teaching vol. 6: Teaching and learning history*. JAI Press.

Barton, K. C. (2008a) 'Bossed around by the queen' Elementary students' understanding of individuals and institutions in history, in L.S. Levstik and K. C. Barton (Eds), *Researching History Education: History, Method and Context*. Routledge.

Barton, K. C. (2008b). I just kinda know: Elementary students' ideas about historical evidence. In L. S. Levstick and K. C. Barton (Eds), *Researching History Education: Theory, Method, and Context*. Routledge.

Barton, K. C. (2008c). Visualizing time. In L. S. Levstick and K. C. Barton (Eds), *Researching History Education: Theory, Method, and Context*. Routledge.

Barton, K. C. and Levstik, L. S. (2004). *Teaching History for the Common Good.* Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Bassey, M. (2000). *Case study research in educational settings*. Open University Press.

Bennett, M., Barrett, M., Karakozov, R., Kipiani, G., Lyons, E., Pavlenko, V., and Riazanova, T. (2004). Young children's evaluations of the ingroup and of outgroups: A multi-national study. *Social Development, 13*(1), pp. 124–141. https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1467-9507.2004.00260.x

Beattie, A. (1987). *History in Peril: May Parents Preserve It*. London: Centre for Policy Studies.

Bergin, C. C. and Bergin, D. A. (2015). *Child and Adolescent Development in Your Classroom*. Cengage Learning.

Bermudez, A. and Jaramillo, R. (2001) Development of Historical Explanation in Children, Adolescents and Adults. In A. Dickinson, P. Gordon and P.J. Lee (eds), *International review of history education, vol.3: raising standards in history education*. Woburn Press.

Berti, A.E., Baldin, I., and Toneatti, L. (2009). Empathy in history. Understanding a past institution (ordeal) in children and young adults when description and rationale are provided. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 34*, pp. 278-288.

Bierhoff, H-W. (2002) *Prosocial Behaviour*. Psychology Press.

Blaikie, N. (1993). *Approaches to Social Enquiry*. Polity Press.

Boadu, G. (2020). "Hard" Facts or "Soft" Opinion? History Teachers' Reasoning About Historical Objectivity. *Journal of International Social Studies, 10*(1), pp. 177-202.

Boddington, T. (1980). 'Empathy and the teaching of history'. *British Journal of Educational Studies, 28*(1), pp. 13-19.

Booth, M. (1980). A modern world history course and the thinking of adolescent pupils. *Educational Review, 32*(3), pp. 245-257.

Booth, M. (1983). Skills, concepts, and attitudes: The development of adolescent children's historical thinking. *History and Theory, 22*(4), pp. 101-117.

Booth, M. (1987). Ages and Concepts: A Critique of the Piagetian Approach to History Teaching. In C. Portal (Ed.), *The History Curriculum for Teachers*. The Falmer Press.

Bransford, J. D., Brown, A. L. and Cocking, R. R. (Eds) (2000). *How People Learn: Brain, Mind, Experience, and School*. National Academy Press.

British Educational Research Association (BERA) (2018). *Ethical guidelines for educational research, fourth edition*. London. https://www.bera.ac.uk/researchers-resources/publications/ethical-guidelines-for-educational-research-2018. (accessed 22 February 2022)

Brooks, S. (2008). Displaying Historical Empathy: What Impact Can a Writing Assignment Have?. *Social Studies Research and Practice, 3*(2), pp. 130-146.

Brooks, S. (2011). Historical Empathy as Perspective Recognition and

Care in One Secondary Social Studies Classroom. *Theory and Research in Social Education, 39*(2), pp. 166-202. https://doi.org/10.1080/00933104.2011.10473452.

Cambridge Dictionary (n.d.) Practice. https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/practice. (accessed 22 February 2022)

Carril- Merino, T., Sánchez, M. M., and Muñoz-Labraña, A. C. (2020). Historical empathy in future primary teachers: the child labor in the 19th century. *Educ. Pesqui., 46*, pp. 1-16.

Carril- Merino, T., Sánchez, M. M., and Miguel-Revilla, D. (2017). Historical Perspective and Empathy in Primary Education Pre-Service Teachers: Making the Connection. *Aula Abierta, 47*(2), pp. 221-228.

Carretero, M., Asensio, M. and Rodríguez-Moneo, M. (Eds) (2013). *History Education and the Construction of National Identities*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

Carretero, M, López-Manjón and Jacott, L. (1997). Explaining historical events. *International Journal of Educational Research, 27*(3), pp. 245-253,

Centre for the Greek Language (n.d.). Logismiko Anagnosimotitas [Readability Software]. https://www.greek-language.gr/certification/readability/index.html. (accessed 22 February 2022).

Centre for the Greek Language (2014). Shediasmos ke ilopiisi. [Design and Implementation]. https://www.greek-language.gr/certification/readability/about.html. (accessed 22 February 2022).

Centre of Educational Research and Evaluation (n.d.). Guidelines for obtaining a permit to conduct research in public schools. https://www.pi.ac.cy/pi/files/keea/SDG-CERE-ASE-Guidelines.pdf. (accessed 22 February 2022)

Cercadillo, L. (2001). Significance in History: Students' Ideas in England and Spain. In A. Dickinson, P. Gordon and P. J. Lee, (Eds.), *Raising Standards in History Education: Vol. 3. International Review of History Education*. Woburn Press.

Cercadillo, L., Chapman, A., and Lee, P. (2017). Organizing the past: Historical accounts, significance and unknown ontologies. In M. Carretero, S. Berger, and M. Grever (Eds.), *Palgrave handbook of research in historical culture and education.* Palgrave Macmillan UK. https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-52908-4.

Chapman, A. (2009a). Introduction: Constructing history 11- 19. In H. Cooper and A. Chapman (Eds.), *Constructing history 11- 19.* Sage.

Chapman, A. (2009b) *Towards an Interpretations Heuristic: A case study exploration of 16–19-year-old students' ideas about explaining variations in historical accounts.* Unpublished EdD thesis. Institute of Education, University of London.

Chapman, A. (2011). Understanding historical knowing: Evidence and accounts. In L. Perikleous and D. Shemilt (Eds.), *The future of the past: Why history education matters.* AHDR

Chapman, A. (2017). Make It Strange — History as an Enigma, not a Mirror. *Public History Weekly*, *5*(37). http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/phw-2017-10381

Chapman, A. (2021a). Introduction: Historical knowing and the 'knowledge turn'. In A. Chapman (Ed.), *Knowing History in Schools: Powerful knowledge and the powers of knowledge.* UCL Press.

Chapman, A. (Ed.) (2021b). *Knowing History in Schools: Powerful knowledge and the powers of knowledge*. UCL Press.

Chapman, A. and Georgiou, M (2021). Powerful knowledge building and conceptual change research: Learning from research on 'historical accounts' in England and Cyprus. In A. Chapman (Ed.), *Knowing History in Schools: Powerful knowledge and the powers of knowledge*. UCL Press.

Chapman, A., Perikleous, L., Yakinthou, C. and Celal, R. Z. (2011). *Thinking Historically about Missing Persons: A Guide for Teachers*. Association for Historical Dialogue and Research.

Chapman, A. and Perikleous (2011). Developing Historical Thinking: Theory and Research. In Chapman, A., Perikleous, L., Yakinthou, C. and Celal, R. Z., *Thinking Historically about Missing Persons: A Guide for Teachers*. Association for Historical Dialogue and Research.

Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory: a practical guide through qualitative analysis*. SAGE.

Christou, M. (2007). The language of patriotism: sacred history and dangerous memories. *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 28*(6), pp. 709-722. https://doi.org/10.1080/01425690701609946

Chrysostomos II. (2009). 'Chairetismós tou makariotátou archiepiskópou tīs Kýprou Chrysostómou II [Opening remarks by the archbishop of the Church of Cyprus Chrysostomos II]'. in A. Pastelas (ed.), *Ekpaideftiki "metarrithmisi" kai ethniki allotriosi [Educational "reform" and national alienation].* Society for the study of Greek issues.

Clark, A. (2009). 'Teaching the nation's story: Comparing public debates and classroom perspectives of history education in Australia and Canada'. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 41*(6), pp. 745-762.

Collingwood, R. G. (1994). *The idea of history*. (J. v.d. Dussen Ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Concato J. and Hartigan, J. A. (2016). *P values: from suggestion to superstition. Journal of Investigative Medicine, 64*, pp. 1166-1171.

Cooper, H. (1994). Historical thinking and cognitive development in the teaching of history. In H. Bourdillon (Ed.), *Teaching History.* Open University Press.

Cooper, H. (2007). *History 3–11: A guide for teachers*. David Fulton Publishers

Coplan, A. and Goldie, P. (2011). 'Introduction '. In A. Coplan and P. Goldie (Eds), *Empathy: Philosophical and Psychological Perspectives.* Oxford University Press.

Council of Europe (2021). Ethics and Empathy. https://www.coe.int/en/web/digital-citizenship-education/ethics-and-empathy. (accessed 22 February 2022)

Council of the European Union (2018). Council Recommendation of 22 May 2018 on key competences for lifelong learning. *Official Journal of the European Union.* https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32018H0604(01)andrid=7. (accessed 22 February 2022)

Counsell, C. (2018) 'Taking curriculum seriously. *Impact: Journal of the Chartered College of Teaching, 4*. https://impact.chartered.college/article/taking-curriculum-seriously/. (accessed 22 February 2022)

Cunningham, D. L. (2003). *Professional Practice And Perspectives In The Teaching Of Historical Empathy*. Unpublished PhD thesis. University of Oxford.

Davis Jr, O.L. (2001) In pursuit of historical empathy. In O.L. Davis Jr., S. J. Foster and E. A. Yeager (Eds), *Historical empathy and perspective taking in social studies*. Rowman and Littlefield.

Davison, M. (2012). Teaching historical empathy and the 1915 Gallipoli campaign. In Harcourt, M and Sheehan, M. (Eds.), *History matters: teaching and learning history in New Zealand secondary schools in the 21st century*. ZCER Press.

Dawson, I. (1989). The Schools History Project: A Study in Curriculum Development. *The History Teacher, 22*(3), pp. 221-238.

de Leur, T., van Boxtel, C., and Wilschut, A. (2015). "Just Imagine ...": Students' perspectives on empathy tasks in secondary history education. *International Journal of Historical Learning, Teaching and Research, 13*(1), pp. 69-84.

de Leur, T., van Boxtel, C., and Wilschut, A. (2017). 'I Saw Angry People and Broken Statues': Historical Empathy in Secondary History Education. *British Journal of Educational Studies, 65*(3), pp. 331-352. https://doi.org/10.1080/00071005.2017.1291902

Denzin, N. K. (1970). *The research act: A theoretical introduction to sociological methods*. Aldine.

Derksen, D. G., Hunsche, M. C., Giroux, M. G., Connolly, D. A., and Bernstein, D. M. (2018). A Systematic Review of Theory of Mind's Precursors and Functions. *Zeitschrift für Psychologie, 226*(2), pp. 87-97. https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1027/2151-2604/a000325

DeSilva, W.A. (1972). The formation of historical concepts through contextual cues. *Educational Review, 24*(3), pp. 174-182. https://doi.org/10.1080/0013191720240302

Dickinson, A. (2000). 'What should history be?'. In A. Kent (Ed.), *School subject teaching: the history and future of the curriculum*. Kogan Page.

Dickinson, A.K. and Lee, P.J. (1978). Understanding and research. In A. K. Dickinson, P. J. Lee (Eds), *History Teaching and Historical Understanding.* Heinemann.

Dickinson, A. K., and Lee, P. J. (1984). Making sense of history. In A. K. Dickinson and P. J. Lee and P. J. Rogers (Eds.), *Learning History*. Heinemann.

Dilthey, W. (2006). The Understanding of Other Persons and Their Life-Expressions. In K. Mueller-Vollmer (Ed.), *The Hermeneutics Reader: Texts of the German traditions from the Enlightenment to Present*. Continuum.

Donovan, S. and Bransford, J.D. (2000). Introduction. In M. S. Donovan and J. D. Bransford (Eds), *How Students Learn: history, mathematics and science in the classroom*. National Academy Press.

Doppen, F. H. (2000). Teaching and learning multiple perspectives: The atomic bomb. *The Social Studies, 91*(4), pp. 159-169.

Downey, M. T. (1995). Perspective taking and historical thinking: Doing history in a fifth-grade classroom. *Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association*. San Francisco, CA.

Downey, M. T., and Levstik, L. S. (1988). Teaching and learning history: The research base. *Social Education, 52*(5), pp.336-342.

Droysen, G. (2006). History and the Historical Method. In K. Mueller-Vollmer (Ed.) *The Hermeneutics Reader: Texts of the German traditions from the Enlightenment to Present*. Continuum.

Dunn, R. E. (2000). The making of a national curriculum: the British case. *The History Teacher, 33*(3), pp. 395-398.

Educational Reform Commitee (2004) Dīmokratikí kai anthrópinī paideía stīn Evrokypriakí politeía [Democratic and Humanistic Education in the Euro- Cypriot state]. http://www.edume.myds.me/00_0051_Odigies_ekpedevtikou_periexomenou/045_iliko_gia_proagoges/iliko/16_manifesto.pdf. (accessed 21 February 2022)

Efstathiou, I., Kyza, E., and Georgiou, Y (2018). An inquiry-based augmented reality mobile learning approach to fostering primary school students' historical reasoning in non-formal settings. *Interactive Learning Environments, 26*(1), pp. 22-41. https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2016.1276076.

Endacott, J. L. (2014). Negotiating the Process of Historical Empathy. *Theory and Research in Social Education, 42*(1), pp. 4-34.

Endacott, J. and Brooks, S. (2013 Historical Empathy Perspectives and Responding to the Past. In S. A. Metzger and L. McArthur Harris (Eds), *The Wiley International Handbook of History Teaching and Learning*. Willey Blackwell.

Endacott, J. and Brooks, S. (2018) An updated theoretical and practical model for promoting historical empathy. *Social Studies Research and Practice, 8* (1), pp. 41–58.

Endacott, J. and Pelekanos, C. (2015). Slaves, Women, and War! Engaging Middle School Students in Historical Empathy for Enduring Understanding. *The Social Studies, 106*(1), pp. 1-7.

Endacott, J. and Sturtz, J. (2015). Historical empathy and pedagogical reasoning. *Journal of Social Studies Research, 39*(1), pp. 1-16. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jssr.2014.05.003

Epstein, T. (1994). The arts of history: An analysis of secondary school students' interpretations of the arts in historical contexts. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 9*(2), 174-194.

Epstein, T. (2012, May). Preparing history teachers to develop young people's historical thinking. https://www.historians.org/publications-and-directories/perspectives-on-history/may-2012/preparing-history-teachers-to-develop-young-peoples-historical-thinking. (accessed 22 February 2022).

Evans, R. (1994). Educational ideologies and the teaching of history. In G. Leinhardt, I. L. Beck and C. Stainton (Eds), *Teaching and Learning in History*. LEA Publishers.

Filho, D. B. F., Paranhos, R., da Rocha, E. C., Batista, M., da Silva, J. A., Santos, M. W., and Marino, J. G. (2013). When is statistical significance not significant?. *Brasilian Political Science Review, 7*(1), pp. 31-55.

Foster, S. J. (1998). Politics, parallels and perennial curriculum questions: The battle over school history in England and the United States. *Curriculum Journal, 9*(2), pp. 153-164.

Foster, S. J. (2001). Historical empathy in theory and practice: some final thoughts. In O. L. Davis, S. J. Foster and E. Yeager (Eds), *Historical empathy and perspective taking in social studies*. Rowman and Littlefield.

Foster, S. J. (2006). Whose history? Portrayal of immigrant groups in US history textbooks, 1800-present. In S. J. Foster and K. A. Crawford (Eds), *What shall we tell the children? International perspectives on school history textbook*. Information Age Publishing.

Foster, S. J. and Crawford, K. A. (2006). The critical importance of history textbook research. In S. J. Foster and K. A. Crawford (Eds), *In What shall we tell the children? International perspectives on school history textbook*(pp. 1-24). Information Age Publishing.

Foster, S. J. and Yeager, E. A. (1998). The role of empathy in the development of historical understanding. *International Journal of Social Education*, *13*(1), pp. 1-7.

Franco, M. G. (2016). Un viaje al siglo XVI a partir de los casos de un corsario y un
bandolero. Una experiencia de empatía histórica en Secundaria [A trip to the 16th century based on the adventures of a brigand and a privateer. Experience of historical empathy in Secondary Education]. *CLIO History and History teaching, 42*.

Gallese, V. (2003). 'The roots of empathy: the shared manifold hypothesis and the neural basis of intersubjectivity'. *Psychopathology, 36*, pp. 171- 180.

Gadamer, H.-G. (2004) *Truth and Method, 2ⁿᵈ ediction*. (J. Weinsheimer, J. and D. G. Marshall, Trans.). Continuum.

Gehlbach, H. (2004). Social Perspective Taking: A Facilitating Aptitude for Conflict Resolution, Historical Empathy, and Social Studies Achievement. *Theory and Research in Social Education, 32*(1), pp. 39-55.
https://doi.org/10.1080/00933104.2004.10473242

Gellner, E. (2008). *Nations and Nationalism, 2nd edition*. Cornell University Press.

Gerring, J. (2007). *Case study research: principles and practices*. Cambridge University Press.

Glaser, B. G. and Straus, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: strategies for qualitative research*. Aldine.

Glasersfeld, E. (1989). Cognition, construction of knowledge, and teaching. *Synthese, 80*(1), pp. 121-140.

Glentis, S., Maragkoudakis, E., Nikolopoulos, N., and Nikolopoulou, M. *(n.d.a). Istoria Pemptis Dimotikou- Sta Vizantina Hronia: Vivlio Mathiti [Year 5 History- In Byzantine Times: Textbook]*. Diofantos, Institute of Computer Technology and Publications.

Glentis, S., Maragkoudakis, E., Nikolopoulos, N., and Nikolopoulou, M. *(n.d.b). Istoria Pemptis Dimotikou- Sta Vizantina Hronia: Vivlio Daskalou [Year 5 History- In Byzantine Times: Teacher's Guide]*. Diofantos, Institute of Computer Technology and Publications.

Glentis, S., Maragkoudakis, E., Nikolopoulos, N., and Nikolopoulou, M. *(n.d.c). Istoria Pemptis Dimotikou- Sta Vizantina Hronia: Tetradio Ergasion [Year 5 History- In Byzantine Times: Activity Book]*. Diofantos, Institute of Computer Technology and Publications.

Golafshani, N. (2003). Understanding Reliability and Validity in Qualitative Research. *The Qualitative Report, 8*(4), pp. 597- 607.

Goldberg. T (2013). "It's in My Veins": Identity and Disciplinary Practice in Students' Discussions of a Historical Issue. *Theory and Research in Social Education, 41*(1), pp. 33-64.

Gottlieb, E. and Wineburg, S. (2012). Between Veritas and Communitas: Epistemic switching in the reading of academic and sacred history. *Journal of the Learning Sciences, 21*(1), pp. 84-129.
https://doi.org/10.1080/10508406.2011.582376

Greener, S. (2018). Research limitations: the need for honesty and common Sense. *Interactive Learning Environments, 26*(5), pp. 567-568.

Hamel, J. (1993) *Case study methods*. Sage Publications

Hammond, K. (2014) The knowledge that "flavours" a claim: Towards building and assessing historical knowledge on three scales. *Teaching History, 157*, pp. 18–24

Harrington, A. (2001). Dilthey, Empathy and Verstehen A Contemporary Reappraisal. *European Journal of Social Theory, 4*(3), pp. 311-329. https://doi.org/10.1177/13684310122225145

Harris, R. and Foreman-Peck. (2004). Stepping into other peoples' shoes: teaching and assessing empathy in the secondary history curriculum. *International Journal of Historical Learning, Teaching and Research, 4*(2).

Hartley, L. P. (1953). *The Go- Between*. London: Hamish Hamilton.

Hartmann, U. and Hasselhorn, M. (2008). Historical perspective taking. A standardized measure for an aspect of students' historical thinking. *Learning and individual differences, 18*(2), pp. 264-270. https://doi.org/10.25656/01:11637

Harwood, M. D., and Jeffrey Farrar, M. (2006). Conflicting emotions: The connection between affective perspective taking and theory of mind. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology, 24*, pp. 401–418.

Heidegger, M. (2008). *Being and Time*. (J. Macquarrie and E. Robinson, Trans.). Blackwell Publishing.

Hirsch, E. D. (1987). *Cultural Literacy: What Every American Needs to Know*. Houghton Mifflin

Holt, T. (1990). *Thinking historically: narrative, imagination, and understanding*. College Entrance Examination Board.

Hsiao, Y. (2005). Taiwanese Students' Understanding of Differences in Textbook Accounts. In R. Ashby, P. Gordon and P. J. Lee (Eds.), *Understanding History-*

Recent Research in History Education: Vol. 4. International Review of History Education. Routledge Falmer.

Huijgen, T., van Boxtel, C., van de Grift, W. and Holthuis, P. (2014) Testing elementary and secondary school students' ability to perform historical perspective taking: The constructing of valid and reliable measure instruments. *European Journal of Psychology of Education, 29*(4), pp. 653–672. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10212- 14-0219-4

Humboldt, W. (2006). On the task of the historian. In K. Mueller-Vollmer (Ed.) *The Hermeneutics Reader: Texts of the German traditions from the Enlightenment to Present*. Continuum.

Husbands, C. (1996). *What Is History Teaching?: Language, Ideas and Meaning in Learning about the Past*. Open University Press.

Husbands, C., Kitson, A. and Pendry, A. (2003). What do history teachers do in history classrooms? . In C. Husbands, A. Kitson and A. Pendry (Eds), *Understanding history teaching*. Open University Press.

Husserl, E. (1969). *Formal and transcendental logic*. (D. Cairns, Trans.). Martinus Nijhoff.

Iakovides, S. (16 November, 2008) Pós eksynchronízetai ī Istoría? [How history is being modernized?]. Simerini.

Incorporated Association of Assistant Masters in Secondary Schools (1965). *The Teaching of History in Secondary Schools*. Cambridge University Press

Ioannou, G. (2010). I didaskalia tis Istorias stin E/K koinotita tis Kyprou [The teaching of history within the Greek Cypriot community in Cyprus]. *Kalemi, 13*, pp. 8-13.

Iordanou, K., Kendeou, P. and Zembylas, M. (2020). Examining my-side bias during and after reading controversial historical accounts. *Metacognition Learning, 15*, pp. 319–342. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11409-020-09240-w

Jenkins, K. (1991). *Re-thinking history*. Routledge.

Jenkins, K. and Brickley, P. (1989). Reflections on the empathy debate. *Teaching History, 55*, pp. 18- 23.

Jensen, J. (2008). Developing Historical Empathy through Debate: An Action Research Study. *Social Studies Research and Practice, 3*(1), pp. 55-67.

Johnsen, H. and Olsen, B. (1992). Hermeneutics and Archaeology: On the Philosophy of Contextual Archaeology. *American Antiquity, 57*(3), pp. 419-436. http://www.jstor.org/stable/280931

Karayianni, E. (2005). *What, and how, national identity is promoted by Greek-Cypriot history textbooks? A case study of three history textbooks*. Unpublished MA thesis. Institute of Education, University of London.

Katsoulakos, T, Karioti, I., Lena, M., and Katsarou, C. (n.d.a) *Istoria Tetartis Dimotikou- Sta Archea Hronia: Vivlio Daskalou [Year 4 History- In the Ancient Times: Teacher's Guide]*. Diofantos, Institute of Computer Technology and Publications.

Katsoulakos, T, Karioti, I., Lena, M., and Katsarou, C. (n.d.b) *Istoria Tetartis Dimotikou- Sta Archea Hronia: Tetradio Ergasion [Year 4 History- In the Ancient Times: Activity Book]*. Diofantos, Institute of Computer Technology and Publications.

Kim, H. Y. (2017). Statistical notes for clinical researchers: Chi-squared test and Fisher's exact test. *Restorative Dentistry and Endodontics, 42*(2), pp. 152-155.

Kim, S. H. (2021). Max Weber. In E. N. Zalta (Ed.), *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2021/entries/weber/. (accessed 22 February 2022).

Kirschner, P., Sweller, J., and Clark, R. (2006) Why Minimal Guidance During Instruction Does Not Work: An Analysis of the Failure of Constructivist, Discovery, Problem-Based, Experiential, and Inquiry-Based Teaching. *Educational Psychologist, 41*(2), pp.75-86. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326985ep4102_1

Klerides, E. (2019). Cyprus. In L. Cajani, S. Lässig, and M. Repoussi (Eds), *The Palgrave Handbook of Conflict and History Education in the Post-Cold War Era*. Palgrave Macmillan, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-05722-0_15

Klerides, E., and Zembylas, M. (2017). Identity as immunology: History teaching in two ethnonational borders of Europe. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education, 47*(3), pp. 416-433. https://doi.org/10.1080/03057925.2017.1292847

Knight, P. (1989a). Empathy: concept, confusion and consequence in a national curriculum. *Oxford Review of Education, 15*(1), pp. 41- 53.

Knight, P. (1989b). A study of children's understanding of people in the past. *Educational Review, 41(3),* pp. 207-219.

Koliopoulos, I, Michaelides, I, Kallianiotis, A., and Minaoglou, M. (n.d.) *Istoria tou neoterou kai sighronou kosmou: Ekti taksi [History of the modern and contemporary world: Year 6].* Diofantos, Institute of Computer Technology and Publications.

Koliopoulos, I and Veremis, T. (2004) *Greece the modern sequel from 1821 to the present.* Hurst and Company.

Kosti, K., Kondoyianni, A., Tsiaras, A. (2015). Fostering Historical Empathy through Drama in education: A Pilot Study on Secondary School Students in Greece. *Drama Research, 6*(1), pp. 1-22.

Kourgiantakis, C. (2005) *Historical thinking and empathy of primary and secondary students in history [Istoriki Skepsi kai Ensynaisthisi ton Mathiton tis Protovathmias kai Deuterovathmias Ekpaideusis stin Istoria]*. Unpublished PhD thesis. Aegean University.

LaCapra, D. (2001). *Writing History, Writing Trauma*. JHU Press.

Lakoff, G. and Johnson, M. (1980). Metaphors we live by. University of Chicago Press.

Lakshmi, R. (October 15, 2000). 'Hindu rewriting of history textbooks splits India'. *International Herald Tribune*.

Lee, P. J. (1978). Explanation and understanding in history. In In A. K. Dickinson, P. J. Lee (Eds), *History Teaching and Historical Understanding*. Heinemann.

Lee, P. J. (1992). History in Schools: Aims, Purposes and Approaches. A Reply to John White. In P. J. Lee, J. Slater, P.Walsh and J. White (Eds), *The Aims of School History: The National Curriculum and Beyond*. Tufnell Press.

Lee, P. J. (1983). History Teaching and Philosophy of History. *History and Theory, 22*(4), pp. 19-49. https://doi.org/2505214

Lee, P. J. (1984). Why learn history?. In A. K. Dickinson, P. J. Lee and P. J. Rogers (Eds), *Learning History*. Heinemann.

Lee, P. J. (1998). 'A lot of guess work goes on': children's understanding of historical accounts'. *Teaching History, 92*, pp.29-35.

Lee, P. J. (2004). 'Historical Literacy: Theory and Research'. *International Journal of Historical Learning, Teaching and Research, 5*(2).

Lee, P. J. (2005). Putting principles into practice: understanding history. In M. S. Donovan and J. D. Bransford (Eds), *How Students Learn: history, mathematics and science in the classroom*. National Academy Press.

Lee, P. J. (2006). Understanding history. In P. Seixas (Ed.), *Theorizing Historical Consciousness*. University of Toronto Press.

Lee, P. J. (2011). Historical literacy and transformative history. In L. Perikleous and D. Shemilt (Eds), *The Future of the Past: Why history Education Matters*. Association for Historical Dialogue and Research.

Lee, P. J. and Ashby, R. (2000). Progression in historical understanding among students ages 7-14. In P. N. Stearns, P. Seixas, and S. Wineburg (Eds.), *Knowing, teaching, and learning history: National and international perspectives.* New York University Press.

Lee, P. J. and Ashby, R. (2001). Empathy, perspective taking, and rational understanding. In O. L. Davis, S. J. Foster and E. A. Yeager (Eds), *Historical empathy and perspective taking in social studies*. Rowman and Littlefield.

Lee, P. J., Ashby, R., and Sheldon, N. (2009) Interview with Peter Lee and Ros Ashby. History in Education Project. https://archives.history.ac.uk/history-in-education/browse/interviews/interview-peter-lee-and-ros-ashby-3-september-2009.html. (accessed 22 February 2022)

Lee, P. J., Dickinson, A. K., and Ashby, R. (1996). Project Chata: Concepts of History and Teaching Approaches at Key Stages 2 and 3 Children's Understanding of 'Because' and the Status of Explanation in History. Teaching History, 82. pp. 6-11. https://www.jstor.org/stable/43260097

Lee, P. J., Dickinson, A. K., and Ashby, R. (1997) "Just another emperor": Understanding action in the past. *International Journal of Educational Research, 27*(3), pp. 233-244. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0883-0355(97)89731-5

Lee, P. J., Dickinson, A. K., and Ashby, R. (2001) 'Children's ideas about historical explanation'. In Dickinson, A., Gordon, P. and Lee, P. (Eds), *International Review of History Education: Volume 3: Raising standards in history education*. Woburn Press.

Lee, P. J. and Howson, J. (2009). 'Two out of five did not know that Henry VIII had six wives': History education, historical literacy and historical consciousness. In: L. Symcox, A. Wilschut (eds.), *National History Standards: The problem of the canon and the future of teaching history*. Information Age Publishing.

Lee, P. J. and Shemilt, D. (2003). A scaffold, not a cage: Progression and progression models in history. *Teaching History, 113*, pp. 13-23.

Lee, P. J. and Shemilt, D. (2004). "I just wish we could go back in the past and find out what really happened": Progression in understanding about historical accounts, *Teaching History, 117*, pp. 25-31.

Lee, P. J. and Shemilt, D. (2009). Is any explanation better than none? Over-determined narratives, senseless agencies and one-way streets in students' learning about cause and consequence in history. *Teaching History, 137,* pp. 42-49.

Lee, P. J. and Shemilt, D. (2011). 'The concept that dares not speak its name: Should empathy come out of the closet?'. *Teaching History*, *143*, pp. 39-48.

Levinas, E. (1990). *Time and the Other*. (R. Cohen, Trans.). Duquesne University Press.

Lévesque, S. (2008). *Thinking historically: educating students for the twenty-first century*. University of Toronto Press.

Levstik, L. S. (2001). Crossing the empty spaces: Perspective taking in New Zealand adolescents' understanding of national history. In O. L. Davis, Jr. and E. A. Yeager and S. J. Foster (Eds.), *Historical Empathy and Perspective Taking in the Social Studies*. Rowman and Littlefield.

Levstik, L. S. (2008) The relationship between historical response and narrative in a sixth- grade classroom. In L.S. Levstik and K. C. Barton (Eds), *Researching History Education: History, Method and Context*. Routledge

Low-Beer, A. (1989). Empathy and history. *Teaching History, 55*, pp. 8- 12.

Lowenthal, D. (1985). *The Past is a Foreign Country*. Cambridge University Press.

Lowenthal, D. (2000). Dilemmas and delights of learning history. In P. N. Stearns and P. Seixas and S. S. Wineburg (Eds.), *Knowing, Teaching, and Learning History: National and International Perspectives*. New York University Press.

Macionis, G. and Linda, J. (2011). *Sociology*. Toronto: Pearson Canada Inc.

Maistellis, S., Kalivi, E., and Michael, M. *(n.d.a). Istoria Tritis Dimotikou- Apo ti Mithologia stin Istoria: Vivlio Daskalou [Year 3 History- From Mythology to History: Teacher's Guide]*. Diofantos, Institute of Computer Technology and Publications.

Maistellis, S., Kalivi, E., and Michael, M. *(n.d.b). Istoria Tritis Dimotikou- Apo ti Mithologia stin Istoria: Tetradio Ergasion [Year 3 History- From Mythology to History: Activity Book]*. Diofantos, Institute of Computer Technology and Publications.

Maggioni, L., VanSledright, B. A., and Alexander, P. A. (2009). Walking on the borders: A measure of epistemic cognition in history. *The Journal of Experimental Education, 77*(3), pp. 187-214.

Makkreel, R. (2011). Wilhelm Dilthey. In E. N. Zalta (Ed.), *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2011/entries/dilthey/. (accessed 22 February 2022)

Makkreel, R. (2021). Wilhelm Dilthey. In E. N. Zalta (Ed.), *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2021/entries/dilthey. (accessed 22 February 2022)

McAleavy, T. (1998). The use of sources in school history 1910-1998: A critical perspective. *Teaching History, 91*, pp. 10-16.

McConachie, S. M. and Petrosky, A. R. (Eds) (2010). *Content Matters: A Disciplinary Literacy Approach to Improving Student Learning.* Jossey- Bass.

McCully, A. (2012). History teaching, conflict and the legacy of the past. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice, 7*(2), pp. 145–159. https://doi.org/10.1177/1746197912440854

McCully, A., Pilgrim, N., Sutherland, A., and McMinn, T. (2002). "Don't worry, Mr. Trimble, we can handle it": balancing the emotional with the rational in teaching of contentious topics. *Teaching History, 106*, pp. 6-12.

Megill, A. (2007). *Historical knowledge, historical error a contemporary guide to practice.* The University of Chicago Press.

Menon, T., Morris, M. Chiu, C., and Hong, Y. (1999). Culture and the construal of agency: Attribution to individual versus group dispositions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* 76(5), pp. 701-717.

Merriam- Webster (2022). Empathy. https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/empathy. (accessed 21 February 2022)

Merleau-Ponty, M. (2002). *Phenomenology of perception*. (C. Smith, Trans.). London: Routledge Classics.

Milanov, M., Rubin, M., and Paolini, S. (2014). Different types of ingroup identification: A comprehensive review, an integrative model, and implications for future research. *Psicologia sociale, 3,* pp. 205-232.

Mill, J. S. (1867). *An examination of Sir William Hamilton's philosophy and of the principal philosophical questions discussed in his writings*, *3rd edition*. Longmans, Green, Reader, and Dyer.

Ministry of Education and Culture (n.d.). *Istoria [History]*. Pedagogical Institute.

Ministry of Education and Culture (2012). *I istoria mou, i istories mou, i istoria mas, i istories mas [My history, my histories, our history, our histories]*. Pedagogical Institute. https://archeia.moec.gov.cy/sd/202/c_taxi_meros_a.pdf. (accessed 22 February 2022)

Ministry of Education and Culture (2013). *Didaktikes protasis ke idees gia ekpedeftikous pou didaskoun Istoria: Istoria C Dimotikou [Teaching proposals and ideas for teachers of history: Year 3 History]*. Pedagogical Institute. https://archeia.moec.gov.cy/sd/202/c_taxi_didaktikes_protaseis_2013.pdf. (accessed 22 February 2022)

Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports and Youth (n.d.a) Analitika Programmata, Diktes eparkias kai epitixias [Curricula, Attainment and Adequacy Targets]. http://www.moec.gov.cy/analytika_programmata/anadomisi_ap_politiki_deikton_eparkeias.html. (accessed 22 February 2022).

Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports and Youth (n.d.b) Statistika stihia diefthinsis dimotikis ekpedefsis [Primary education statistics]. http://archeia.moec.gov.cy/mc/407/statistika_el.pdf. (accessed 22 February 2022).

Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports and Youth (n.d.c) Diefthinsi Dimotikis Ekpedefsis: Nomothesia [Department of Primary Education: Legislation]. http://www.moec.gov.cy/dde/nomothesia.html. (accessed 22 February 2022).

Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Cyprus (2022). Historical Background. https://mfa.gov.cy/historical-background.html. (accessed 22 February 2022)

Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (2011). Historical Background. https://mfa.gov.ct.tr/cyprus-negotiation-process/historical-background/. (accessed 22 February 2022)

Morris, M. W., and Peng, K. (1994). Culture and cause: American and Chinese attributions for social and physical events. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *67*, pp. 949-971.

Moschner, B., Anschuetz, A., Wernke, S., and Wagener, U. (2008). Measurement of epistemological beliefs and learning strategies of elementary school children. In M. S. Khine (Ed.), *Knowing, Knowledge, and Beliefs: Epistemological Studies across Diverse Cultures*. Springer.

Moyn, S. (2006). Empathy in History, Empathizing with Humanity. *History and Theory, 45(*3), pp. 397-415. http://www.jstor.org/stable/3874132

Mueller-Vollmer, K. (2006). Introduction: Language, Mind, and Artifact: An Outline of Hermeneutic Theory Since the Enlightenment. In K. Mueller-Vollmer (Ed.) *The Hermeneutics Reader: Texts of the German traditions from the Enlightenment to Present* (pp. 1-71). New York: Continuum.

Myrianthopoulos, K. (1946). *Ī paideía en Kýpro epi Anglokratías [Education in Cyprus during the Agglocracy]*. Limassol.

Nakou, I. and Barca, I. (Eds) (2010). *Contemporary Public Debates Over History Education*. The Information Age Publishing, Inc.

Ní Cassaithe, C. (2020). "*Which is the truth? It's actually both of them": a design-based teaching experiment using learning trajectories to enhance irish primary children's epistemic beliefs about history*. Unpublished PhD thesis. Dublin City University.

Novick, P. (1988). *That Noble Dream: The 'Objectivity Question' and the American Historical Profession*. Cambridge University Press.

Office for Standards in Education (Ofsted) (2021) Research review series: history. https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/research-review-series-history/research-review-series-history. (accessed 22 February 2022).

Ogawa, M. (2000). Sixth Grade Students' Development of Historical Perspective: World War II and de Atomic Bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Paper presented at the *80th Annual Meeting of the National Council for the Social Studies.* San Antonio, USA. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED449098.pdf (accessed 22 February 2022)

Ogawa, M. and Field, S. (2006). 'Causation, controversy and contrition: recent developments in the Japanese history textbook content and selection process'. In J. Nicholls (Ed.), *School history textbooks across cultures: international perspectives and debates*. Symposium Books.

O'Laughlin, M. J., and Malle, B. F. (2002). How people explain actions performed by groups and individuals. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 82*(1), pp. 33-48. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.82.1.33

Olcaysoy Okten, I., and Moskowitz, G. B. (2018). Goal versus trait explanations: Causal attributions beyond the trait-situation dichotomy. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 114*(2), pp. 211–229. https://doi.org/10.1037/pspa0000104

Oner, U. and Kinaci, M. K. (2020). The Views of Social Studies Teachers on Historical Empathy. *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences, 12*(3), pp. 136-152

Onurkan-Samani, M., and Tarhan, B.A. (2017). Challenging the established role of history education in Cyprus: A brief enquiry into its difficulties and premises. In I. Psalits, N. Anastasiou, H. Faustmann, M. Hadjipavlou, H. Krahasan, and M. Zackheos (Eds.). *Education in multicultural Cyprus.* Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Oswald, P. A. (1996). The effects of cognitive and affective perspective taking on empathic concern and altruistic helping. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 136*(5), pp. 613-623.

Papadakis, Y. (2008). *History Education in Divided Cyprus: A Comparison of Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot Schoolbooks on the "History of Cyprus".* Oslo: PRIO.

Papapoliviou, P. (2008). 'Istories tis Istorias [Stories of History]'. *Apopsi, 7.*

Pastelas, A. (ed.) (2009) *Ekpaideftikí "metarrýthmisī" kai ethnikí allotroíosī [Educational "reform" and national alienation].* Society for the study of Greek issues.

Peck, C.L. (2010). "It's not like [I'm] Chinese and Canadian. I am in between": Ethnicity and Students' Conceptions of Historical Significance. *Theory and Research in Social Education, 38*(4), pp. 574-617.

Peel, E. A. (1972). Understanding School Material. *Educational Review, 24*(3), pp. 163-173. https://doi.org/10.1080/0013191720240301

Perikleous, L. (2010). At a crossroad between memory and thinking: the case of primary history education in the Greek Cypriot educational system. *Education 3–13, 38*(3), pp. 315-328.

Perikleous, L. (2011). Why did They Treat Their Children Like This?: A Case Study of 9-12 year-old Greek Cypriot Students' Ideas of Historical Empathy. In L. Perikleous and D. Shemilt (Eds), *The Future of the Past: Why history education matters.* Association for Historical Dialogue and Research.

Perikleous, L. (2013). A game of identities: Debates over history in Greek Cypriot education. *International Journal of Historical Learning Teaching and Research, 11(*(2), pp. 45-58.

Perikleous, L. (2014). Deanna Troi and the Tardis: Does Historical Empathy have a Place in Education?. *History Education Research Journal, 12*(2), pp. 22-30. http://dx.doi.org/10.18546/HERJ.12.2.03

Perikleous, L. (2015). A brave new world?: History education reform in the Greek Cypriot educational system. In A. H. J. Wilschut and A. Chapman (Eds), *Joined-up History.: New Direction in History Education Research, International Review of History Education.* Information Age Publishing.

Perikleous, L. (2018a). 'En niothoume ti idia sinesthimata epidi en imsaste emis pou ta pathenoume… den pais sti thesi tous': idees istorikis ensinesthisis se pedia ke ekpedeftikous sto dimotiko scholio ['We don't share their feelings because it doesn't happen to us… we don't get in their place': primary students' and teachers' ideas of historical empathy], *15th Conference of the Cyprus Pedagogical Association.* Nicosia, Cyprus: Cyprus Pedagogical Association.

Perikleous, L. (2018b). The Girl in the Fireplace and the Droids: historical empathy in Greek Cypriot primary education, *History Educators International Research Network 15th International Conference.* Corfu, Greece: HEIRNET.

Perikleous, L. (2018c). 'My mind to your mind, my thoughts to your thoughts': students' ideas of the troublemaker concept of historical empathy. *Michael Sant Memorial Lecture*. Malta: University of Malta- Malta History Teachers Association.

Perikleous, L. (2019). 'Because they believed': Students' ideas of historical empathy in Greek Cypriot primary education. *History Education Research Journal, 16*(2), pp. 195–208. https://doi.org/10.18546/HERJ.16.2.04

Perikleous, L. (2020). Istoriki ensinesthisi kai istoriki ekpedefsi sto ellinokypriako ekpedeftiko sistima [Historical empathy and history education in the Greek Cypriot educational system]. *Democritus University Laboratory of Technologies, Research and Applications in Education seminar*. Komotini, Greece: Democritus University of Thrace.

Perikleous, L. (2022). A word he brought into history teaching: The highly contest term of historical empathy and its place in education. *Educação Histórica: Laboratório seminar*. Portugal: EDHILAB

Perikleous, L. and Shemilt, D. (Eds) (2011). *The Future of the Past: Why does history education matter*. Association for Historical Dialogue and Research.

Perikleous, L., Onurkan-Samani, M., and Onurkan-Aliusta, G. (2021). Those who control the narrative control the future: The teaching of History in Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot schools. *Historical Encounters, 8*(2), pp. 124-139. https://doi.org/10.52289/hej8.207

Persianis, P. (2010). *Ta politiká tīs ekpaídefsīs stīn Kýpro [The politics of education in Cyprus].* University of Nicosias Publications.

Philippou, S. (2009). What makes Cyprus European? Curricular responses of Greek-Cypriot civic education to 'Europe'. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 41*(2), pp. 199-223.

Philippou, S. (2020). Tracing Disciplinarity in the History Classroom: The Cases of Two Elementary School Teachers Amid Curriculum Change in the Republic of Cyprus. In C. W. Berg and T. M. Christou (Eds), *The Palgrave Handbook of History and Social Studies Education*. Palgrave

Phillips, R. (1998). *History Teaching, Nationhood and the State: A Study in Educational Politics*. Cassell. London: Palgrave Macmillan, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-37210-1_17

Pingel, F. (2014). The Holocaust in textbooks: from a European to a global event. In K. Fracapane and M. Haß (Eds). *Holocaust Education in a Global Context*. UNESCO Publishing.

Polydorou, A. (1995). *Ī anáptyxī tīs dīmotikís ekpaídefsīs stīn Kýpro [The development of primary education in Cyprus]*. Nicosia.

Portal, C. (1983). Empathy as an Aim for Curriculum: Lessons from History. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 15*(3), pp. 303-310.

Primary History Education (n.d.a). Analitiko Programma [Curriculum]. https://istod.schools.ac.cy/index.php/el/istoria/analytiko-programma. (accessed 22 February 2022)

Primary History Education (n.d.b). Analitiko Programma Istorias Dimotikis Ekpedefsis: Genikos Skopos [Primary History Curriculum: General Purpose]. https://archeia.moec.gov.cy/sd/94/ap_genikos_skopos_mathimatos.pdf. (accessed 22 February 2022)

Primary History Education (n.d.c). Analitiko Programma Istorias Dimotikis Ekpedefsis: Diktes epitihias ke eparkias [Primary History Curriculum: Attainment and Adequacy Targets]. https://archeia.moec.gov.cy/sd/94/ap_deiktes_eparkeias_epitychias.zip. (accessed 22 February 2022)

Primary History Education (n.d.d). Analitiko Programma Istorias Dimotikis Ekpedefsis: Methodologia [Primary History Curriculum: Methodology]. https://archeia.moec.gov.cy/sd/94/ap_methodologia.pdf. (accessed 22 February 2022)

Primary History Education (n.d.e). Programmatismi: Ekti taksi [Planning: Year 6]. https://archeia.moec.gov.cy/sd/95/programmatismos_st_dim.pdf. (accessed 22 February 2022)

Primary History Education (n.d.f). Piges- Eghiridia [Resources- Textbooks]. https://istod.schools.ac.cy/index.php/el/yliko/piges-didaktika-encheiridia. (accessed 22 February 2022)

Primary History Education (n.d.g). Didaktikes Protasis [Teaching Proposals]. https://istod.schools.ac.cy/index.php/el/yliko/didaktikes-protaseis. (accessed 22 February 2022)

Primary History Education (n.d.h). Imerides- Seminaria- Sinedria [Day events-Seminars- Conferences]. https://istod.schools.ac.cy/index.php/el/epimorfosi/imerides-seminaria-synedria. (accessed 22 February 2022)

Pritschet, L., Powell, D., and Horne, Z. (2016). Marginally Significant Effects as Evidence for Hypotheses: Changing Attitudes Over Four Decades. *Psychological Science, 27*(7), pp. 1036-1042. https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797616645672

Psaltis, C., Lytras, E. and Costache, S. (2011). *History Educators in the Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot Community of Cyprus: Perceptions, Beliefs and Practices.* Association for Historical Dialogue and Research.

Psychology Today (2022). Empathy. http://shorturl.at/jJVX7 (accessed 22 February 2022)

Qualifications and Curriculum Authority (2007). *History: Programme of study for key stage 3 and attainment target*. QCA.

Rantala, J, (2011). Assessing historical empathy through simulation – How do Finnish teacher students achieve contextual historical empathy?. *Nordidactica – Journal of Humanities And Social Science Education, 1*, pp. 58-76

Rantala, J. (2012). How Finnish Adolescents Understand History: Disciplinary Thinking in History and Its Assessment Among 16-Year-Old Finns. *Education Sciences, 2*(4), pp. 193-207. http://dx.doi.org/10.3390/educsci2040193

Rantala, J., Manninen, M., and van den Berg, M. (2015). Stepping into other people's shoes proves to be a difficult task for high school students: assessing historical empathy through simulation exercise, *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 48*(3), p. 1-23. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00220272.2015.1122092

Redfern, N. (2006). Realism, Radical Constructivism, and Film History. *Essays in Philosophy, 7*(2). https://commons.pacificu.edu/work/sc/d3036050-4382-4b22-a66b-f48d4ed380e9. (accessed 22 February 2022)

Republic of Cyprus (n.d.) Republic of Cyprus from 1960 to the present day [Pamphlet]. Press and Information Office.

Sartre, J.-P. (1989). *Being and nothingness : an essay on phenomenological ontology*. Routledge.

Retz, T. (2015) 'A moderate hermeneutical approach to empathy in history education. *Educational Philosophy and Theory, 47*(3), pp. 214–26. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00131857.2013.838661.

Ross, P. T. and Bibler Zaidi, N. L. (2019). Limited by our limitations. *Perspectives on Medical Education, 8*, pp. 261–264

Savenije, G. M. and de Bruijn, P. (2017). Historical empathy in a museum: uniting contextualisation and emotional engagement. *International Journal of Heritage Studies, 23*(9), pp. 832-845.

Savin- Baden, M. and Howell Major, C. (2013). *Qualitative Research: The Essential Guide to Theory and Practice*. Routledge.

Scheler, M. (1954). *The nature of sympathy*. (P. Heath, Trans.). Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Schleiermacher, F. (2006). General hermeneutics. In K. Mueller-Vollmer (Ed.) *The Hermeneutics Reader: Texts of the German traditions from the Enlightenment to Present*. Continuum.

Schommer-Aikins, M., and Hutter, R. (2002). Epistemological beliefs and thinking about everyday controversial issues. *The Journal of Psychology: Interdisciplinary and Applied, 136*(1), pp. 5–20. https://doi.org/10.1080/00223980209604134

Schütz, A. (1967). *The phenomenology of the social world*. (G. Walsh and F. Lehnert, Trans.). Northwestern University Press.

Scott, D. and Morrison, M. (2005). *Key ideas in educational research*. Continuum.

Seixas, P. (1993). Popular film and young people's understanding of the history of Native American- White relations. *The History Teacher, 26*(3), pp. 351- 270.

Seixas, P. (1994) Students' Understanding of Historical Significance. *Theory and Research in Social Education, 22*(3), pp. 281-304.

Seixas, P. (1998). Conceptualizing the Growth of Historical Understanding. In D. R. Olson and N. Torrance, *The Handbook of Education and Human*

Development: New Models of Learning, Teaching and Schooling. Blackwell Publishers.

Seixas, P. (2000). Schweigen! die Kinder! or, Does Postmodern History Have a Place in the Schools?. In P. Seixas, P. Streams and S. Wineburg (Eds), *Teaching, Learning and Knowing History*. New York University Press.

Seixas, P. (2002). The Purposes of Teaching Canadian History. *Canadian Social Studies, 36*(2).

Seixas, P. and Peck, C. (2004). Teaching historical thinking. In A. Sears and I. Wright (Eds.), *Challenges and Prospects for Canadian Social Studies*. Pacific Educational Press.

Seixas, P., Streams, P. and Wineburg, S. (2000). Introduction. In P. Seixas, P. Streams and S. Wineburg (Eds), *Teaching, Learning and Knowing History*. New York University Press.

Seixas, P., Gibson, L., and Ercikan, K. (2015). A Design Process for Assessing Historical Thinking: The Case of a One-Hour Test. In K. Ercikan, P. Seixas (Eds), *New Directions in Assessing Historical Thinking*. Routledge

Serrano, J. S. (2013). Empatía histórica, historia social e identidades: pensar históricamente la conquista cristiana de la Valencia musulmana con estudiantes de 2º ESO [Historical empathy, social history and identities: thinking historically the Christian conquest of muslim Valencia with students of 2n ESO]. *CLIO History and
History teaching, 39*.

Shanahan, T. and Shanahan, C. (2008). Teaching Disciplinary Literacy to Adolescents: Rethinking Content- Area Literacy. *Harvard Educational Review, 78*(1), pp. 40-59.

Shemilt, D. (1980). *History 13-16 evaluation study*. Holmes McDougall.

Shemilt, D. (1983). The devil's locomotive. *History and Theory, 22*(4), pp. 1-18.

Shemilt, D. (1984). Beauty and the philosopher: Empathy in history and classroom. In A. K. Dickinson, P. J. Lee and P. J. Rogers (Eds), *Learning History*. Heinman Educational Books.

Shemilt, D. (2000). The caliph's coin: the currency of narrative frameworks in history teaching. In: P. Seixas, P. N. Stearns, S. Wineburg (eds.), *Knowing, teaching and learning history*. New York University Press.

Shemilt, D. (2009). Drinking an ocean and pissing a cupful. How adolescents make sense of history. In L. Symcox, A. Wilschut (eds.), *National history standards: The problem of the canon and the future of teaching history.* Information Age Publishing.

Shemilt, D. (2011). The Gods of the Copybook Headings: Why Don't We Learn from the Past?. In L. Perikleous and D. Shemilt (Eds), *The Future of the Past: Why history education matters*. Association for Historical Dialogue and Research.

Shemilt, D. and Sheldon, N. (2009). Interview with Denis Shemilt. History in Education Project. https://sas-space.sas.ac.uk/3175/. (accessed 22 February 2022).

Sikes, P. (2004). Methodology, procedures and ethical concerns. In C. Opie (Ed.), *Doing Educational research: a guide for first time researchers*. Sage.

Skinner, Q (2001). The rise of, challenge to and prospects for a Collingwoodian approach to the history of political thought. In D. Castiglione and I. Hampsher-Monk (Eds), *The History of Political Thought in National Context*. Cambridge University Press.

Skinner, Q. (2002). *Visions of Politics, Volume 1: Regarding Method*. Cambridge University Press.

Skidelsky, R. (March 1, 1988). 'History as social engineering'. The Independent.

Skouros, T. (1999). I kataktisi ton istorikon afigimatikon ennoin apo Ellinokiprious mathites tis ektis dimotikou (11–12) [Acquisition of narrative historical concepts by Year 6 Greek Cypriot students (11–12)]. *Pedagogical Review 29*, pp. 147–67.

Spicker, P. (2011). Ethical covert research. *Sociology, 45*(1), pp. 118–133.

Stake, R. E. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Sage Publications.

Steele, I. K. (1976). *Developments in history teaching*. Open Books Publishing Ltd

Stoel, G. L., van Drie, J. P., and van Boxtel, C. A. M. (2017). The effects of explicit teaching of strategies, second-order concepts, and epistemological underpinnings on students' ability to reason causally in history. Journal of Educational Psychology, 109(3), 321–337. https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/edu0000143

Strauss, A. L. (1987). *Qualitative analysis for social scientists*. Cambridge University Press.

Strauss, A., and Corbin, J. M. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques*. Sage Publications

Stueber, K. (2008). Empathy. In E. N. Zalta (Ed.), *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2008/entries/empathy/. (accessed 22 February 2022)

Stueber, K. (2010). *Rediscovering Empathy: Agency, Folk Psychology, and the Human Sciences*. A Bradford Book.

Stueber, K. (2019). Empathy. In E. N. Zalta (Ed.), *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2019/entries/empathy/. (accessed 22 February 2022)

Sylvester, D. and Sheldon, N. (2009). Interview with David Sylvester. History in Education Project. Online www.history.ac.uk/history-in-education/browse/interviews/interview-david-sylvester-7-july-2009.html (accessed 22 February 2022).

Taber, K. S. (2010). Constructivist pedagogy is superior – it's a matter of definition. *Advanced Distributed Learning Newsletter for Educators and Educational Researchers*, pp. 1-9. http://research.adlnet.gov/newsletter/academic/201010.htm (accessed 22 February 2022)

Tajfel, H. (1970). Experiments in Intergroup Discrimination. *Scientific American, 223*(5), pp. 96-103.

Taylor, T. (2004). Disputed territory: the politics of historical consciousness in Australia. In P. Seixas (Ed.), *Theorizing historical consciousness*. University of Toronto Press.

Taylor, T. and Guyver, R. (Eds) (2011). *History Wars and the Classroom: Global Perspectives*. The Information Age Publishing, Inc.

Thatcher, M. (1993). *The Downing Street Years*. HarperCollins.

Trimbur, J. (1987). Cultural Literacy and Cultural Anxiety: E. D. Hirsch's Discourse of Crisis. *Journal of Teaching Writing, 6*(2), pp. 345-55.

Tosh, J. (2008). *Why History Matters*. Palgrave MacMillan

UCL Centre For Holocaust Education (n.d.). Agency and responsibility: Perpetrators and collaborators. https://www.holocausteducation.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/Research-Briefing-1.pdf. (accessed 22 February 2022)

UCL Institute of Education (2022). Research ethics at IOE. https://www.ucl.ac.uk/ioe/research/research-ethics-ioe. (accessed 22 February 2022)

UCL Library Services (2022). Open Access for Theses: how to deposit. https://www.ucl.ac.uk/library/open-science-research-support/open-access/open-access-theses-how-deposit. (accessed 22 February 2022)

UNICEF (n.d.). Mission #3 – Empathy. https://www.unicef.org/lac/en/mission-3-empathy. (accessed 22 February 2022)

United Nations (2019). Is Kindness the Secret to Achieving the Sustainable Development Goals?. https://www.un.org/en/un-chronicle/kindness-secret-achieving-sustainable-development-goals. (accessed 22 February 2022)

United Nations Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus (2022a). Events in the summer of 1974. https://unficyp.unmissions.org/events-summer-1974. (accessed 23 February 2022)

United Nations Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus (2022b). Operations since 1974. https://unficyp.unmissions.org/operations-1974. (accessed 23 February 2022)

van Teijlingen, E. R. and Hundley, V. (2001). The importance of pilot studies. Social *Research UPDATE, 35*.

VanSledright, B. (2001). From empathic regard to self-understanding: Im/positionality, empathy, and historical contextualization. In O. L. Davis, Jr. and E. A. Yeager and S. J. Foster (Eds), *Historical Empathy and Perspective Taking in the Social Studies.* Rowman and Littlefield.

VanSledright, B. (2010). *The challenge of rethinking history education: on practices, theories, and policy*. New York: Routledge.

VanSledright, B. A. and Reddy, K. (2014). Changing epistemic beliefs? An exploratory study of cognition among prospective history teachers. *Revista Tempo e Argumento, 6*(11), pp. 28-68.

VanSledright, B., and Maggioni, L. (2016). Epistemic cognition in history. In J. A. Greene, W. A. Sandoval, and I. Bråten (Eds.), *Handbook of epistemic cognition*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315795225

VanSledright, B. A., Maggioni, L., and Reddy, K. (2011). Preparing teachers to teach historical thinking: The interplay between professional development programs and school-systems' cultures. *Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association*. New Orleans, USA.

Virta, A., and Kouki, E. (2014). Dimension of historical empathy in upper secondary students' essays. *Nordidactica – Journal of Humanities and Social Science Education*, *4*(2) pp. 137- 160. https://journals.lub.lu.se/nordidactica/article/view/18982/17176

Waldman, A. (2009). The Politics of History Teaching in England and France during the 1980s. *History Workshop Journal, 68*, pp. 199–221

Waldron, F. (2004). Making the Irish: Identity and citizenship in the primary curriculum. In C. Sugrue (Ed.), *Curriculum and ideology: Irish experiences, international perspectives*. The Liffey Press.

Waldron, F. (2015). Commemorating 1916 in Irish primary schools: Looking back and looking forward. *Education Matters Yearbook*, pp. 127–129.

Waldron, F. and McCully, A. (2016). Republic of Ireland and Northern Ireland: Eroded certainties and new possibilities. In R. Guyver (Ed.), *Teaching history and the changing nation state: Transnational and intranational perspectives*. Bloomsbury Publishing. https://doi.org/10.5040/9781474225892.ch-003

Waldron, F. and Pike, S. (2006). What does it mean to be Irish? Children's construction of national identity. *Irish Educational Studies, 25*(2), pp. 231–251. https://doi.org/10.1080/03323310600737586

Wasserstein, R. L. and Lazar, N. A. (2016). *The ASA Statement on p-Values: Context, Process, and Purpose. The American Statistician, 70*(2), pp. 129-133. https://doi.org/10.1080/00031305.2016.1154108

Weber, M. (1949). *The methodology of the social sciences*. (E. A. Shils and H. A. Finch, Trans.). The Free Press of Glencoe.

Wertsch, J. V. (1997). *Vygotsky and the formation of the mind*. Harvard University Press.

Whittington, D. (1991). What Have 17-Year-Olds Known in the Past?. *American Educational Research Journal, 28*(4), pp. 759–780. https://doi.org/10.3102%2F00028312028004759

Willingham, D. T. (2009). *Why don't students like school? A cognitive scientist answers questions about how the mind works and what it means for the classroom*. Jossey-Bass.

Wilschut, A. (2010). History at the mercy of politicians and ideologies: Germany, England, and the Netherlands in the 19th and 20th centuries. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 42*(5), pp. 693-723.

Wilschut, A. and Schiphorst, K. (2019) 'One has to take leave as much as possible of one's own standards and values': improving and measuring historical empathy and perspective reconstruction. *History Education Research Journal, 16*(1), pp. 74-87.

Winch, P. (1958). *The Idea of a Social Science and its Relation to Philosophy*. Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Wineburg, S. (1996). The psychology of teaching and learning history. In D. C. Berliner and R. C. Calfee (Eds.), *The Handbook of Educational Psychology*. Simon and Schuster Macmillan.

Wineburg, S. (2001). *Historical Thinking and Other Unnatural Acts*. Temple University Press.

Wineburg, S. (2007). Unnatural and essential: the nature of historical thinking. *Teaching History, 129*, pp. 6-11.

Wineburg, S. and Wilson, S. M. (1991). Subject-matter knowledge in the teaching of history. In J. Brophy (Ed.), *Advances in Research on Teaching: Vol. 2*. JAI Press.

Wispé, L. (1987). History of the concept of empathy. In N. Eisenberg and J. Strayer (Eds), *Empathy and its development*. Cambridge University Press.

Yeager, E. A. and Davis, O. L., Jr. (1996). Classroom teacher's thinking about historical texts: An exploratory study. *Theory and Research in Social Education, 24*(2), pp. 146-166.

Yeager, E.A. and Doppen, F.H. (2001). Teaching and Learning Multiple Perspectives on the Use of the Atomic Bomb: Historical Empathy in the Secondary Classroom. In O. L. Davis, Jr., E. A. Yeager and S. J. Foster (Eds), *Historical Empathy and Perspective Taking in the Social Studies*. Rowman and Littlefield Publishers

Yeager, E. A. and Foster, S. J. (2001). The role of empathy in the development of historical understanding. In O. L. Davis, Jr., E. A. Yeager and S. J. Foster (Eds), *Historical Empathy and Perspective Taking in the Social Studies*. Rowman and Littlefield.

Yiangou, M. S. (2004). *Colonial Classrooms in Cyprus: Teachers, Schools and National Identity*. Unpublished PhD thesis. University of Cambridge.

Yin, R. K. (1994). *Case study research design and methods: 2nd edition*. Sage Publications.

Yin, R. K. (2013). Validity and generalization in future case study evaluations. *Evaluation, 19*(3), pp. 321–332.

Young, M. (2014). Powerful knowledge as a curriculum principle. In M. Young, D. Lambert, C. Roberts and M. Roberts, *Knowledge and the future school: curriculum and social justice*. Bloomsbury Academic.

Zahavi, D. (2001). 'Beyond empathy: Phenomenological approaches to intersubjectivity'. *Journal of consciousness studies*, *8*(5-7), pp. 151- 167.

Zahavi, D. (2010). Empathy, Embodiment and Interpersonal Understanding: From Lipps to Schutz. *Inquiry, 53*(3), pp. 285- 306.

Zembylas, M. (2013). The Emotional Complexities of "Our" and "Their" Loss: The Vicissitudes of Teaching about/for Empathy in a Conflicting Society. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 44*(1), pp. 19-37.
https://www.jstor.org/stable/23359090

Zembylas, M. and Kambani, F. (2012). The Teaching of Controversial Issues During Elementary-Level History Instruction: Greek-Cypriot Teachers' Perceptions and Emotions. *Theory and Research in Social Education, 40*(2), pp. 107-133. https://doi.org/10.1080/00933104.2012.670591

Zembylas, M., Loukaides, L., and Antoniou, P. (2020). Teachers' understandings of empathy in teaching about the holocaust in Cyprus: The emotional risks of identification and the disruptive potential of 'empathic unsettlement'. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 89*, pp. 1-12. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2019.103007

Zembylas, M. and Loukaides, L. (2021). Affective practices, difficult histories and peace education: An analysis of teachers' affective dilemmas in ethnically divided Cyprus. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 97,* pp. 1-11*.* https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2020.103225

Appendices

Appendix A Consent form for parents and guardians

Note: This is an English translation of the original text in Greek

Lukas Perikleous

UCL Institute of Education

University College London

Email: lukasp@ucy.ac.cy

Tel.: ██████████

Dear parents/guardians,

Subject: Research on students' and teachers' ideas of behaviour in the past

For the purposes of my doctoral studies in History Education, I am conducting a case study on students' and teachers' ideas of behaviour in the past. I have selected your child's school for this study and therefore ask for your permission for your child's participation.

The study aims to explore how students and teachers explain human behaviour in the past and also compare this with their explanations for similar behaviour in the present. In order to investigate these ideas, participants will complete pen and papers tasks, while a number of participants will also be interviewed. Pen and paper tasks ask open-ended questions which invite participants to explain specific behaviours in the past and in the present. Interviews ask general questions regarding the issue of differences between behaviour of people in the present and in the past.

It should be stressed that the study does not aim to assess the participants' historical knowledge, but to investigate the kind of ideas they use when they provide explanations for past behaviour.

Your child's participation is valuable, since the data of the study will provide useful information about students' and teachers ideas of the past that can be used for the development of effective policies and practices in history education.

All participants will participate anonymously, and your child's identity will not be revealed to anyone during or after the end of the research. The findings of this study will be reported in my doctoral thesis. Also, research articles are likely to result from this study. All data analysed and published in such reports will be presented anonymously: no one will be able to know who said or wrote each piece of information.

After the completion of my doctoral thesis, a short report on the findings of the study will be disseminated to the participants (i.e., school, teachers, students and their parents/guardians)

Please explain the purpose and the process of the study to your child and talk over with them whether they want to take part or not. You and your child will decide together if you want your child to take part and, even if you say 'yes', they can drop out at any time or say that they do not want to answer some questions. I will also ask the children about their willingness to participate during sessions and make it clear that they can drop out if they wish.

The project has been reviewed by the Research Ethics Committee of the UCL Institute of Education and by the Centre for Educational Research and Evaluation, Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports and Youth.

Feel free to contact me if you need any further details and/or clarifications regarding your child's participation in the study.

You can declare your agreement for your child to participate the study by signing the attached consent form.

Kind regards,
Lukas Perikleous

Research on students' and teachers' ideas of behaviour in the past

<u>Consent form</u>

I have read and understood the information letter about the research.   ☐ (please tick)

I understand that my child's participation in this project is entirely voluntary and that they can withdraw from the project without giving a reason and that there will be no negative consequences if they do so.   ☐ (please tick)

I consent to the data stemming from my child's responses being used in the writing of a doctoral thesis and in further publications or presentations. This is on the understanding that their contributions will be anonymized and their identity protected.   ☐ (please tick)

I agree for my child to be interviewed   ☐ (please tick)

I agree for my child to take the pen and paper tasks   ☐ (please tick)

Child's name _____

Guardian's name _____

Signed _____   Date _____

Researcher's name _____

Signed _____   Date _____

Appendix B Consent form for teachers

Note: This is an English translation of the original text in Greek

Lukas Perikleous

UCL Institute of Education

University College London

Email: lukasp@ucy.ac.cy

Tel.: ███████████

Dear colleague,

Subject: Research on students' and teacher's ideas of behaviour in the past

For the purposes of my doctoral studies in History Education, I am conducting a case study on students' and teachers' ideas of behaviour in the past. I have selected your school for this study and therefore ask for your participation.

The study aims to explore how students and teachers explain human behaviour in the past and compare this with their explanations for similar behaviour in the present. In order to investigate this, participants will complete pen and papers tasks and a number of them will also be interviewed. Pen and paper tasks will ask open-ended questions which will invite the participants to explain specific behaviours in the past and the present. Interviews will ask general questions regarding the issue of differences between behaviour of people in the present and the past.

It should be stressed that the study does not aim to assess the participants' historical knowledge, but to investigate the kind of ideas they use when provide explanations for past behaviour.

Your participation is valuable since the data of the study will provide useful information about students' and teachers ideas of the past that can be used for the development of effective policies and practices in history education.

All participants will participate anonymously and your and your students' identity will not be revealed to anyone during or after the end of the research. The

findings of this study will be reported in my doctoral thesis. Also, research articles are likely to result from this study. All data that are analysed and published in these reports will be presented anonymously: no one will be able to know who said or wrote what.

After the completion of my doctoral thesis a short report on the findings of the study will be disseminated to the participants (i.e., school, teachers, students and their guardians).

You decide if you want to take part and, even if you say 'yes', you can drop out at any time or say that you don't want to answer some questions.

The project has been reviewed by the Research Ethics Committee of the UCL Institute of Education and by the Centre for Educational Research and Evaluation, Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports and Youth.

Feel free to contact me if you need any further details and/or clarifications regarding your participation in the study.

You can declare your agreement for to participate the study by signing the attached consent form.

Kind regards,
Lukas Perikleous

Research on students' and teachers' ideas of behaviour in the past

<u>Consent form</u>

I have read and understood the information letter about the research. ☐ (please tick)

I understand that my participation in this project is entirely voluntary and that I can withdraw from the project without giving a reason and that there will be no negative consequences if I do so. ☐ (please tick)

I consent to the data stemming from my responses being used in the writing of a doctoral thesis and in further publications or presentations. This is on the understanding that my contributions will be anonymised, and my identity protected. ☐ (please tick)

I agree to be interviewed ☐ (please tick)

I agree to take the pen and paper tasks ☐ (please tick)

Participant's name _____
Signed _____   Date _____

Researcher's name _____
Signed _____   Date _____

Appendix C Pen and paper tasks

Note:

The four pen and paper tasks are reproduced below. These are English translations of the original Greek texts.

The instructions and the questions which were the same in all tasks are reproduced here only in the case of the Ancient Greeks task.

The exact word count of the English translations differs from the one of the original Greek texts.

Ancient Greek practice for treatment of diseases

Name:	Class:

Instructions

1. This is not a test, and it does not measure how much you know about the Ancient Greeks.
2. What I want to know is your own opinion about the reasons Ancient Greeks chose this course of treatment when sick.
3. Please, read the text very carefully.
4. The text provides information about the practice, but you cannot find ready-made answers to the questions in the text.
5. Should you not understand a word or phrase, feel free to ask me about it.
6. Please, answer each question as fully as possible.

Thank you for your valuable contribution.

Ancient Greek practice for treatment of diseases

In Ancient Greece people, who suffered from diseases, visited healing sanctuaries called Asclepeions. These places were dedicated to Asclepius (the god of medicine).

Before they entered the Asclepeion, the patients had to make a series of baths and follow a special diet for several days. This process was called Katharsis. When the patient entered the Asclepeion, the priest invoked prayers in order to prepare the patient for the treatment.

Then the patient entered a room called the Abaton. He slept there for one or more nights waiting to be healed or to be visited by Asclepius, who would tell them what to do to cure their illness. In such a case, the patient described their dream to the priest. Then the priest decided the right course of therapy.

Question 1

Based on what you have read here and on your general knowledge about the Ancient Greeks, what is your opinion about them? (Explain your answer as fully as you can)

Question 2

Why do you think Ancient Greeks chose this course of treatment when sick?

(Explain your answer as fully as you can.)

Question 3

Are there any other reasons for which Ancient Greeks chose this kind of treatment apart from those you mentioned when answering question 2? (Explain your answer as fully as you can.)

Question 4

Is there anything that you find strange about the fact that Ancient Greeks chose this course of treatment when sick? Why?

(Explain your answer as fully as you can.)

Question 5

Do you agree or disagree with the Ancient Greeks' choice of treatment? Why?

(Explain your answer as fully as you can.)

Question 6

If you were an Ancient Greek, would you choose this course of treatment when sick? Why? (Explain your answer as fully as you can.)

Question 7

Why don't we use the same course of treatment when we are sick? (Explain your answer as fully as you can.)

Ancient Mayan practice for treatment of diseases

The Ancient Maya lived in South America since 2000 BC. When they were sick, they visited the healer.

At first, the healer decided what day best suited the healing ceremony. In order to do this, the healer would toss red seeds from the coral tree onto a clay plaque. This plaque was a type of calendar. Then the healer counted the seeds and took note of the place they landed on the calendar. In this way, the priest would decide the day of the healing ceremony. Before the day of the ceremony, the patient had to fast for a number of days.

During the ceremony, the healer invoked prayers to the gods, asking for the expulsion of evil spirits. At the end of this, the healer made offerings to the gods. These included food or ornaments. After this ceremony, all people present danced, feasted, and drunk.

Orthodox Christian practice for treatment of diseases

Today, some Orthodox Christians seek the help of a priest when sick. The priest performs a ritual called Eucheleon.

Before the actual ritual, the patient and their relatives must confess their sins to the priest (Holy Confession). This needs to take place in order for the sins of the patient and of their relatives to be forgiven.

During the ceremony, the priest applies olive oil on the patient's forehead, face, and hands. During this process, the priest reads a specific blessing, with which he asks God to heal the patient. This process is repeated seven times. After the last repetition, the priest places an open Gospel Book over the head of the patient and reads a prayer, which asks for the patient's sins to be forgiven. The purpose of the Eucheleon is to heal the body of the patient and at the same time to be forgiven for their sins.

Muslim practice for treatment of diseases

Today, some Muslim people practice a ceremony called Ruqyah when sick.

During this ceremony, the patient, or someone else, recites parts of the Quran or other prayers with the purpose of being healed from the disease. This is repeated for several times. At the end, the person who reads the prayers spits or blows in their hands and rubs them together.

It is important that the patient clearly understands the recited part. It is also important that the patient accepts that their protector is Allah and that He is the one who heals them and not the prayer. The ceremony should not be performed in places where prayer is forbidden (e.g., baths or cemeteries). Finally, a sick person may never ask a sorcerer to perform the Ruqyah.

Appendix D Codes, code categories and types of explanation of the choice of practice

During an initial coding phase students' and teachers' responses were initially coded line-by-line (Charmaz, 2006) in order to produce 'low-inference descriptive codes' (Chapman, 2009b, p. 32), which represented ideas in their simplest forms (not analysable in terms of combinations of simpler ones). During this process, 483 low inference initial codes were developed. After initial coding, codes which seemed to have a similar content in terms of ideas were grouped in order to form 18 categories of responses.

The table below presents and exemplifies the initial codes that formed two of these categories.

Initial codes and code categories

Initial code	Exemplification	Code category
If I lived back then, I would agree.	*If I lived back then, I would agree. But I am not therefore I do not agree (Arya, Year 3, Ancient Maya, Question 5).*	1. Choice of practice related to living in that specific context
If I lived back then, I would do the same.	*I agree because if it was me in their time I would do the same thing (Elizabeth Year 3, Ancient Greeks, Question 5).*	
It looks normal for that time.	*I agree with this choice because it looks normal to me for that time (Dean, Year 5, Ancient Maya, Question 5).*	
We live in different times.	*I disagree with the choice of this treatment although*	

	I cannot be objective since the circumstances today are very different from the ones of the Mayan era (Ian, Teacher, Ancient Maya, Question 5). .	
If I lived at that time, it would be rational for me.	Maybe, if I lived at that time, I would consider this treatment to be a rational one (Ian, Teachers, Ancient Maya, Question 5).	
This religion made sense at that time.	I don't find something strange because this religion was rational for that time (Dean, Year 5, Ancient Greeks, Question 4).	
I find it strange because I live in a different time.	I find it strange because we are in the 21st century. For them, it was something that made sense. (Barry, Year 6, Ancient Maya, Question 4)	
I would do the same because back then they all did it.	Yes, [I would choose this treatment if I was an Ancient Greek], because in the ancient times they all went for this treatment. (Han, Year 5, Ancient Greeks, Question 6)	

They chose this treatment because doctors failed to provide a cure.	[They chose this because] … doctors didn't manage to treat them (Barry, Year 6, Orthodox Christians, Question 2)	9. Practice chosen as a last resort after others fail
They chose this treatment as their last resort	Maybe they end up with this treatment when they feel that nothing else helps them; they put their faith to God. (Barbara, Teacher, Muslims, Question 2).	
Not a strange choice because is the last resort after all others fail	Since the doctors can't cure you then you turn to your good friend the God and wish for the best, I don't find it strange (Barry, Year 6, Orthodox Christians, Question 4)	
Today some people still resort to this treatment as a last resort	Of course, in many cases people who are desperate with diseases that doctors cannot handle resort to churches to make offers [tamata] to the Saints and God because the doctors "raise their hands" and say that only a miracle will save them (Clara, Teacher, Ancient Greeks, Question 7).	

The table below presents the 18 code categories that emerged from grouping the 483 initial codes developed from coding explanations about the choice of practice.

Code categories of explanations of the choice of practice

Code category	Codes
1. Choice of practice related to living in that specific context	8
2. Choice of practice related to the group's way of life	20
3. Choice of practice based on beliefs of how things work	21
4. Choice of practice based on religious beliefs	84
5. Choice of practice based on religious beliefs that are correct	48
6. Choice of practice based on religious beliefs that are different	16
7. Choice of practice based on religious beliefs that are false	63
8. Chosen practice as the best available option	24
9. Practice chosen as a last resort after others fail	4
10. Choice of practice based on empirical evidence	33
11. Choice of practice based on knowledge that is valid today	11
12. Choice of practice due to financial constrains	5
13. Choice of practice due to the fact that people are/were less rational and/or evolved and/or clever than us	22
14. Choice of practice due to the fact that people do not/did not have the medical means and knowledge we have	69
15. Choice of practice based on people's preferences	14
16. Tautologies	12
17. No explanation due to lack of information	10
18. Minor codes	19

The following table lists types of explanation and indicates which code categories were grouped under each type of explanation.

Code categories and types of explanations

Type of explanation	Code categories
Life Forms	1,2
Beliefs	3, 4, 5, 6,7
Available Options	8, 9
Effectiveness	10, 11
Deficit	12, 13, 14
Pseudo-explanations	15, 16
Lack of information	17
Minor codes	18

Appendix E Explanations of the choice of practice: description of types of explanation and exemplification of code categories

The **Life Forms** type of explanation includes responses that explained the choice of practice by reference to the fact that this treatment is/was an intrinsic part of the group's way of life and/or made sense in that specific context.

Code categories	Exemplification
1. Choice of practice related to living in that specific context	*I find it strange because we are in the 21st century. For them, it was something that made sense. (Barry, Year 6, Ancient Maya, Question 4)* *Yes, [I would choose this treatment if I was an Ancient Greek], because in the ancient times they all went for this treatment. (Han, Year 5, Ancient Greeks, Question 6)*
2. Choice of practice related to the group's way of life	*Maybe Muslims choose this treatment because it is related with their everyday life or it has something that characterizes them. (Lyra, Year 6, Muslims, Question 2)* *I don't find it strange because they simply followed their own treatment. (Tulip, Year 3, Ancient Maya, Question 4)* *I would choose it because it would be the treatment of the tribe to which I would belong. (Lyra, Year 6, Ancient Maya, Question 6)*

The **Beliefs** type of explanation includes responses that explained the choice of practice by reference to the groups' beliefs. Some of them referred to beliefs in general. However, the majority of these responses explicitly referred to religious beliefs. In some of the responses, these beliefs were considered to be correct while in other cases they were considered to be false. Finally, some responses referred to religious beliefs as simply different from the participants' own ones.

3. Choice of practice based on beliefs about how things work	*I think that the Ancient Greeks believed that …in this way they would heal better. (Luke, Year 5, Ancient Greeks, Question 2)*
	Based on the knowledge and the beliefs they held, maybe this treatment was the appropriate one. Therefore, I don't find something to be strange. (Barbara, Teacher, Ancient Maya, Question 4)
	If I was an Ancient Maya, I would believe and I would be sure that it would be the best and most appropriate one therefore I would choose it. (Clara, Teacher, Ancient Maya, Question 6)
4. Choice of practice based on religious beliefs	*Ancient Maya were very religious people who believed that the cure of diseases (or not) was according to the will of god. (Ian, Teacher, Ancient Maya, Question 1)*
	[They choose this treatment] because this is their religion and they believe in it. (Mary, Year 5, Muslims, Question 2)
	I agree with the choice of this treatment, because it means that they had faith in their gods, so they asked them to cure a member of the tribe. (Harley, Year 6, Ancient Maya, Question 5)

	Yes, I would choose this treatment because I would believe in the 12 gods of Olympus as well because I wouldn't know about Christ. (Frank, Year 5, Ancient Greeks, Question 6)
5. Choice of practice based on religious beliefs that are correct	*I agree with this process, because it is good for your sins to be forgiven for Christ and to be cured by the god you believe in. (Han, Year 5, Orthodox Christians, Question 5).* *Yes, if I was in their place, I would choose this treatment because I believe in God and I believe in His power to cure me. (Harley, Year 6, Ancient Maya, Question 6)* *I agree because as I said in a previous answer we believe in the miracles He [God] did. (Stephen, Year 6, Orthodox Christians, Question 5)*
6. Choice of practice based on religious beliefs that are different	*Because they believed in different gods than we do and they believed that they would help them (Clark, Year 6, Ancient Maya, Question 2).* *I disagree because I was not taught with these principles since I belong in a different religion. (Diana, Year 6, Muslims, Question 5)* *[We don't follow this practice] because first of all we are Christians who believe in God and Christ and not Allah. (Tealc, Year 3, Muslims, Question 7)*

	I think [we don't follow this treatment] because now… we stopped believing in Asclepius. (Matt, Year 6, Ancient Greeks, Question 7)
7. Choice of practice based on religious beliefs that are false	*I think they did all this, because they didn't believe in the true God. If they believed in the true God, they would all be like us. (Daenerys, Year 3, Muslims, Question 2)* *There are many things I find strange… such as the fact that they believe that a fake god who doesn't exist can help them. (Obi-Wan, Year 5, Muslims, Question 4)* *I disagree because the god was fake and if you say different words the patient won't get well. (Joe, Year 3, Ancient Maya, Question 5)* *[If I was an Ancient Greek, I would not follow this treatment] because someone who doesn't exist cannot essentially do anything. (Tony, Year 6, Ancient Greeks, Question 6)*

The **Available Options** type of explanation includes responses which explained the choice of practice by reference to the fact that the treatment in question is/was best one available. In some cases, responses referred to the fact that is/was their last choice after all others failed.

8. Practice chosen as a last resort after others fail	*Maybe they end up with this treatment when they feel that nothing else helps them; they put their faith to God. (Barbara, Teacher, Muslims, Question 2).*

9. Chosen practice as the best available option	*I believe that there were other ways too to treat people, but this was the best I think. (Kara, Year 5, Ancient Maya, Question 2)*
	I would choose it because back then I wouldn't have any other choice. (Arya, Year 3, Ancient Maya, Question 6)

The **Effectiveness** type of explanation includes responses that explained the choice of practice by reference to its effectiveness. These responses referred to contemporary medicinal knowledge that is valid today, despite the fact that nothing in the practice's description suggested that such knowledge was involved in it, or the fact that the groups had empirical evidence of the treatment's effectiveness.

10. Choice of practice based on knowledge that is valid today	*This process proves once more the cleverness of the ancients and their faith in "axioms" such as "a healthy mind in a healthy body", (Danny, Teacher, Ancient Greeks, Question 1)*
	I think they applied this treatment because maybe the red seeds were from healing herbs or weeds. (Audrey, Year 3, Ancient Maya, Question 2)
11. Choice of practice based on empirical evidence	*I think they chose this treatment because it cured them and they never got sick again. (Dale, Year 3, Ancient Maya, Question 2)*

	Also maybe they knew of cases of people who were cured with this method. (River, Teacher, Ancient Greeks, Question 2)

The **Deficit** type of explanation includes responses which explained the choice of practice by reference to deficits in terms of ideas and/or medical knowledge and means and/or financial means available to the group in question.

12. Choice of practice due to financial constrains	*Because… most probably they can't afford other treatments. (Barry, Year 6, Orthodox Christians, Question 2)*
13. Choice of practice due to the fact that people are/were less rational and/or evolved and/or clever than us	*I think that this [the choice of the treatment in question] is because Ancient Maya, as other people in the past, were not as rational as we are today. (Deanna, Year 4, Ancient Maya, Question 2)* *I disagree because they could do something simpler and more rational. (Sara, Year 6, Ancient Maya, Question 5)* *[Today we do not choose this treatment] because we have evolved as a species. (Arya, Year 3, Ancient Maya, Question 7)*
14. Choice of practice due to the fact that people do not/did not have the medical means and knowledge we have	*I think they did it because back then there were no medicines. (Audrey, Year 3, Ancient Greeks, Question 2)* *The ancients did what they knew. They didn't have any further medical knowledge therefore they did right. (Clara, Teachers, Ancient Greeks, Question 4)*

	I would choose this treatment because first of all I would be an ancient woman which means I wouldn't have medicines to be cured. (Elizabeth, Year 3, Ancient Greece, Question 6)

The **Pseudo-explanations** type of explanation includes responses that essentially did not provide an explanation for the choice of practice. Instead, they referred to personal preferences and/or provided descriptions of the practice and/or used tautologies (i.e., people choose the treatment in question in order to be cured).

15. Choice of practice based on people's preferences	*Because maybe they liked fasting and listening to prayers for the gods. (Jean-Luc, Year 4, Ancient Maya, Question 2)*
	[Not all Orthodox Christians] choose this treatment because some like it and some not. Different preferences. (Dean , Year 5, Orthodox Christians, Question 6)
16. Tautologies	*I think that they chose this treatment because the disease should be cured because if it wasn't the people would die. (Kate, Year 3, Ancient Maya, Question 2)*

The **Lack of Information** type of ideas includes responses that did not provide any explanation for the practice on the grounds of lack of information.

17. No explanation due to lack of information	*Maybe there are other reasons too. However, my knowledge is not adequate to provide further explanations. (Barbara, Teacher, Ancient Maya, Question 3)*

	I do not agree or disagree because I don't know what the Orthodox Christians think when they choose this treatment. (Samantha, Year 3, Orthodox Christians, Question 4)

Minor Codes

The Minor Codes type of explanations includes explanations that figured in a small number of responses and therefore could not be grouped in code categories and types of explanations.

18. Minor codes	*Ancient Maya had other methods because they lived in the jungle; they were secluded. (Tony, Year 6, Ancient Maya, Question 2)*
	I think that the Ancient Maya chose this treatment when they were sick because the healers where probably wizards. (Caprica, Year 5, Ancient Maya, Question 2)
	Maybe [they chose this treatment because] they were influenced by other tribes of that time. (Ian, Teacher, Ancient Maya, Question 3)

Appendix F Full tables of tests for statistical significance

In order to establish statistical significance, chi-square and Fisher's exact tests were employed. Chi-square tests were employed in cases of comparisons that contained values equal or above 5. In the case of comparison that contained values lower than 5 Fisher's exact tests were employed. This was because when comparisons contain values below 5 Fisher's exact tests are considered to be a more adequate way of testing the statistical significance of differences (Kim, 2017).

In the main text of this thesis, the tables which contain the results of the tests for statistical significance only present the result of the test that was used in each comparison. Version of the tables which also indicate the type of test used in each case can be found below. For the purposes of readers' convenience, I kept the numbers used for each table in the main text adding the letter F. For example, table F5.2 in this appendix, is the extended version of table 5.2. This extended version also indicates the type of test used in each case. Values that indicate statistical significance of p< 0.05 are highlighted with yellow colour. Values that indicate marginal statistical significance of p< 0.10 are highlighted with blue colour. Values that indicate near-marginal statistical significance of p< 0.18 are highlighted with green colour.

Table F5.2 Tests for the statistical significance of differences in references to types of explanation (Ancient Greeks and Ancient Maya tasks)

This table shows the results of the tests for the statistical significance of the differences in the frequency of references to the different types of explanation in responses for each task question.

Question	Type of test	P-value
Question 1	Chi-square	-
	Fisher's exact	<0.01
Questions 2-3	Chi-square	-
	Fisher's exact	<0.01
Question 4	Chi-square	-
	Fisher's exact	<0.01
Question 5	Chi-square	-
	Fisher's exact	<0.01
Question 6	Chi-square	-
	Fisher's exact	<0.01
Question 7	Chi-square	-
	Fisher's exact	<0.01

Table F7.3 Tests for the statistical significance of differences between age groups in attainment of levels of progression (Ancient Greeks and Ancient Maya tasks).

The table presents the results of the tests for the statistical significance of differences in terms of correspondence to levels of the model of progression between adjacent age groups, oldest and youngest students (Year 3 and Year 6), oldest and youngest participants (Year 3 students and teachers), and students and teachers for all tasks.

Level of progression model	Type of test	Year 3 & Year 4 (p-value)	Year 4 & Year 5 (p-value)	Year 5 & Year 6 (p-value)	Year 6 & Teachers (p-value)	Year 3 & Year 6 (p-value)	Year 3 & Teachers (p-value)	Students & Teachers (p-value)
Level 5	Chi-square	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Level 5	Fisher's exact	-	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	0.3999	1.0000	1.0000
Level 4	Chi-square	-	-	0.7060	-	0.1993	-	-
Level 4	Fisher's exact	0.2436	0.1194	-	0.7287	-	0.2908	0.4018
Level 3	Chi-square	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Level 3	Fisher's exact	0.0025	0.0631	0.7544	0.1981	0.0239	1.0000	0.2822
Level 2	Chi-square	-	-	0.9440	-	0.0969	-	-
Level 2	Fisher's exact	0.5454	1.0000	-	0.5727	-	0.7452	0.9734
Level 1	Chi-square	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Level 1	Fisher's exact	1.0000	1.0000	0.0300	-	0.0111	0.4909	0.3517

Table F8.3 Tests for the statistical significance of the differences in the distribution of responses to the progression models level between tasks about to past practices and tasks about present practices

The table presents the results of the tests for the statistical significance of differences between the distribution of responses to task about tasks practices and responses to tasks about present practices to the progression model levels.

Types of explanation	Type of test	Students (p-value)	Teachers (p-value)	All participants (p-value)
Level 5	Chi-square	-	-	-
	Fisher's exact	*0.3434*	*1.0000*	*0.5487*
Level 4	Chi-square	0.0555		0.0705
	Fisher's exact	-	*1.0000*	-
Level 3	Chi-square	-	-	-
	Fisher's exact	*0.0922*	*1.0000*	*0.1795*
Level 2	Chi-square	0.0389	-	0.0495
	Fisher's exact	-	*1.0000*	-
Level 1	Chi-square	0.7963	-	0.7963
	Fisher's exact	-	-	-

Table F8.5 Tests for the statistical significance of differences in the distribution of responses to the progression model's level between tasks about the Ancient Greeks' and tasks about the Orthodox Christians' practices

The table presents the results of the tests for the statistical significance of differences between the distribution of responses to tasks about the Ancient Greeks' and tasks about the Orthodox Christians' practices to the progression model levels.

Types of explanation	Type of test	Students (p-value)	Teachers (p-value)	All participants (p-value)
Level 5	Chi-square	-	-	-
	Fisher's exact	1.0000	-	1.0000
Level 4	Chi-square	-	-	1.0000
	Fisher's exact	0.7538	1.0000	-
Level 3	Chi-square	-	-	-
	Fisher's exact	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Level 2	Chi-square	-	-	-
	Fisher's exact	0.2000	--	0.2000
Level 1	Chi-square	-	-	-
	Fisher's exact	1.0000	-	1.0000

Table F8.7 Tests for the statistical significance of differences in the distribution of responses to the progression model's level between tasks about the Ancient Greeks' and tasks about the Muslims' practices

The table presents the results of the tests for the statistical significance of differences between the distribution of responses to tasks about the Ancient Greeks' and tasks about the Muslims' practices to the progression model levels.

Types of explanation	Type of test	Students (p-value)	Teachers (p-value)	All participants (p-value)
Level 5	Chi-square	-	-	-
	Fisher's exact	0.4286	-	0.4286
Level 4	Chi-square	-	-	-
	Fisher's exact	0.2264	-	0.2264
Level 3	Chi-square	-	-	-
	Fisher's exact	0.3651	-	0.3651
Level 2	Chi-square	-	-	-
	Fisher's exact	0.2126	1.0000	0.2877
Level 1	Chi-square	-	-	-
	Fisher's exact	1.0000	-	1.0000

Table F8.9 Tests for the statistical significance of differences in the distribution of responses to the progression model's level between tasks about the Ancient Maya's and tasks about the Orthodox Christians' practices

The table presents the results of the tests for the statistical significance of differences between the distribution of responses to tasks about the Ancient Maya's and tasks about the Orthodox Christian's practices to the progression model levels.

Types of explanation	Type of test	Students (p-value)	Teachers (p-value)	All participants (p-value)
Level 5	Chi-square	-	-	-
	Fisher's exact	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Level 4	Chi-square	-	-	-
	Fisher's exact	0.5073	1.0000	0.3434
Level 3	Chi-square	-	-	-
	Fisher's exact	1.0000	-	1.0000
Level 2	Chi-square	-	-	-
	Fisher's exact	0.2000	-	0.2000
Level 1	Chi-square	-	-	-
	Fisher's exact	1.0000	-	1.0000

Table F8.11 Tests for the statistical significance of differences in the distribution of responses to the progression model's level between tasks about the Ancient Maya's and tasks about the Muslims' practices

The table presents the results of the tests for the statistical significance of differences between the distribution of responses to tasks about the Ancient Maya's and tasks about the Muslims' practices to the progression model levels.

Types of explanation	Type of test	Students (p-value)	Teachers (p-value)	All participants (p-value)
Level 5	Chi-square	-	-	-
	Fisher's exact	1.0000	-	1.0000
Level 4	Chi-square	-	-	-
	Fisher's exact	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
Level 3	Chi-square	-	-	-
	Fisher's exact	0.4286	-	0.4286
Level 2	Chi-square	-	-	-
	Fisher's exact	1.0000	-	1.0000
Level 1	Chi-square	-	-	-
	Fisher's exact	1.0000	-	1.0000

Table F8.13 Tests for the statistical significance of differences in the distribution of responses to the progression models level between tasks about the Ancient Greeks' practice and tasks about the Ancient Maya practice

The table presents the results of the tests for the statistical significance of differences between the distribution of responses to tasks about the Ancient Greeks' practice and tasks about the Ancient Maya practice to the progression model levels.

Types of explanation	Type of test	Students (p-value)	Teachers (p-value)	All participants (p-value)
Level 5	Chi-square	-	-	-
Level 5	Fisher's exact	-	-	-
Level 4	Chi-square	0.4054	-	0.2850
Level 4	Fisher's exact	-	*1.0000*	-
Level 3	Chi-square	-	-	-
Level 3	Fisher's exact	*0.6850*	-	*0.6850*
Level 2	Chi-square	0.5637	-	0.4054
Level 2	Fisher's exact	-	*1.0000*	-
Level 1	Chi-square	-	-	-
Level 1	Fisher's exact	*0.6129*	-	*0.6129*

Table F8.15 Test for statistical significance of differences in the distribution of responses to the progression models level between tasks about the Orthodox Christians practice and tasks about the Muslims' practice.

The table presents the results of the tests for the statistical significance of differences between the distribution of responses to tasks about the Orthodox Christians' practice and tasks about the Muslims' practice to the progression model levels.

Types of explanation	Type of test	Students (p-value)	Teachers (p-value)	All participants (p-value)
Level 5	Chi-square			
	Fisher's exact	*0.4510*	-	*0.4510*
Level 4	Chi-square	0.7561		0.7656
	Fisher's exact		*1.0000*	
Level 3	Chi-square			
	Fisher's exact	*1.0000*	*1.0000*	*0.6129*
Level 2	Chi-square			
	Fisher's exact	*0.0968*	*1.0000*	*0.0476*
Level 1	Chi-square			
	Fisher's exact			