

Lisbeth Bergum Johanson

Førstelektor i samfunnsfag ved Institutt for lærerutdanning og pedagogikk, campus Alta, UiT Norges arktiske universitet

The Norwegian Curriculum in History and Historical Thinking: A case study of three lower secondary schools

Abstract

The teaching of history and the content of the curriculum and syllabi have changed over the years in order to make history more relevant for the students of today. It is important to provide students with “knowing what” knowledge in addition to “knowing how” knowledge in order to support and develop critical thinking and historical understanding. One way of promoting historical understanding is through introducing the concepts of historical thinking. However, studies show that history classes often promote teaching that is still quite traditional, using history books uncritically and without problematizing their truthfulness. This does not let students see how history is formed, nor how it can be important for the present and the future. This article explores whether the concepts of historical thinking are encouraged and used in three different lower secondary schools in Norway today. The main sources of data are current history textbooks, teaching plans, tests and assignments. The findings of the study show that the concepts of historical thinking are not made clear and explicit enough in neither history books, plans nor tests. Furthermore, it seems like reproduction rather than reflection is focused on in many classrooms, making it difficult to develop a historical understanding. It is therefore suggested that both teachers and students learn and work thoroughly with the concepts of historical thinking.

Key words: Didactics of history, historical understanding, historical thinking, curriculum and syllabi

Sammendrag

I tråd med samfunnsendringer og endringer i skolen har historiedidaktikken og læreplanene i historie blitt endret for å gjøre historiefaget mer relevant for elevene i dag. For å utvikle elevenes kritiske tenkning og historieforståelse bør elevene tilegne seg både ”vite at- kunnskap” og ”vite hvordan - kunnskap”. En måte å fremme historieforståelse på, er gjennom introduksjon av historisk tenkning. Studier utført i klasserommet viser imidlertid at historieundervisningen fortsatt er forholdsvis tradisjonell i den forstand at lærebøker i historie anvendes ukritisk, uten å problematisere hvordan historie

konstrueres eller hvorfor historie er viktig både i dag og for fremtida. Denne artikkelen ser på hvorvidt og hvordan historisk tenkning fremmes og anvendes i tre ulike skoler på ungdomstrinnet. Lærebøker i historie, ukeplaner, halvårsplaner, prøver og oppgaver danner hovedgrunnlaget for empirien i denne undersøkelsen. Funnene i undersøkelsen viser at historisk tenkning er lite tydelig i lærebøker, planer eller i prøver og oppgaver. Samtidig ser det ut til at det fokuseres mer på reproduksjon enn refleksjon i klasserommet, noe som vanskeliggjør historisk forståelse. Det foreslås derfor at både lærere og studenter arbeider mer grundig med historisk tenkning.

Nøkkelord: Historiedidaktikk, historieforståelse, historisk tenkning, læreplaner.

Introduction

The content of the Norwegian curriculum, the history syllabi, and the didactics of history¹ have changed over the years. From the 19th century onwards, the government aimed to enhance nation building and patriotism, and schools made an important contribution to this process of building a nation state and a strong national culture (Hodne, 2002; Koritzinsky, 2012; Lund, 2011b). History was primarily treated as dissemination, presenting the most important events of the past as facts and as a consensually accepted narrative, rather than as a subject to be debated or examined from different sources. It was not until 1974, when history, geography, and sociology were combined to create the subject of social studies (Koritzinsky, 2012; Lund, 2011b; Syse, 2011), that the syllabus was revised to require the use of scientific methods. Even though these changes were introduced in the 1974 syllabus, they were not implemented until the 1990s (Lund, 2011b). The teaching of history was then to introduce concepts such as historical consciousness, the use of history and historical thinking (Bøe 2006). However, teachers found it difficult to meet the goals of the syllabus, such as asking questions, making observations, and evaluating sources (Lund, 2011b).

The current curriculum, known as The Knowledge Promotion Reform (hereafter referred to as K06), aims to develop the students' competence in historical understanding. To have competence in history, students must gain expert knowledge while possessing the interdependent ability to reflect (Kvande & Naastad, 2013). K06 is thus divided between "knowing how" knowledge and "knowing what" knowledge, just as with curricula in the UK and the US (Lund, 2011b; Syse, 2011). Nevertheless, integrating these two aspects of knowledge is challenging, and Lund (2011b) asserted that history as a subject is still practiced as "knowing what", rather than "knowing how." Kvande and Naastad (2013)

¹ The concept of historical didactics is used in this article even though the concept can have negative connotations in English. However, the concept is well incorporated in the subject field. The concept in use is more aligned with the German term "fachdidaktik".

also made this assumption and noted that most teachers “pass on” historical facts to their students. In a study of history education, Rosenlund (2011) found that questions and assignments often followed the structure of the course book with assignments and tests being reconstructive and focusing on the “what” questions. The problem with this traditional education is that it might impart a consensus on the past that does not enable the students to see or understand how history is formed, or how it is used in the present (Syse, 2011). Even so, according to Lund (as cited in Syse, 2011), schools continue to promote the story of the past as a truth that is found in history books. In addition, working with only facts in course books removes students’ curiosity (Kvande & Naastad, 2013) and “hinders the multi-perspectival reading, studying, analyzing in history, and cuts the domain from the students’ interests and aspirations” (Constantin, 2011, p. 58). Seixas and Morton (2013) asserted that encouraging students to work with questions that are thought-provoking is essential in history education and will allow students to engage with the past.

The aim of this article is to investigate whether schools and teachers are able to meet the challenge of integrating the two parts of “knowing what” and “knowing how.” The question of “knowing how” is closely linked to historical thinking, which “requires students to critically read primary sources, to inquire deeply and critique historical narratives, and to form reasoned conclusions about the past based on corroborating sources” (Fránquiz & Salinas, 2011, p. 197). Because of the identified difficulty in encouraging and enhancing this way of thinking in education, this article intends to answer the following research question: how is historical thinking encouraged when teaching history in schools today?

To address this question, this study involved the thorough examination of the history books used in classes, the K06 curriculum, history syllabi, and weekly plans handed out to students in three lower secondary schools. An examination of tests and the questions asked therein allowed the researcher to develop a deeper understanding of how history is taught in schools. To narrow down the investigation, this article will look into topics that are essential in the syllabus of Norwegian history and competence aims after the 10th grade. Though the syllabus includes both “knowing what” knowledge and “knowing how” knowledge, this article will focus on competence aims that are compatible with historical thinking.

K06 – “The Knowledge Promotion Reform” and Historical Thinking

Through the early 21st century, the previous school reforms and curricula in Norway were critically assessed. Students’ poor results on international tests and the education system’s lack of adaption to students’ needs challenged the reforms (Norwegian Ministry of Education and Research, 2007; Syse, 2011). The Ministry of Education and Research introduced a new school reform called The Knowledge Promotion Reform in 2006 that aimed not only to restore

knowledge in schools, but also to include basic skills. The K06 reform applies to all levels of compulsory education and comprises the core curriculum, quality frameworks and syllabi. It is divided into different subjects, each with described competence aims that are to be met after the 4th, 7th, and 10th years.

Social studies is one of the K06 subjects and consists of sociology, geography, and history. History includes how and why both society and people have changed over centuries, and also how this picture of the past is created by people. The social studies syllabus from the Ministry of Education and Research (2010) notes that “developing historical overviews and insight, and training skills in everyday life and participation in society are key elements of this main subject area (p. 2)”. Moreover, K06 is concerned with developing democratic competence and historical understanding (Syse, 2011), which includes both “knowing what” and “knowing how” knowledge. Kvande and Naastad (2013) have explained that the syllabus is about knowing historical facts as well as understanding historical method and the importance of history for today’s society and students. Recognizing how methods and facts are interwoven to create interesting and important issues is therefore vital for a deeper understanding of history and provide meaning.

According to Koritzinsky (2012), the curriculum adopts a social constructivist view of knowledge and teaching. In this view, developing knowledge about society is a dynamic process. In terms of history, the social constructivist viewpoint, means acknowledging that the past is changeable and makes sense through communicative social processes that signify a presentation of history as competing or imbricated narratives and interpretations of the past (Lenz & Risto Nilssen, 2011). Furthermore, history as a subject should enhance the students’ ability to think critically and freely, and to take different perspectives. It should also increase the students’ ability to discuss different problems in society and stimulate their curiosity (Koritzinsky, 2006; Ministry of Education, 2010). Lenz and Risto Nilssen (2011) argued that when a history presentation is connected to a culture that is both pluralistic and democratic, it is just as vital to focus on historical thinking and historical consciousness as on a knowledge of history. As such, critical thinking skills curricula are designed to help students acquire and apply the skills they learn in new situations (Beach, 1999). The resulting goals and demands of the curricula then make new demands for assignments and activities of learning (Lund, 2011b), so a different approach to the didactics of history should include working with the concepts of historical thinking.

To develop historical thinking, teachers must challenge students by using both historical sources and historical methods (Lund, 2011a, 2011b). The students need to know “how” in order to be able to know “what.” For Lee and Howson (as cited in Rosenlund, 2011), it is vital that students understand how historians work. In this way, students will not only receive a historical understanding, but will also profit from what and how they are taught in history

education. Additionally, Rosenlund (2011) asserted that a more developed way of thinking will lead to more knowledge of history, and work as a tool for how to deal with the different pictures of the past. Students create their own interpretations of history, which means students have to interact with historical documents. According to Lesh (2011), for students to see history as a construction and to make evidence-based arguments, they have to see history as being driven by questions, to understand the nature of historical evidence, to analyse and question a variety of sources, and to develop and defend evidence based on interpretations of the past. However, Rosenlund (2011) argued that the subject of history and the knowledge of history are taught in two different ways. On one side of the continuum, teachers and course books present a reproduction of history for the students, while on the other side of the continuum, students learn that all history is constructed, that multiple different interpretations of the past exist, and that no interpretation is better than the other. Rosenlund (2011) asserted that both perspectives are needed. The latter end of the continuum, known as the reconstructive perspective, is needed if the students are to put together what they study in a reconstructive way. Thus, the two perspectives are interwoven, just as the “knowing what” knowledge and “knowing how” knowledge are supposed to be.

Seixas (2006) argued that historical thinking is indicated in many syllabi, but is often not properly defined. Accordingly, the concepts can be identified in the Norwegian syllabus, but needs to be clearer. Historical thinking concepts can help “students to think about how historians transform their past into history, and to begin constructing history by themselves” (Seixas & Morton, 2013, p. 3). To address this issue Seixas (2006) and Seixas and Morton (2013) introduced six historical thinking concepts to help students understand how history is constructed and what arguments are valid. The concepts included both “knowing what” knowledge and “knowing how” knowledge, leading students to think historically.

The six proposed concepts are *historical significance, evidence, continuity and change, causes and consequences, historical perspective/empathy* and *moral judgement/dimension*. The first concept *historical significance*, is essential because students must realize that some events or issues played a significant role and are still important today. This concept concerns what is significant in history. Seixas and Peck (2004) noted, “Significant events and people may be those that have the greatest impact on people and on our environment, over the longest period of time” (p. 111). It is impossible to know everything that concerns the past; therefore, individuals select what to study, teach, and learn (Seixas, 2005). To be historically significant, the event should result in changes and be revealing. The concept concerns how incidents are interpreted, understood, and utilized in the present. Consequently, the significance is dynamic, and different groups might interpret them in different ways (Kvande & Naastad, 2013; Seixas, 2005) at different times. Significance

then depends on one's purposes and perspectives (The Historical Thinking Project, n.d.), which can express a relationship that is flexible (Seixas & Morton, 2013). According to The Historical Thinking Project (n.d.), "A historical person or event can acquire significance if we, the historians, can link it to larger trends and stories that reveal something important for us today." Kvande and Naastad (2013) noted the importance of strengthening different perspectives, critically interpreting, giving a reasoned analysis, and conducting oneself in accordance with historical fact. When working with the concept in school, teachers should help students understand how we as a society decide what is significant because "students should take responsibility for understanding how and why particular events are significant enough for them to learn about it" (Seixas & Morton, 2013, p. 14). Students must realize that many stories could be told in ways that differ from the narratives included in their course books. In doing so, students should wonder: why is this story part of the book and not another story? A pedagogical goal in education is therefore to motivate the students to make their own choices when working with their own project. Seixas and Morton (2013) argued that students are not able to go further than the course book to find what is of significance until they are introduced to historical thinking. As a result, students are passive towards the authority of the text (Seixas & Morton, 2013). When being critical and thinking historically, the students will be able to make decisions through reasoning what and why an event, person, or development could be historically significant. This concept thus gives the students a tool for understanding how the event or incident is chosen.

The second concept of historical thinking is the use of primary sources as *evidence*. This concept addresses how individuals can use, select, and interpret sources when arguing historically (Seixas, 2006). Seixas and Peck (2004) argued that history in school should provide students with the skills to critically approach historical narratives. Students should be taught to ask what sources are used when confronted with historical accounts, if there are other accounts of the events, if they differ, and what sources are believable. For this reason, primary sources must be read differently than the course book students have; in particular, they have to be set in a historical context, and students must make inferences in order to acquire a deeper understanding of what was going on when they were constructed (The Historical Thinking Project, n.d.). To be able to interpret different texts is a premise for becoming a critical citizen (Kvande & Naastad, 2013). Kvande and Naastad (2013) agreed that making a critical assessment of sources is important, further arguing that if students do not learn how information is gathered and how these sources are being critically interpreted, the students will have problems in achieving the competence goals outlined in the syllabus. According to Seixas and Peck (2004), young people can be quite uncritical of those they see as experts, and students need to learn who or what to rely on. Moreover, Kvande and Naastad (2013) believed that, even though historical thinking and methods should be part of history education, the

students face great challenges because of their lack of historical facts and knowledge of how the sources originated.

To identify both *continuity and change* is a third concept that is essential to historical thinking and historical understanding. Inherent in this concept are questions regarding what has remained the same and what has changed as well as what changes fast and what changes slowly. The concepts of continuity and change are interrelated and make sense in relation to each other (Kvande & Naastad, 2013; Seixas, 2005, 2006). Change is seen as a process that varies in both paces and patterns (Seixas & Morton, 2013), and there are turning points when history changes or shifts directions. To help identify change, Seixas (2005) stated that it is essential to set one phenomenon against another that is continuous. Even so, students often misunderstand history as a series of events. Understanding these concepts can be difficult for students, and individuals' direct experiences of historical change are relevant for their conceptualization. Age, location, and experiences are vital for this understanding. Lund (2011b, 2012) asserted that students' understanding of the concepts starts with students' everyday understanding. For them, changes are comprised of several historical happenings, but history has no empty spaces, only continuity. Changes in history are related to conditions or situations and a theme. When students understand they are part of history themselves, and see history as a mixture of continuity and change, they will find a different understanding of the past (The Historical Thinking Project, n.d.). As a result, both progress and decline are part of how we discuss continuity and change (Seixas & Morton, 2013).

The fourth concept of historical thinking is to *analyse causes and consequences*, or to examine why some conditions have led to others (Seixas, 2006; Seixas & Morton, 2013). According to Kvande and Naastad (2013), the different explanations through causes are fundamental issues because they help us see what is most essential for historical changes. Seixas and Morton (2013) asked, "How do the interaction between the human agencies and the existing conditions shape the course of events?" (p.6). However, for many critics, the causes are students' characteristics of incidents and not a relationship, for example, between two incidents. This way of thinking can become deterministic (Lund, 2011b). Students may therefore see a historical incident as something inevitable. Seixas and Peck (2004) argued that historical agency is a way of thinking about historical causation that focuses on the relationship between historians and power. The questions of *how* and *why* start the search for causes. In particular, students must ask: what were the beliefs, the actions, and the circumstances that led to these consequences? Students must know the human agency, but causes go beyond these and must be set in a larger context. Hence, causes are both multiple and layered, and involve ideologies, institutions, conditions, and more short-termed actions, events, or motivations (The Historical Thinking Project, n.d.).

The fifth and sixth concepts of historical thinking are taking a *historical perspective*, also called *historical empathy*, and making a *moral judgment* or *dimension*. Students should understand the past “as a foreign country” (The Historical Thinking Project, n.d.). When taking a historical perspective, students understand “the social, cultural, intellectual, and emotional settings that shaped people’s actions in the past” (The Historical Thinking Project, n.d.). Seixas and Morton (2013) stated that “an ocean of world views [...] can lie between current worldviews and those of earlier periods of history” (p. 136). The ability to put oneself into the perspective of historical persons or situations is a key element for Kvande and Naastad (2013). Furthermore, empathy can be a key motivating factor for democratic formation. However, a huge difference exists between those in the past and those of us living in the present. When students interpret the past, they may naturally take the view of the present and assume that people of the past thought similarly to them. As such, Sam Wineburg (as cited in Lund, 2011b, 2012) believed that historical thinking is an unnatural act because students use their own life experiences when working with historical sources and interpret the sources with contemporary glasses. This is what Wineburg calls *presentism* (Lund, 2011b). Thinking historically is actually counter-intuitive (Lee, 2011), but judging history from a current point of view is regarded as non-historical and should be avoided (Hartmann & Hasselhorn, 2008; Seixas & Morton, 2013). It is therefore important for students to learn to understand and see the world from a perspective other than that of the present. They need to imagine what it would be like for somebody else in the past, thereby taking a historical perspective. Exploring the different perspectives that historical actors have is hence a key to understanding historical events, and the perspectives of these actors are best understood by considering their historical context. Students must use evidence to make the best inferences of how people felt and thought in the past. If not, it is all about guessing, which is undesirable (Seixas & Morton, 2013). According to Seixas and Morton (2013), students tend to judge the past quite harshly when using today’s standards. Individuals make moral judgments in history, and they must understand the differences between the modern world’s moral universe and that in the past in order to judge the past fairly. At the same time, students should be able to learn something from the past that enables them to face some of today’s ethical issues (The Historical Thinking Project, n.d.). Otherwise, as Seixas (2005) reasoned, “why would we undertake the historical project at all, if not to orient ourselves morally?” (p. 144). Teaching students to think critically about the past contributes to historical consciousness, which means they see the links between the past, the present, and the future (Seixas & Morton, 2013). To better understand the ethical dimension, Seixas and Morton (2013) further suggested that teachers help students recognize the author’s implicit and explicit ethical judgment in their narratives. Taking into account the historical context is another suggestion. Information about the past can also help students remember, inform others, and contribute to

action. Understanding history can help students make informed judgments concerning the issues of today.

All these concepts tie what Seixas (2006) called historical thinking together with the competencies of being historically literate. By teaching students historical thinking, the students will better understand the past and expand their historical understanding. Rosenlund (2011) believed that it is vital that students are trained to think historically, and thereby enabling them to address the historical information, they encounter in society. The concepts of historical thinking include both “knowing how” and “knowing what” knowledge, which are the goals of K06. Therefore, the following discussion uses Seixas and Morton’s concepts of historical thinking in the analysis of the schools under scrutiny. Although they were initially meant to be tools for teachers in history education, the analytical use of the concepts can frame whether history education encourages historical understanding as stated in the K06 guidelines, or is merely a reproduction of the course book.

Method

The present study employed a case study to help answer the research question. A case study is useful because it can give in-depth information and provides an opportunity to analyse the main characteristics of the phenomenon under study (Berg, 2004). Furthermore, the case study can provide an idea of *how* historical, or *if* historical thinking, is applied in schools. To determine whether teachers practice historical thinking in history classes today, three lower secondary schools in northern Norway were chosen for the study. The schools were selected for the following reasons: (a) having the schools nearby offered convenient access for follow-up questions, (b) it was interesting to see how local or regional schools work with historical thinking, and (c) all schools in the region use the same course book in history.

The researcher contacted the headmaster of each school to obtain approval to perform the study. Once approval was granted, the headmaster then contacted the history teacher, who sent the tests and plans to the researcher. In one of the schools, three different teachers were involved in each grade, while in another smaller school only one teacher was involved. In the third school, two teachers sent information concerning tests and plans on behalf of themselves and other teachers for the 8th, 9th and 10th grades. In total, six teachers were involved in the research, and 19 tests and 34 plans were analysed. The researcher had little information on the teachers’ backgrounds or the class sizes at each grade level, which of course can influence how and whether teachers work with historical thinking concepts and therefore the results of the study. However, these factors were inconsequential because the study concerns how teachers work with historical thinking, regardless of their backgrounds or the class sizes.

The empirical information gathered from the three schools was analysed as one case, and the course books used in history classes from all three schools were also analysed. Based on findings by Kvande and Naastad (2013), the course books were analysed because the researcher assumed that they are a significant part of the students' history education. All the schools in the region use the course books, entitled *Kosmos*, which are divided into geography, history, and social studies sections. Since this research concerns historical thinking, only the parts addressing history were of interest. The chapters of *Kosmos* are divided into different historical themes, such as Traces of the Past, the American and French Revolutions, the Constitution of 1814, the World Wars, Colonization, and the Sámi People. The end of each chapter presents assignments and questions, which are divided into two sections. In the first, students can find answers in the text, while the second section requires them to reflect.

It was essential to explore the books in connection to the questions of “knowing how” knowledge and “knowing what” knowledge, in particular the concepts of historical thinking. The questions and the assignments in the books were also analysed in relation to historical thinking and K06 and specifically the history syllabi. Tests and assignments that were given to students throughout the year were collected and analysed in connection to the concepts of historical thinking. In addition, the tests were also compared to the course books used by the teachers in class. The reason for comparing the tests and the course books was to obtain an understanding of whether the tests and assignments distributed to the students contained questions that the students merely had to reproduce from the content of the book or whether the tests clearly aimed to test the students' historical understanding, requiring them to use historical thinking skills.

Questions are central in history, not only in historical writing, but also in school situations (Rosenlund, 2011). Kvande and Naastad (2013) argued that tests and assignments must concern connections in history, and ask *how* and *why* instead of simply *what*, *who*, and *when*. Hence, it is important to know how teachers ask questions when testing their students, and whether they are testing the students' understanding or only their ability to memorize facts. The researcher collected weekly plans handed out to the students to learn what the classes were to go through each week of the year. The contents of the weekly plan varied from teacher to teacher, and some plans were more detailed and explained more in depth than other plans. Even though the weekly plans alone cannot give enough information about what is taking place in the classroom, they can give an impression of what – and why – different topics of history were admitted into the plans. Studying the weekly plans also gave the researcher an idea of whether the students worked with the concepts of historical thinking or mostly a reproduction of facts. The validity of this study's results could be improved by more closely involving the practitioners (Chaiklin, 2011) and

investigating how teachers used the texts and the categories within them. Nonetheless, books, tests, and plans likely reflect or give some idea of how historical thinking and “knowing how” and “knowing what” knowledge are encouraged in school. In comparison to the *what* questions in books, the *how* questions, tests, and assignments are therefore of particular interest.

Applying these sources for the research obviously created some challenges and weaknesses, and strictly limited the traditional understanding of generalization in which predicting and controlling are goals (Danermark, Ekström, Jakobsen & Karlsson, 2002; Lincoln & Guba, 2000). Firstly, the selection of only three schools limits generalization. Secondly, the schools were not selected randomly, but rather based on proximity. This convenience sample was important to allow easier access to teachers and to clear up possible misunderstandings or questions during the research. Thirdly, no interviews or observations of the history classes were conducted, although these might have cleared up or explained some of the results of the data. A follow-up study, applying either interviews or observations or both, can provide further answers. Such a study would be reasonable after analysing books, tests, and weekly plans.

Findings and Discussion

In this study, the historical thinking concepts by Seixas and Morton (2013) were applied as an analytic tool to determine whether historical thinking is encouraged in schools. This analysis was performed on the course books, tests, assignments, and plans at all levels of the three grades. Furthermore, the analysis was conducted in connection with K06, which was influential in the construction of the course books, and is what schools, teachers, and students should aim to accomplish over the years. The preface of the first book specifies that the book was written because of the new curriculum.

Historical Significance

According to Seixas and Peck (2004), *historical significance* refers to events or people that have a great impact on people over a long period of time. Moreover, these facts are significant if we “see them as part of a larger narrative that is relevant to important issues that concern us today” (Seixas and Morton, 2013, p. 5). Even if the concept of historical significance is not made explicit in the history syllabi, some statements in the competence aims that are to be met after the 10th grade can be connected to the concept. One example of this concept found in the syllabus is the instruction that students must “find examples of events that have helped shape modern Norway” (Ministry of Education and Research, 2010, p. 8). In other examples, students are asked to “elaborate on imperialism and provide examples of de-colonization” or explain how the

French or American Revolutions influenced democracy in Norway” (Ministry of Education and Research, 2010, p.8).

An examination of the course books revealed a connection to historical thinking and significance. For instance, *Kosmos 8* (Nomedal, 2007) contains many examples of historical significance, such as the events of 1814, in which Norway was freed from its union with Denmark and developed its own constitution. The events of 1814 are still significant, and the author makes an explicit connection to the development of modern-day Norway. *Kosmos 9* (Nomedal & Bråthen, 2007a) has themes that are clearly of historical significance, such as the First and Second World Wars and the Russian Revolution. Another example of an event that is of historical significance is the colonization of Africa, and *Kosmos 10* (Nomedal & Bråthen, 2007b) contains chapters concerning the Cold War and the decolonization of Africa, which is also of historical significance. These are all examples of events that are of historical significance and resulted in changes (Seixas & Peck, 2004). Even though these events can be categorized as being historically significant, they were nevertheless selected with K06 in mind, but the reasons for the selection are not explicitly stated in the books. The question is whether guidance from the teachers, information from the course book, and questions and assignments will all help students obtain an understanding of why some events, persons, or developments are historically significant.

To this end, the questions and assignments in the course books can give an indication of how, or if, the students are working with the concept of historical significance. For instance, students should learn how the authors of the course books or the historians selected what events or persons are of significance and why. Questions on tests and assignments in the books are therefore vital in shaping how students work with history. In all three course books, the questions and assignments are divided in two. One section is called “Find the Answers in the Text,” whereas the other is “Reflect On.” The first section of questions clearly assesses “knowing what” knowledge and allows students to find answers directly from the text. The other section is somewhat more related to “knowing how” questions, and the answers the students give are not merely a reproduction of the text. As a result, the students can find answers to the first questions in the text of every chapter of *Kosmos 8*. Still, there are some indications that these kinds of “knowing what” questions can help students understand the concept of historical significance. In the 8th grade book, one assignment in the “Reflect On” section asks the students to find course books that are at least 20 years old. By examining these books, the students shall learn what previous students had to learn. Additionally, they are supposed to compare the contents with the books of today by finding chapters that concern the same theme as well as discovering what has changed and what has remained the same.

According to Seixas and Morton (2013), these types of assignments can make students understand how history is constructed, and that the choices that

are made change over time. In one assignment found in *Kosmos 9*, the students are asked to make a mind map of the Second World War and then argue what the thoughts behind the map are. Another assignment asks the students to pick out a specific theme from the war, do some research on it, and tell the others why the subject was chosen. In *Kosmos 10*, the students are asked to find keywords from the text that concern the Cold War and construct arguments about their choices. They then have to discuss their answers with their group and attempt to find out why the keywords differ. These assignments could be excellent exercises for learning the concept of historical significance in terms of requiring students to argue for their choices. A pedagogical goal when working with historical significance should be that students themselves are motivated to make choices. Assignments can certainly motivate students to make choices, although the question is whether these choices will relate to the concept of historical significance. Few assignments explicitly address this significance, and the term itself is not used.

When studying the tests and plans handed out to the 8th graders, the researcher found few examples of questions that can be related to historical significance. One question asked why the events of the French Revolution were of significance, but no questions addressed why these events are still important for us today. In one of the tests, the teacher asked the students to draw the lines from either or both the French- and American Revolutions until today. This way of asking a question can contribute to students' understanding of how a significant historical event influences society today. The criteria of evaluation for this question also stated that attaining the best grade requires the students to see whether we can learn something from the start of the aforementioned revolutions until today.

In contrast, the tests handed out to 9th graders did not specifically mention historically significant events. The students were asked about the First World War, Norway becoming a national state, and the Second World War, but in no way were these questions connected to why these events are historically significant. Moreover, some of the students were given different assignments for presentations of the Second World War in Norway, and in these assignments they were given different keywords and questions. Even though most of the questions were descriptive, it can be argued that these assignments were related to historical significance. Similarly, it can be argued that the questions about vital historical persons are of significance, such as Johan Sverdrup or Christian Michelsen, both of whom were important in helping Norway achieve its independence. Although these questions were about important persons, the questions did not reveal anything regarding each person's importance today.

Like the 9th grade materials, tests for the 10th grade did not show any signs of working with the concept of historical significance – or, for that matter, more than simply recalling significant historical events or happenings. The weekly plans did not give any thorough information that can be related to historical

significance, but the plans from both the 8th and 9th grades stated goals of how certain events had an impact on today's Norwegian society. However, the tests show that students work with the concept to a small degree, and there seems to be little connection to why some elements of history are significant while others are not, how history is constructed, or how to ask critical questions of the narratives that are presented in the course book.

Evidence

One of the aims of the K06 history syllabi is consequently to “search for and select sources, assess them critically and show how different sources might present history differently” (Ministry of Education and Research, 2010, p. 8). The aim concurs with historical thinking, in which the use of primary sources, as well as the selection and interpretation of sources used as *evidence*, are vital. Lund (2011a, 2011b) and Lesh (2011) also emphasized scrutinizing sources, interacting with historical documents, and valuing the understanding of history as being driven by questions that are asked to various sources. The first chapter of *Kosmos 8* actually concerned primary sources, and the end of the chapter contained questions concerning sources that the students can find directly in the text. In the question section of “Reflect On,” one of the assignments was:

Imagine you have to write a paper about something you find interesting. You have found two different sources you can use, but the two sources do not agree with each other. One of them has to be wrong. How can you decide which source is the correct one? (Nomedal, 2007, p. 122, researcher's translation)

The rest of the chapters had no such questions related to the theme or to the sources used, except for when the students were asked to find more sources for different issues, such as the battle at Trafalgar Square, or more information on figures such as Montesquieu, Voltaire, and Rousseau. In *Kosmos 9*, the students were asked to use other sources to learn more about famous Norwegians such as Marcus Thrane, who led a working class movement in the 1800s, and Gina Krog, who worked for women's rights in the 19th century, in addition to world figures such as Mahatma Gandhi and Karl Marx. However, the text offered few directions on how to be critical of the sources the students used or what kinds of sources they found. Nevertheless, there are two examples where students were asked to be critical of their sources: One is when the students were asked to look at a photograph as a source and compare the source to a painting. In the same assignment, the author asked whether photography always tells the truth. Seixas and Pecks (2004) found it important to ask such questions, and Seixas and Morton (2013) noted that asking good questions of a source can lead to reasonable inferences. In another assignment that involved the use of newspapers as a source, the students were asked why individuals should be critical when using newspapers as sources. This is an important question since, as Seixas and Pecks (2004) demonstrated, students can be quite uncritical of

figures they see as experts. In *Kosmos 10*, students were asked to find sources other than information found in the book to investigate figures such as Tito and Gorbachev. Furthermore, the students were asked to interview persons who lived in the post-war years. In this particular chapter, the author suggested using objects from this period to create an exhibition. The use of different sources to create different stories is clearly present, but the text lacks critical questions to guide the students' understanding.

In addition to investigating course books, the researcher examined whether tests, assignments, and weekly plans showed any signs of working with the historical concept of evidence. In an 8th-grade test, the students were given different types of pictures. One is from the book and represents the French Revolution in an image of the Bastille, which was built to protect Paris from the English. The next picture is also of a revolution, but this time of the American Revolution. The third picture is of a rock carving that can be related to local history, while the last picture is a drawing of two persons, a woman talking and a man listening. The students have to explain how the sources were used, whether they were oral or written sources, and who wrote the sources. Even without clues as to who painted the pictures, the students might be able to assess the pictures in relation to the story, or they might be able to say something about the type of source. Still, the test did not include questions concerning source criticism or whether the sources were used as evidence. Another test included pictures of the French Revolution, but even though the pictures were connected to the theme, there were no questions concerning sources or source criticism, or the use of pictures as evidence. Some assignments required students to find out more about a theme, but offered no instructions about being critical of sources or using different kinds of sources to put together a picture of the past.

None of the 9th-grade tests mentioned anything about historical sources. The assignments distributed for an oral presentation likewise said nothing about how the students should be critical of the sources, how to select them, or how to use them as evidence in their presentation. However, it is probable that the students had to use different sources to find out more about the theme of their presentation. Neither the 9th nor the 10th graders seemed to be working explicitly with sources as evidence. In only one of the assignments was the concept of source used, and that was only in relation to the evaluation of an oral presentation which stated "use of sources" in an assessment sheet. The plans for the 8th grade only gave the themes, and did not give any further information on the use of historical thinking, with the exception of the goals related to K06. In one of the weekly plans, the students were told to respond to the questions and study the pictures related to the chapter. Underneath one of the pictures in the book that showed the war of the French Revolution, the subtext asked whether the image was an accurate description of reality (Nomedal, 2007, p. 159). The goals in the plans for the 9th grade did not mention historical sources, nor did those for the 10th grade. Hence, little in the tests, assignments, and plans

indicated working specifically with how to use, select, and interpret sources when arguing historically.

Continuity and Change

The concepts of *continuity and change* say something about what has remained the same and what has changed (Seixas, 2006; Seixas & Morton, 2013). According to Seixas and Morton (2013), these concepts will help students understand that progress for some can be a disaster for others. In the history syllabi, the concepts can be identified in the following objective: “Discuss and elaborate on important changes in society in recent times and reflect on how today’s society opens to new changes” (Ministry of Education and Research, 2010, p. 8).

In the book for the 8th grade, these concepts did not appear in the assignments or in the questions. The themes in the book, such as the Constitution of 1814 or the Industrial Revolution, are examples of continuity and change, though this might not be clear for the students. The book for the 9th grade included one example of a question that asked how imperialism changed during the 19th century, which is an answer that the students were meant to find in the text. Another question asked the students to choose an African country and tell its story from the day the country was colonized until today. Finding the differences between two different maps, from 1914 and 1918 respectively, was yet another assignment that could help students understand continuity and change. As Seixas and Peck (2004) and Seixas and Morton (2013) pointed out, it can be helpful to use chronology and periodization to help understand the concepts. In one assignment, the students were told to create a lecture about their family. Seixas and Morton (2013) explained that this type of exercise can be a good starting point for introducing vocabulary such as *decade* and *turning point*, which are used in relation to change and continuity. It can also help students or encourage them to see how change can vary, and that change and continuity are interwoven. Still, the use of the concepts was not explicit in these assignments. Likewise, the 10th-grade book had few examples of continuity and change, but one assignment asked students to describe how a radio programme for children had changed over the years. Additionally, one question addressing the changes in gender roles in society asked students to interview their grandmothers or other women who lived in the 1960s or 1970s about the differences between now and then.

In addition to examining the course text, the researcher investigated whether tests and plans integrated the concept of continuity and change. The tests distributed to the 8th graders did not make students identify changes directly. Only one assignment in the 9th grade connected to the concept of continuity and change. In this assignment, which concerned the interwar years, the students were asked to draw parallels to today. This assignment showed continuity, but could also be interpreted as a moral question or reflection. Another question

asked why the Battle of Stalingrad is said to be a turning point in the Second World War. According to Seixas and Morton (2013), these kinds of questions, which show turning points, can make students understand that change is a process that varies in pace and direction. The 10th-grade tests included some questions connected to changes, including one question that required the students to indicate five changes in Western European countries during the Cold War. Furthermore, the students also had to describe the types of changes the Eastern European countries experienced when introducing democracy. Only one of the plans from the 9th grade stated that the students should present important developments in Norwegian history from the 19th and 20th centuries, and explore how these changes are connected to today's society. Discussing important changes in modern times and reflecting on how today's society opens for new changes were also mentioned in both one 9th- and one 10th-year plan, as the history syllabi requires, but it was scarcely addressed in the weekly plans. Yet, it can be difficult to understand these concepts (Seixas & Peck, 2004), and teachers should probably start with the students' everyday understanding (Seixas, 2006).

Causes and Consequences

The concepts of *causes and consequences* (Seixas, 2006) were more distinct in the books than the other concepts of historical thinking, and the books asked the question of why one event led to others. The concepts were also clearly stated as goals in the history syllabus, which required that the students should be able to "formulate causal explanations and discuss consequences" or "discuss and elaborate on ideas and forces that led to the American struggle for freedom and the French Revolution and the consequences these had for the development of democracy in Norway" (Ministry of Education and Research, 2010, p. 8). To reflect on "how society might have been different if these events had developed differently" (Ministry of Education and Research, 2010, p. 8) is another such goal that can relate to causes and consequences. The 8th grade book asked several *why* questions and, as recommended by Seixas and Morton (2013), required students to give different reasons for a historical happening. The 9th grade book also asked many *why* questions, but additionally asked questions regarding consequences, such as requiring students to explain the reasons for, and the consequences of, the First World War. Other questions were counterfactual. Examples of such questions are: (a) what would have been different if the people of Norway had voted for a republic in 1905, (b) what would have happened if Hitler had been stopped earlier, and (c) what would Europe have looked like today if the Germans had won the war? According to Seixas and Morton (2013), counterfactual questions could help students understand the past as not being inevitable. The book for 10th graders provided a much greater focus on these concepts, as several of the chapters had questions regarding what happened, why it happened, and what the consequences were.

Just as Seixas and Morton (2013) suggested, the questions asked for several causes of historical incidents, thereby helping students to understand the complexity of causes and consequences.

Because the concept of causes and consequences is clearly stated in both the history syllabi and the course books, it was therefore presumed that the tests and plans would include the concept. One of the tests for 8th graders required students to explain why the Danish king supported Napoleon, in addition to why the war with Great Britain became a disaster for Norway. When it came to the French and American Revolutions, the students had to explain both the causes and consequences, and they were also asked to trace the long lines between the French Revolution and today's society. Yet another question addressed why the women marched on Versailles in 1789 and the consequences of the march. The questions concerning both causes and consequences were hence clearer than the other concepts. Although students in the 9th grade were required to give primarily descriptive oral presentations on the wars, several of the tests for the 9th grade showed work with this particular concept of historical thinking. Tests asked questions about the causes of the First and Second World Wars, but not about the consequences. According to Lund (2011b), many students do not see the relationship between two incidents. As Seixas and Morton (2013) argued, some causes that lead to a specific historical event can vary in how influential and important they were. One test asked for examples of what Norway would have looked like if the votes of 1905 had turned out differently. Only one question was found that addressed both causes and consequences. This question concerned why there was a crack in the US in 1929 and how it affected the economy of the United States and the rest of the world. The remaining tests of the 9th grade asked little about the consequences, and were primarily assignments that asked students to "write about" particular subjects, which is a rather descriptive and reproductive way of testing the students. In a test for the 10th grade, the students were asked about the causes of the fall of Communism and why the Cold War ended, whereas another question asked how the discovery of oil affected Norway. Yet another test asked about the background of the problems in the Middle East and what the consequences of the conflict are. The same test asked the students about the causes of wars and conflicts in addition to why terrorism exists in the world, though the consequences were not part of the questions. Questions such as these help teachers meet the K06 standards regarding causes and consequences.

The weekly plans of the 8th grade said little about these concepts, except for noting that students were supposed to work with the tasks in the course book. In contrast, a plan for 9th grade stated that the students were to explain the causes and consequences of both the First and Second World Wars. The same plan mentioned the goal of K06 concerning a reflection on how events could have turned out differently. One of the 10th-grade plans noted a goal from K06. The students were supposed to formulate causes and discuss the consequences of

conflicts in the 20th century. Just as in the course books and K06, the concept of causes and consequences was more explicit than the other concepts. This prominence is therefore an indication that the concept has been given priority in history education.

Historical Perspective/Historical Empathy and Moral Judgment/Dimension

The concepts of *historical perspective/historical empathy* and *moral judgment/dimension* were found in all three books. Rather than embracing the view of the present, or what Wineburg calls *presentism*, these assignments represented an attempt to understand the vast differences between the current worldviews and the past through evidence-based inferences of the past, and to put the variety of perspectives of historical actors or happenings into a historical context (Lund, 2011b; Seixas & Morton, 2013). In the syllabus, one competence aim after year 10 states that the students should be “able to create narratives about people in the past, and thus show how frameworks and values in society influence thought and action.” The aim of presenting a “historic event on different ideologies” can also be related to historical perspectives (Ministry of Education and Research, 2010, p. 8). The book for 8th graders included several assignments in which the students had to put themselves into a situation in the past. For instance, the author asked the students how they believe ordinary persons in France responded to being treated unjustly in a particular time period. Another question asked the students to describe the feelings of persons depicted in a picture of the French Revolution, while another assignment required the students to imagine themselves as coalminers 200 years ago and to prepare to describe their intolerable situation. These questions could be interesting introductions to taking a historical perspective, but it is vital that students apply the historical context and utilize historically based evidence. A role play of a discussion between Montesquieu, Voltaire, and Rousseau in Paris was yet another assignment, which was actually recommended by Seixas and Morton (2013). The book for 9th graders also asked the students to do role plays. One involved putting themselves into a situation as a farmer in the summer of 1830, with another assignment asking the students to write a letter to a friend from the First World War. Another task asked students to imagine being a Jew in Germany during the Second World War and the Kristallnacht and to write a diary entry describing their experiences.

Teachers can also encourage students to base their story on evidence through assignments such as the one that required them to imagine being part of the King's escape from Oslo to London in 1940. In this assignment, students had to describe the incident and use more sources, thus taking a historical perspective. Asking the students whether it was right or wrong to work for the Germans can help students more fairly judge the historical actors. The 10th-grade book gave assignments that can be related to historical perspectives, such as asking students to imagine being a friend of Peter Fechter and then write about the

escape to West Berlin, or to write a narrative of how it felt to be separated from their family when the Berlin Wall was constructed. One assignment required students to imagine being an 18-year-old soldier from the US during the Vietnam War and to write a narrative about themselves, in which they choose perspectives and actions. Likewise, another assignment had students imagine being a journalist covering the Middle East conflict, attempting to give perspectives from both the Israeli and Palestinian viewpoint. Through these assignments, students can begin to understand historical perspectives.

In contrast to the course book assignments requiring historical perspectives, few tests and plans were explicit when it came to the concept of historical perspective/historical empathy and moral judgment/dimension. In the tests for 8th graders, only one question or assignment related to historical perspective taking. This question concerned Napoleon's last words and required the students to explain why they felt he chose these last words. In the weekly plans, they were asked to answer the questions in the chapters which, as described above, did often relate to historical empathy. The question remains, however, whether students are able to avoid taking a present perspective when examining the past. Neither the 9th nor 10th grade had tests or assignments addressing historical empathy or moral judgment; likewise, there was no indication in the plans of how or if they worked with these historical concepts. Nonetheless, an assignment given to the 9th graders that asked the students to draw parallels from the interwar years until today could be interpreted as a moral question. In addition, an assignment for the 10th grade stated a goal to create stories of people from the past, and in this way show how frames and values in a society affect thoughts and actions.

Historical Thinking

Applying historical thinking concepts in education can give students a better learning experience, in addition to helping them develop skills that are applicable later in life. The general impression when analysing the tests was that some questions could be related to historical thinking concepts, primarily the concept of *causes and consequences*. These questions were also quite evident in the course books that all the schools use, as well as in the history syllabi. However, many of the questions could be traced directly to the book, and quite a few of the questions were rather reproductive – asking not *how*, but *what* questions. These findings were in accordance with Rosenlund (2011), who found that students seem to discern answers directly from the course book. As Syse (2011) argued, this way of asking questions may promote a particular truth of history determined by the author of the history book rather than a multifaceted truth about the past that involve many perspectives.

In addition, tests and assignments communicate what kind of knowledge is important to learn. When tests are all about memorization, the students learn history as detached pieces of information (Rosenlund, 2011). This method of

learning can be seen in quiz-like and multiple choice questions posed to students. Another example is an assignment addressing the interwar years that asks many questions, all of which are reproductive. The teacher states in an assessment sheet that in this assignment the students cannot get the highest grade because the questions do not give the opportunity to reflect. Traditional tests that require students to memorize what they have read in a course book do not inspire historical thinking in the same way as do assignments that demand reflection, creativity, and independence in the use of sources.

While history syllabi and the course texts are consistent across schools, the weekly plans varied significantly. Some teachers gave plans that were quite detailed and could clearly be related to some of the concepts of historical thinking, whereas others gave few indications of what the students were working with, and why. This discrepancy gives rise to the main finding of this study. Specifically, even though the didactics of history have been debated since the 1970s and “new” concepts such as historical consciousness, history use, and historical thinking were introduced a long time ago, the history classes at the lower secondary levels examined in this study seem to include only a limited use of these concepts. The concepts are clearly indicated in the syllabus, but they are incorporated to a lesser degree in history education, despite the discovery of a few examples in the tests and plans. The “Reflect On” assignments in the books were more explicit when it came to the concepts of historical thinking, but they were hardly visible in the tests and plans. Rosenlund (2011) argued that, in order to be able to think historically, students must understand and have knowledge of how history is constructed to interpret historical facts. Without such an understanding, history becomes one dimensional. He further argued for an education that applies the entire curriculum, thereby making it possible for students to think historically. As previously mentioned, clear connections exist between the history syllabi and historical thinking, but historical thinking is not apparent in the classrooms, at least not in the empirical data gathered in this research.

Conclusion

The didactics of history have certainly changed over the last few decades, but the question examined in this study is whether traditional methods still dominate the teaching and learning of history in many classrooms today. The current classroom-level educational landscape seems to be constructed on an understanding that historical knowledge is comprised of facts that are found in history books rather than facts that are constructed by asking different questions of sources, a kind of reconstruction (Green, Bolick, & Robertson, 2010; Knutsen, 2009; Lesh, 2011; Lund, 2011b; Syse, 2011). Lee (2011) argued that “the ability to recall accounts without any understanding of the problems

involved in constructing them or the criteria involved in evaluating them has nothing historical about it” (p. 141). Likewise, researchers today have reached a consensus that learning history should be much more than simply learning facts (Hartmann & Hasselhorn, 2008). The primary aim of the didactics of history is to expand our understanding of how we meet with the past, and to offer a better education and teaching of the past that is relevant for today’s students (Bøe, 2006; Jensen, 2012). Such relevance can be teaching students to utilize historical thinking.

Even if the didactics of history have changed, it is unclear how this change has affected history education in school and how many assignments incorporate historical thinking concepts. The tests and assignments examined included quite a lot of reproduction of the course books’ contents. This arrangement promotes the learning of facts that are stated in the course book, which is comprised of mostly “knowing what” knowledge and not “knowing how” knowledge. Even though the weekly plans, the national curriculum, and the syllabi require historical thinking, few questions or assignments are related to these concepts. Additionally, quite a few tests were clearly descriptive and reproductive, and some of the concepts were found only indirectly in the plans.

Regarding sources, this examination revealed that the history parts of the books in use were short, so it is therefore reasonable to question whether it is possible for the students to acquire a real understanding of historical thinking. To obtain such an understanding, students likely need to use sources other than the book. Interestingly, the weekly plans and some of the assignments required students to work with history by using sources other than the course book. However, it was difficult to determine whether the students worked directly with the concepts of historical thinking in relation to these assignments. The books also seemed to steer many of the questions of the tests, even more so than the goals of the history syllabus that are to be met after the 10th grade. If the books have few questions or assignments connected to the particular goals of the history syllabi that can be related to historical thinking, the tests will neither use nor work with these concepts. The concepts of historical thinking in the books might not be as explicit as hoped for in the questions, and a clearer focus would be preferable. The concept of causes and consequences is the clearest historical thinking concept in the books, in the questions in the texts, and in the tests themselves, in addition to working with sources, even though this is only explicitly found in the 8th grade book. These concepts are also those that are most explicitly and clearly stated in the history syllabi.

Interaction with historical sources and using historical methods to create different narratives of the past make history relevant and interesting. History should not be all about numbers and historical events that the students have to reproduce on tests. Rather, the study of history should be concerned with achieving a historical understanding through learning the concepts of historical thinking and using evidence-based arguments when constructing history through

narratives. In this way, students will have a better understanding of the past that has meaning for both the present and the future.

Referencer

- Beach, K. (1999). Consequential transitions: A sociocultural expedition beyond transfer in education. *Review of Research in Education*, 24, 101–139.
- Berg, B. L. (2004). *Qualitative research methods*. Boston: Pearsons Education Inc.
- Bøe, J. B. (2006). *Å lese fortiden. Historiebruk og historiedidaktikk*. Kristiansand: Høgskoleforlaget.
- Chaiklin, S. (2011). Social scientific research and societal practice. Action research and cultural-historical research in methodological light from Kurt Lewin and Lev. S. Vygotsky. *Mind, Culture, and Activity*, 18, 129–147.
- Constantin, I. (2011). More than chapters in a textbook. Multiple representations in history teaching. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 11, 57–61.
- Danermark, B., Ekström, M., Jakobsen, L., & Karlsson, J. C. (2002). *Explaining society*. London: Routledge.
- Fránquiz, M. E., & Salinas, C. S. (2011). Newcomers developing English literacy through historical thinking and digitized primary sources. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 20, 196–210.
- Green, J. A., Bolick, C. M., & Robertson, J. (2010). Fostering historical knowledge and thinking skills using hypermedia learning environments: The role of self-regulated learning. *Computer & Education*, 54, 230–243.
- Hartmann, U., & Hasselhorn, M. (2008). Historical perspective taking: A standardized measure for an aspect of students' historical thinking. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 18, 264–270.
- Hodne, B. (2002). *Norsk nasjonalkultur. En kulturpolitisk oversikt*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Jensen, B. E. (2012). Historie bevidsthed – en nøgle til at forstå og forklare historisk-sosiale processer. In P. Eliasson, K. G. Hammarlund, E. Lund, & C. T. Nielsen (Eds.), *Historiedidaktikk i Norden 9. Del 1: Historiemedvetande – historiebruk* (pp. 14-34). Malmö: Holmbergs AB.
- Koritzinsky, T. (2006). *Samfunnskunnskap. Fagdidaktisk innføring*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Koritzinsky, T. (2012). *Samfunnskunnskap. Fagdidaktisk innføring*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Knutsen, P. (2009). Analytisk narrasjon og historisk forståelse – Et bidrag til hermeneutisk teori. *Norsk Filosofisk tidsskrift*, 2, 123–139.
- Kvande, L., & Naastad, N. (2013). *Hva skal vi med historie? Historiedidaktikk i teori og praksis*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Lee, P. (2011). Historical literacy and transformative history. In L. Perikleous & D. Shemilt (Eds.), *The future of the past: Why history education matters* (pp. 130-167). Nicosia, Cyprus: KAILAS Printers and Lithographers Ltd. Retrieved from <http://www.ahdr.info/ckfinder/userfiles/files/TheFutureOfThePast.pdf>.
- Lenz, C., & Risto Nilssen, T. (2011). Innledning: historiekultur, historiebevissthet og historisk kompetanse. In C. Lenz & T. Risto Nilssen (Eds.), *Fortiden i nåtiden. Nye veier i formidlingen av andre verdenskrigs historie* (pp. 11–26). Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Lesh, B. A. (2011). *Why won't you just tell us the answer? Teaching historical thinking in grades 7-12*. USA: Stenhouse Publishers.

- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (2000). The only generalization is: There is no generalization. In R. Gomm, M. Hammersly, & P. Foster (Eds.), *Case study method* (pp. 27–45). London: Sage Publication.
- Lund, E. (2011a). Historiebevissthetsbegrepet i engelsk historiedidaktikk – teoriutvikling og didaktisk konkretisering. Tendenser i pågående forskning og praksisutøvelse. *Den 27. Nordiske historiekonferanse i Tromsø 11-14 August*.
- Lund, E. (2011b). *Historiedidaktikk. En håndbok for studenter og lærere*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Lund, E. (2012). Historiebevissthetsbegrepet i engelsk historiedidaktikk – teoriutvikling og didaktisk konkretisering i en ny læreplan. In P. Eliasson, K. G. Hammarlund, E. Lund, & T. C. Nielsen, (Eds.), *Historiedidaktikk i Norden 9. Del 1: Historiemedvetende – historiebruk* (pp. 96–117). Malmø: Holmbergs AB.
- Ministry of Education and Research. (2010). *Social studies subject curriculum*. Retrieved January 12, 2012 from <http://www.udir.no/Lareplaner/Grep/Modul/?gmid=0&gmi=15604/http://www.udir.no/Lareplaner/Grep/Modul/?gmid=0&gmi=156048>
- Nomedal, J. H. (2007). *Kosmos 8*. Otta: Forlaget fag og kultur.
- Nomedal, J. H., & Bråthen, S. (2007a). *Kosmos 9*. Otta: Forlaget fag og kultur.
- Nomedal, J. H., & Bråthen, S. (2007b). *Kosmos 10*. Otta: Forlaget fag og kultur.
- Norwegian Ministry of Education and Research. (2007). *Education – from Kindergarten to Adult Education*. Retrieved from http://www.regjeringen.no/upload/KD/Vedlegg/Veiledninger%20og%20brosjyrer/Education_in_Norway_f-4133e.pdf
- Rosenlund, D. (2011). *Att hantera historia med ett öga stängt*. Lund: Media-Tryck. Retrieved from <http://dspace.mah.se/bitstream/handle/2043/12076/Att%20hantera%20historia%20med%20ett%20c3%b6ga%20st%20c3%a4ngt.pdf?sequence=2&isAllowed=y>
- Seixas, P. (2005). Historical consciousness. The progress of knowledge in a postprogressive age. In J. Straub (Ed.), *Narration, identity, and historical consciousness* (pp. 141–160). New York/Oxford: Berghahn Books.
- Seixas, P. (2006). *Benchmarks of historical thinking: A framework for assessment in Canada*, Canada: Centre for the Study of Historical Consciousness. Retrieved from <http://historicalthinking.ca/sites/default/files/Framework.Benchmarks.pdf>
- Seixas, P., & Morton, T. (2013). *The big six. Historical thinking concepts*. Toronto, Ontario: Nelson Education Ltd.
- Seixas, P., & Peck, C. (2004). Teaching historical thinking. In A. Sears & I. Wright (Eds.), *Challenges and prospects for Canadian social studies* (pp. 109–117). Vancouver, Canada: Pacific Educational Press.
- Syse, H. (2011). Historieforståelse og holocaust i Kunnskapsløftet. In C. Lenz & T. R. Nilssen (Eds.), *Fortiden i nåtiden. Nye veier i formidlingen av andre verdenskrigs historie* (pp. 26–46). Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- The Historical Thinking Project. (n.d.). *Historical thinking concepts*, Canada: Centre for the Study of Historical Consciousness. Retrieved from <http://historicalthinking.ca/historical-thinking-concepts>