



May 2023

War and Peace in Ukraine: Training for History Teachers on Dynamics of Peace and Conflict

Karina Korostelina

George Mason University, ckoroste@gmu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://nsuworks.nova.edu/pcs>



Part of the [Peace and Conflict Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Korostelina, Karina (2023) "War and Peace in Ukraine: Training for History Teachers on Dynamics of Peace and Conflict," *Peace and Conflict Studies*: Vol. 29: No. 2, Article 3.

Available at: <https://nsuworks.nova.edu/pcs/vol29/iss2/3>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Peace & Conflict Studies at NSUWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Peace and Conflict Studies by an authorized editor of NSUWorks. For more information, please contact nsuworks@nova.edu.

War and Peace in Ukraine: Training for History Teachers on Dynamics of Peace and Conflict

Abstract

Many scholars have discussed the complexities of teaching and learning about past conflicts. However, teaching history during ongoing war and occupation is even more difficult and controversial. This paper posits teachers as agents of peacebuilding, influencing how their students come to understand dynamics of conflict, violence, and peace. The aim of this paper is to describe a training methodology that addresses history teaching in protracted conflict and discuss its implications for diverse classroom practices in teaching difficult history in divided societies. The training project, supported by the Civil Peace Service and financed by the German government through Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH Ukraine, was designed to increase the capacity of history teachers to address conflictual and controversial histories. The project took place in Dnipro, Ukraine during June-December 2021. 53 teachers took part in training activities with a core group of 25 teachers participating in all activities of the program. The implications of the training for teaching history in societies experiencing protracted conflict was analyzed using a mixed-methods approach: data was collected through focus group discussions with participants and through a short open-ended questionnaire.

Keywords: Ukraine, War, Peace Education, History Education, Identity conflict

Author Bio(s)

Karina V. Korostelina is a Professor and a Director of the Peace Lab on Reconciling Conflict and Intergroup Divisions at the Carter School for Peace and Conflict Resolution, GMU. She conducts research on the dynamics of identity and power in protracted conflicts. Her recent interests include the study of national and community resilience, reconciliation, and role of memory and history in conflict and post-conflict societies. She has been Fulbright New Century Scholar and fellow at the Woodrow Wilson Center, the Eckert Institute, National University of Singapore, East-West Center, Institute for Advanced Studies at Waseda University, Northeast Asia Foundation, Central European University, and the Bellagio Center of the Rockefeller foundation. She has received 44 grants from such Foundations as MacArthur, Luce, Spencer, Ebert, and Soros, the US Institute of Peace, US National

Academy of Education, Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs of USDS, USAID, INTAS, IREX, and Council of Europe. The results of her research are presented in more than 90 articles and chapters. She is an author or editor of 16 books including authorship of *Neighborhood Resilience and Urban Conflict* (2021), *Trump Effect* (2016), *International Insult: How Offence Contributes to Conflict* (2014), *Constructing Narrative of Identity and Power* (2013), *History Education in the Formation of Social Identity* (2013), *Why they die?* (2012), *The Social Identity and Conflict* (2007). Among her edited books are: *History Can Bite - History Education in Divided and Post-War Societies* (2016), *History Education and Post-Conflict Reconciliation* (2013), *Forming a Culture of Peace* (2012), *Civilians and Modern War* (2012), *Identity, Morality and Threat* (2006).

**War and Peace in Ukraine:
Training for History Teachers on Dynamics of Peace and Conflict
Karina Korostelina**

In the first two decades of the 21st century, many countries are increasingly facing debates regarding what to teach in history classrooms and how to teach conflicted and controversial histories. The aim of this paper is to describe a training methodology that addresses history teaching in protracted conflict and discuss its implications for diverse classroom practices in teaching difficult history in societies amidst violence. The training project, supported by the Civil Peace Service and financed by the German government through Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH Ukraine, was designed to increase the capacity of history teachers to address conflictual and controversial histories. The project took place in Dnipro, Ukraine during June to December 2021. 53 teachers took part in training activities with a core group of 25 teachers participating in all activities of the program discussed below. The training employed transdisciplinary approaches to peacebuilding and resolution of identity-based conflicts to (1) help history teachers analyze representations of difficult histories in divided societies; (2) assess their current practices for designing and implementing classroom teaching on difficult histories associated with identity-based conflicts; (3) increase the capacity of history teachers to reflect on and increase their own power in teaching about peace, reconciliation and justice; and (4) collaborate with teachers to modify existing and develop new classroom teaching approaches. The paper discusses the implications and challenges of training history teachers in societies affected by protracted violence.

Literature Review

The problem of teaching history during protracted conflict

Many scholars have discussed the complexities of teaching and learning about past conflicts (Borger, 2020; Cajani et al., 2019; Keough, 2020; Santora, 2019; Skårås, 2019), the legacies of war (Schlund-Vials, 2020), and the colonial past and slavery (Alexander & Weekes-Bernard, 2017; Abadia & Collins, 2018; Allers, 2020; Landreiu, 2019; Levinson, 2018; Todd et al., 2019). However, teaching history during ongoing war and occupation is even more difficult and controversial. A deeper understanding of how history teachers approach the nature of their content can provide insights on their role in promoting or mitigating conflicts in the classrooms.

Even more important is to provide history educators with more opportunities to increase their knowledge about the dynamics of identity-based conflicts that impact societal divisions and develop their skills in critically addressing difficult history.

Teaching about controversial history and ongoing violence directly affects the younger generation because it shapes their understanding about the roots and consequences of conflict dynamics and develops connotations of intergroup relations (Bentrovato et al., 2016; Cajani et al., 2019; Cole, 2007; Schissler & Soysal, 2005; Smith, 2005; Stearns et al., 2000; Vickers & Jones, 2005). To combat the development of negative attitudes, prejudice, and hate, the field of history education has benefited from insights developed in peace education (Wisler, 2010; Trifondas & Wright, 2013), human rights education (Apsel, 2004; Eckmann, 2010), global citizenship education (Castro & Aguayo, 2013), and lessons from transitional justice, including truth and reconciliation commissions (Bellino et al., 2017). These intersections have brought to history education new innovative practices of dealing with conflict and violence, including historical reasoning, historical empathy, historical agency, and multi-perspectivity (Carretero et al., 2017; Koster et al., 2014; Metzger & Harris, 2018; Edling et al., 2020; Manfra & Bolick, 2017). While many teachers are familiar with these conceptual frameworks, their application in history classrooms is complicated by disruptive dynamics of ongoing violence and divisions.

The process of teaching history can be especially difficult when the curriculum reflects contradictory views and identity-based divisions (Korostelina, 2015; Potter & Romano, 2012; Rouso, 2016). Many teachers prefer to avoid topics they deem controversial because of their emotional, political, or safety concerns (De Baets, 2015; Martinez-Keel, 2021; Skårås, 2019). Many teachers avoid complicated discussions in classrooms due to discomfort in the face of ongoing violence and identity-based conflicts in the country (Helmsing, 2014; Miles, 2019). Other teachers engage students in discussions of sensitive issues and why those issues are controversial (Cajani et al., 2019; Helmsing, 2014; Miles, 2019; Skårås, 2019). However, research shows that such engagement with difficult topics within the classroom does not always help students understand the dynamics of peace and conflict (Pettigrew et al., 2009; Foster et al., 2016). First, research has found that the social and political context often defines teachers' choices and the curricula available to them, thus teachers frequently present selected views on violence, often reproducing negative stereotypes and hostility toward other groups (Korostelina, 2015; Podeh, 2010; Skårås & Breidlid, 2016; Torsti, 2009; Popovska, 2012). Second, the context of war and

trauma impedes and complicates the application of multi-perspectivity (Eid, 2010; Goldberg, 2017; Jansen, 2009) and critical thinking (Bellino, 2016; Glanvill-Miller, 2017; Kitson & McCully, 2005; Ho, 2017; McCully, 2012; Shepler & Williams, 2017).

In this project, I see teachers as agents of peacebuilding, influencing how their students come to understand dynamics of conflict, violence, and peace (Barton & Levstik, 2015; Hamer, 2000; Hilferty, 2007; Zembylas et al., 2016). It is evident that history teachers' political orientations, positions of power, and social identities impact the teaching process during conflict and division (Anderson, 2011; Epstein & Shiller, 2005; Gee, 2000; Gross & Terra, 2019; Makkawi, 2002; Sung & Yang, 2009). Thus, it is important to empower teachers to address community debates in the framework of a culture of peace and prepare them to effectively deal with differences and biases that might affect what they teach and how they teach students about peace and conflict.

Theoretical Approach

The training utilizes specific aspects of the development of peace culture: the positive experiences, challenges, and problems encountered in processes of teaching conflict histories for the purposes of peacebuilding; re-humanization of enemies; and reframing historical narratives of violent intergroup relations into narratives of peace, equity, and justice. Therefore, the training is rooted in the conceptual ideas of (1) negative and positive peace and (2) three forms of violence: cultural, structural, and direct. Negative peace is defined as a peace without justice or absence of violence that often comes at the cost of justice (Galtung, 1976; Galtung et al., 2002). In a negative peace situation, there may not be open conflict and violence, but reconciliation is not achieved. Efforts to achieve negative peace include (a) managing conflict to mitigate and reduce actual and potential violence, eliminating indirect violence; (b) reducing the incidence of direct violence through international crisis management; and (c) preventing war through strategic deterrence and arms control. The concept of negative peace addresses immediate symptoms, the conditions of war, as well as the use and effects of force and weapons. It does not include the absence of structural violence, the unintended slow and widespread human suffering caused by economic and political structures in the form of massive exploitation and repression. It also does not feature the absence of the cultural violence that legitimizes discrimination and exclusion based on social identity and category.

Positive peace is a true, lasting, and sustainable peace built on justice for all people. Efforts to achieve positive peace include (a) supporting international law; (b) establishing social equality

and justice, economic equity, and ecological balance; (c) protecting citizens from attack and meeting basic human needs; and (d) eliminating all forms of violence. The concept of positive peace involves the elimination of the root causes of war, violence, and injustice and the conscious attempt to build a society that reflects these commitments.

The concepts of direct, cultural, and structural violence are based on social categories and thus reflect the dynamics of identity conflicts. Social identities are rooted in a membership in a specific group (ethnic, national, religious, regional), a strong emotional connection and loyalty to this group, and a perception of significant differences with members of other groups. Social identities do not become more salient during intergroup conflict, but rather, they become more profound and mobilized, leading to a significant transformation of the conflict dynamics. The 4-C model (Korostelina, 2007), comprising four stages—comparison, competition, confrontation, and counteraction—describes the processes of identity-based conflict.

In short, ethnic and religious groups living in multicultural societies with unbalanced power, unequal access to resources and horizontal inequalities, develop various intergroup biases, prejudices, and beliefs about intergroup relations. Multiple factors contribute to this process, including favorable comparisons (an essential need for positive self-esteem that leads to negative evaluation of outgroups in contrast to the ingroup) (Noor et al., 2008; Esses et al., 2001; Tajfel & Turner, 1979; Taylor et al., 1987), relative deprivation (a belief that the social or economic position of the ingroup does not meet group members' expectations and is poorer than other groups) (Gurr, 1970; Runciman, 1966), and global attribution errors (a tendency for people to over-emphasize character-based explanations for behaviors of outgroup members while over-emphasizing the impact of situational influences on the behavior of ingroup members) (Allport, 1954; Pettigrew, 2015). As a result, outgroups are perceived as cunning, deceitful, violent, and aggressive. Injustice, history of conflicts, and inequality amplify these negative and adverse perceptions, contributing to the motivation to fight for social change. When competition for power or resources intensifies, ingroup leaders employ these biases and prejudice as well as loyalties to the ingroup to amplify conflict intentions and mobilize group members. Opposing goals and interests contribute to the escalation of intergroup prejudice entitlement (Pettigrew, 2015; Shin, 2018). The ideologization of identities links them to economic and political interests, thus reinforcing negative views of, and attributions to, aggressive goals and violent motivations of outgroup members. Perceived external threat combined with uncertainties and a lack of information reinforces feelings of danger and

insecurity among ingroup members (Johnson et al., 2005; Louis et al., 2007; Stephan et al., 2002). The ingroup identity becomes more salient and mobilized leading to the development of the dual positive we-negative they perception. Once societal relations have transformed into divisions between antagonistic groups, social identities become the leading force of the conflict, highlighting the security concerns, beliefs, values, and positions of each group. An unbalanced collective axiology develops among ingroup members, placing outgroups outside the moral boundary, devaluating and dehumanizing outgroup members as an homogenous evil (Rothbart & Korostelina, 2006). Thus, it becomes moral and honorable to destroy the economic, social, and political structures that support outgroups and justify mass violence and murders. These actions are, in turn, seen by the outgroup as essentially threatening, leading to violent counteractions, causing a new turn in the spiral of conflict and ferocity.

In addition, power relations between identity groups and the meaning of power shape the complex dynamics of identity-based conflicts (Foucault, 1978; Bourdieu, 1977). Contested intergroup relations involve continuous interrelated processes of legitimization and delegitimization, which lead to the utilization, modification, and creation of societal norms and meanings of social identity. To strengthen or stabilize their power, privileged groups employ the predominant meaning of social identity while subordinate groups challenge it and shape it, thus, contributing to the dynamics of identity-based conflict (Korostelina, 2013).

In the dynamics of such identity-based conflicts, history education often becomes both a tool and a site for political manipulations, contested communal disputes, and clashes over collective memory. As a medium for meaning-making, history education is entrenched in social group members, their aspirations and objectives. History teachers consciously or insentiently define historical narratives in their classrooms based on the political and social needs of their ingroup. As they construct students' knowledge, history teachers can support or contest existing social orders and structures of power, either protecting the metanarratives of powerful groups and sustaining conflict relations or encouraging contestation of inequality and relegation and promoting reconciliation, justice, and peace. Through their beliefs and values as members of identity groups, history teachers are in the epicenter of the struggles over meaning, whether facing complicated encounters between representatives of various identity groups in their classrooms or themselves representing marginalized or dominant groups.

The Case of Ukraine

Since the Russian occupation of Crimea in 2014, Ukraine has been in a permanent state of war. While the scope of the armed conflict and intensity of the violence has varied since the initial invasion resulting in a brutal war, Ukrainian society has been severely and continually impacted by the military casualties, civilian devastation, and protracted displacement. In February 2022, Russia initiated a massive attack on Ukraine from multiple directions. The initial aim was to have a rapid win, seizing the capital, Kyiv, and taking down the government within 72 hours. This effort was supported by missile attacks and troop assaults from Russia, Belarus, and the Crimean region. However, the Ukrainian forces responded with a fierce fight, protecting Kiev. The Russian attacks concentrated in the east and south, seizing several major cities, destroying towns and villages, and targeting civilians as troops moved west. As the war continued to its second year, it generated over seven million refugees, six and a half million internally displaced Ukrainians and more than 100,000 soldier and civilian deaths. Whole cities and towns have been destroyed and infrastructures and ecologies were impacted by the massive destruction. Below is a short description of the context in which training was developed and implemented.

In 2014, the pro-Russian Yanukovich government was overthrown in a mass protest known as the Maydan events. The separatist movement in the Donbas Region—strongholds of Yanukovich and his Party of Regions—asserted that the Revolution of Dignity in February 2014 was illegitimate and orchestrated by the West. They actively implemented a regional agenda that broke the unity of the Ukrainian nation (Shveda & Park Ho, 2015). Utilizing uncertainties in these regions, “unarmed and armed separatists seized and occupied regional administrations, security service (SBU), and police headquarters in Donetsk, Luhansk, and other cities and towns in the regions” (Katchanovski, 2016, p. 8). This separatist movement was aided by Russian military personnel, intelligence operatives, and media consultants who supplied weapons, supported recruitment, training, and provided safe havens for separatists (Czuperski et al., 2015). Direct involvement of the Russian military in hybrid warfare was recognized by reports from international organizations (International Criminal Court, 2017; OSCE, 2017). The “hybrid” warfare tactics of Russian operations “were accompanied by largescale (dis)information operations, cyber operations, various forms of economic pressure, international diplomacy, and so on, in order to maximize the effect of the campaign as a whole” (Åtland, 2016, p. 165). Although Russia officially denied its military presence in Donbas, it emphasized the need to defend ethnic Russians and

Russian-speaking populations living outside the Russian Federation. The local pro-Russian governments were elected in self-proclaimed “Donetsk and Luhansk People’s Republics” (DPR/LPR).

In April 2014, the Ukrainian Government started an anti-terrorist operation to retake the territories, but it has been largely unsuccessful due to the Ukrainian Army’s limited fighting capacity. To support the fight for Ukrainian territory, many Ukrainians joined volunteer groups to both participate in military actions and aid citizens (Dunnett, 2015). On September 5, 2014, an initial ceasefire agreement was signed by representatives of the Ukrainian and Russian governments, separatist leaders, and a representative of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) as a result of the Minsk negotiations. However, after an increase in violent warfare resulting from a new supply of heavy military equipment from Russia to Russian-led forces in the region, France and Germany brokered a second Minsk ceasefire agreement on February 12, 2015. Neither of the agreements had much effect on upholding the ceasefire, the withdrawal of heavy weapons from the conflict zone, or creating a path towards peace.

By the time the project described in this paper began implementation (August to December 2021), Russia still controlled the territory and ran elections in areas of Eastern Ukraine (Radio Free Europe, 2021). As the OSCE mission in Ukraine reported, weapons proscribed by the Minsk agreements, including tanks, mortars, and artillery, have continued to be used extensively on both sides of the contact line. Almost every day, the Monitors of OSCE had corroborated violations of the ceasefire and civilian casualties because of shelling that mostly occurs during the night (CMM, 2021). In addition, residents of both government and non-government controlled areas in Donetsk and Luhansk regions have limited access to services, including “difficulties in attending court hearings, filing legal claims and gaining access to essential documents including birth and death certificates” (OSCE, 2019). The conflict also has resulted in the relocation of 1.7 million people (Beyani, 2015). However, the government has not addressed critical problems facing Internally Displaced People (IDPs), such as their rights to vote and compensation, unemployment, and lack of housing which has led to "conflict trauma, radicalism, and disappointment with the state" (Udovyk, 2017).

Methodology: Training as an approach

Increasingly, training became one of the most prevalent approaches to peacebuilding and

conflict transformation. With the aim of developing the participants' skills and knowledge, training employs the learning sequence of experience – reflection – new understanding – new experience. This process is comprised of three main stages: (1) improved reflection on existing and alternative assumptions, beliefs, and behaviors; (2) developed ability to understand conceptual ideas and comprehend ways to use them; and (3) increased competence in applying the concepts in everyday life and work and ability to generate new ideas (Ricigliano, 2001). Lederach (1997) has identified two aims of training in the conflict resolution field: (1) increasing knowledge about conflict (understanding of the structure and dynamics of conflict and its resolution); and (2) developing skills for conflict transformation and peacebuilding (specific techniques, tools, and tactics for dealing with conflict). In addition, training participants increase their ability to reflect on their conflict-related behavior and work toward changing it to a more peace-oriented one (LeBaron, 2000).

Effective training should include elements of both the prescriptive model, which defines training as content-oriented with the trainer providing knowledge and expertise, and the elective model, which defines training as process-oriented with the trainer working as a facilitator of continuous discovery and creative process (Lederach, 1995). Thus, training functions as a form of dialogue, through which new ideas are analyzed, accepted, and obtained by the participants. As a tool of peacebuilding, training is a process of strategic capacity building and relationship-building between participants, thus creating a strong network of agents for peace (Lederach, 1997).

The training for this project employed transdisciplinary approaches to peacebuilding and resolution of identity-based conflicts to (1) help history teachers analyze representations of difficult histories in divided societies; (2) assess their current practices of designing and implementing classroom teaching on difficult histories associated with identity-based conflicts; (3) increase capacity of history teachers to reflect on and increase their own power in teaching about peace, reconciliation, and justice; and (4) collaborate with teachers to modify existing and develop new classroom teaching approaches.

The training program consisted of four main parts. These parts were designed to support the learning process through hybrid form of interactions as well as allow participants to share their experiences and reflect on their own work.

Part I. Knowledge development

The first part included seminar and three short lectures. The two-hour seminar conducted in Spring 2021 was devoted to the general understanding of identity-based conflicts and their impact on history education (Korostelina, 2014). The lecture described how the main factors that contribute to the dynamics of identity-based conflict shape representations of historical narratives in textbooks and a classroom. Following this lecture, participants discussed their views on the problems of teaching history during ongoing armed conflict in Eastern Ukraine. During the summer, three short lectures were recorded and put online to provide participants an opportunity to review them on their own time.

The first lecture was devoted to the role of social boundary in intergroup relations, demonstrating how history education contributes to the process of boundary formation between social groups. This intergroup boundary, consisting of narratives about identities within ingroups, the relationships across the boundary, and reflection on the boundary and differences itself are represented in the historical narratives of both groups. Changes in boundaries and their meanings are linked to the development of conflicts and greatly influence both the intensity and form of collective violence. The lecture discussed how history education in different countries reinforces social boundaries leading to conflict or, alternatively, transform these boundaries to make them more permeable, shared, and mutual by stressing parallels in culture and history, common heritage, and collaborative activities.

The second lecture discussed how history education can contribute to the formation of different forms of social identity, including cultural, reflected, and mobilized. While the mobilized form of identity—the portrayal of one’s own country or ethnic group as superior, and motivations to fight against an evil and vicious enemy—leads to conflict, the use of the cultural form can be both positive and negative. It includes a focus on traditions, customs, and holidays, however it can show similarities between groups in values, beliefs, and attitudes or emphasize the threat to one’s own culture. The reflected form of identity that contributes to peace can be formed through a deeper understanding of the roots and sources of an ingroup identity and its relationship to outgroups.

The third lecture was devoted to the impact of history education on conceptions of national identity: ethnic, multicultural, or civic. These concepts define the interrelation between majority and minority groups, as well as perceptions and actions toward minorities and immigrants. Using

examples from different countries, the lecture discussed how conceptions of national identity are formed through history education: the ethnic concept of national identity is based on the domination by one ethnic group and the rejection of alternative identities; the multicultural concept rests on the recognition and promotion of cultural diversity; the civic concept supports an idea of civic responsibility, equality, and co-existence. The lecture showed that the concept of active citizenship should prevail in history education, while culture and ethnicity should be presented as mere components of a nation.

Part II. Intensive training

The second part consisted of a 4-day intensive training. The first day included an introductory lecture on four dilemmas of teaching history in conflict societies (Korostelina, 2019) followed by a Peace Café discussion on each of the dilemmas. The lecture discussed how history education in conflict societies reflects both the connotations that are ascribed to the past as well as power dynamics and the meaning of identity promoted by existing leadership. Facing the questions of how to educate students about recent history of violence, teachers encounter four major dilemmas: (1) between critical history that helps to improve the society and monumental history that increases loyalty to the nation and submission to the ruling elite; (2) between the meaning of history as a past and as a possibility of occurring events; (3) between remembering and forgetting—what amount of remembering is most efficient for reconciliation; and (4) investing in remembering versus supporting other important social projects.

The next three days comprised of informational sections, exercises, and discussions. The second day began with a discussion of the concept of peace including the concept of "negative peace" (or peace as the absence of war) and "positive peace" (or peace as the absence of exploitation and the presence of social justice) as well as three forms of violence. Next, participants were introduced to ten goals of peace education and continued discussion in groups. Each group identified three goals of peace education that were the most relevant, in their opinion, to history education and provided examples of relevant methods. The group presentations were followed by a discussion of goals that were not mentioned by any of the groups. After a lunch break, the informational session summarized and refreshed the concepts discussed during the first part of the training program, including an understanding of social identity, formation of national identity through history education, and interrelations between social identity and conflict. The information session was followed by a game: Groups of participants wrote narratives of specific historical

events relevant to the current conflict (establishment of Kievan Rus) from the point of view of Russia and Ukraine and discuss the differences, prejudices, biases, etc. evident in the texts.

The third day was devoted to different mechanisms of prejudice and denigration. First, the information session discussed such processes as (a) social categorization, meta-contrast, and stereotypes; (b) the need for self-esteem and prejudice; (c) locus of self-esteem: from internal to external locus in history textbooks; (d) group prototypes: changes in the types of national heroes in history textbooks; and (e) collective axiology and moral denigration. Following this session, participants were engaged in a game “Anthropologists and natives” which demonstrated how prejudice and denigration arrives from attributions in situations of uncertainty.

After the coffee break, the information session introduced Kegan’s five stages of moral development to illustrate how individual morality progresses from controlling the Other, to functioning as a member of the ingroup, to understanding of the multiplicity of identities and complexity of intergroup relations. The following game “By the lake” demonstrated the transformation from competitiveness related to ingroup membership to cooperation for common success. Participants were working in groups, representing five different enterprises that work on a lake, using the water from the lake for their manufacturing. Their actions, such as dropping polluted water, imposing a fine, cleaning the lake, and so on, are connected to each other. Only one strategy—real cooperation—can help them to get the biggest profits.

After lunch, the information session refreshed the ideas of the lecture on the concepts of national identity—ethnic, multicultural, and civic—concentrating on the presentation of these concepts in history textbooks. The session also introduced the conceptual ideas of debates and dialogue and the differences between these two processes. In groups, participants discussed what concepts of identity are presented in current history textbooks and how they influence identity. Discussions were held first in the form of debates and then dialogue that also helped to unite the concepts of national identity with debates and dialogue as strategies for dealing with contested history. The final session introduced knowledge about identity-based conflicts, including dynamics of relative deprivation, security dilemma, intergroup support, and outgroup threat. The conflict mapping tool was introduced to help analyze these dynamics. Participants were working in five groups, developing a conflict map of their choice from history textbooks.

The fourth day concentrated on methods for managing identity-based conflicts. Decategorization (Levine & Hogg, 2010) promotes the perception of groups as an association of

separate individuals by stressing the variation of opinions among ingroup members and by creating more personalized interactions. Supercategorization (Gaertner & Dovidio, 2000) leads to the perception of several groups as one common group, resulting in the reevaluation and acceptance of former outgroup members as members of a new common ingroup. Cross-categorization (Gaertner & Dovidio, 2000) endorses cross-cutting identities that help develop a feeling of commonality across categories and decreases negative attitudes toward members of other groups. Following the discussion of different types of recategorization, the participants played the game “Photo of the future.” First, they were asked to imagine in detail and discuss with their peers a happy memory of their childhood. Then they were asked to imagine in detail and discuss a happy moment of peaceful intergroup relations in the future. These images of the future were assessed through the types of recategorizations that might help to attain peace.

The final discussion was like the initial group discussion on the goals of peace education. Each group identified three goals of peace education and provided examples of relevant methods that can be used in the classroom. The group presentations were followed by a discussion of goals that were not mentioned by any of the groups. This discussion helped to show changes in knowledge and skills during this part of the training.

Part III. Incorporation of knowledge

The third part of the training program included two monthly online sessions specially designed to support participants in developing new lesson plans and incorporating new ideas and concepts into classroom teaching. Some concepts from the training were verified and participants’ questions were addressed. The participants also shared classroom innovations and discussed problems and challenges in their implementation.

Part IV. Evaluation and strategic planning

The fourth part of the training program was conducted in the end of the year after teachers were able to develop and implement new lesson plans. It included a final discussion on the implementation of new lesson plans, evaluation of the training, and strategic planning for next steps. The participants were asked to complete a specially designed form to describe one of their innovative approaches, lesson plans, or techniques. Then, they worked in rotating groups of three to share these approaches; what worked and what did not work in their implementations in their classrooms. Finally, every participant had three minutes to describe their approach to the entire group, thus developing a set of ideas for all participants.

Implications for teaching practices in history classrooms

Methodology

To analyze the implications of the training for teaching history in societies experiencing protracted conflict, I used a qualitative method approach to collect data with triangulation of focus group discussions with participants and a short open-ended questionnaire. Participants' responses during focus group discussion were recorded and transcribed for the analysis. Both the responses to the survey and focus group discussions were analyzed using thematic analysis. First, several themes were identified to manage large data clusters without losing meaning present in the data or the focus of the research questions (Brough, 2018; Clarke, 2017; Creswell, 2018). I formed specific clusters by merging similar or related themes and making a summary table of the structured themes. The analysis of each response contributed to the generation of common, general themes for all or most responses.

Results

The training participants discussed multiple ways of implementing skills and knowledge developed through the training in their teaching. They had fourteen weeks to create and test new lesson plans in their classrooms. Many of them stressed that they incorporated ideas and exercises from the training and many lessons and students liked them. Below are examples of applications of the training materials in the classroom.

Meaning of peace and violence. For many teachers, increasing students' recognition of the complexity of peace and violence became one of the main tasks. Some teachers asked students to conduct interviews about peace. The exercise increased students' understanding of many options and views on peace and helped them arrive to conclusions about positive and negative peace. One teacher used the history of Napoleon to discuss equality and respect as a key to positive peace. One teacher used the narrative that described the history of Heroic Symphony: As Beethoven first saw Napoleon as bringing about positive change and democracy, he devoted his symphony to Napoleon. However, seeing the violence of war, Beethoven changed it to "Heroic Symphony." Another teacher used Leo Tolstoy's *War and Peace* to discuss what peace really means. To increase students' recognition of positive and negative peace, this teacher used a method involving the selection of cards with single words from a set of cards and explaining why they represent peace for each student.

Another lesson, devoted to the history of mass murder of Ukrainian Jews by Nazis in Babiy Yar (Gitelman, 1997; Khanin, 2003) and to the state-organized famine (Holodomor) of 1932-33 (Cameron, 2018; Klid & Motyl, 2012), required students to conduct research and prepare presentations for younger students. It gave them an opportunity to understand the importance of life, motivation to protect and support others, and, thus, promoted deeper emotional involvement with other people, and compassion.

Ten aims of peace education. Many teachers reflected on the ten aims of peace education and how they incorporate them in their teaching. For example, they encouraged students to work with documents and understand Ukrainian nation-building as complex and controversial. They used a structural approach to this controversial topic, highlighting multiple ways to explain the current conflict dynamics. One teacher discussed with students all ten aims of peace education using a 1-2-4 exercise that allowed students to discuss their views in groups of two and then in groups of four. Most aims selected by students were “Stop violence,” “Stop fears,” and “Understanding of war processes.” Then she asked students to prepare a short video discussing each of the 10 aims and show it to the class. Another teacher stressed the importance of conflict mediation and a peaceful approach to conflict. She asked younger students to prepare a photo collage for older students on civic responsibility and involved all children in discussions on how to find a peaceful resolution to conflicts they face every day in their environment and ongoing societal conflicts.

Multiplicity of interpretations and understanding of the complexity of conflict. Many teachers discussed how they changed their lesson plans to introduce the multiplicity of possible interpretations of conflict. For example, the exercise “the Portrait of Symon Petliura” (the Supreme Commander of the Ukrainian Army and the President of the Ukrainian People's Republic during 1918–1921, the leader of Ukraine's struggle for independence) required students to conduct research on something interesting about this person, using the documents and memoirs of people who knew him. It helped them recognize the diversity of stereotypes, attitudes, and positions as well as different interpretations of his activities. In the end, students developed a complex image of Petliura, understanding the controversies, and seeing the multiplicity of possible assessments.

Discrimination and prejudice. Many teachers addressed discrimination through games and exercises presented in the training. For example, they used a 1-2-4 exercise that allowed students to discuss their views in groups of two and then in groups of four. Discussions within groups

showed students that they were not racially tolerant, as it helped reveal their biases toward people of different ethnic and racial groups through comparing perceptions of other classmates. However, according to teachers, students were able to start changing their ideas during the discussion, especially toward Roma people as a most negatively perceived outgroup. Another teacher asked students to work in groups of three to define who they want/do not want to take as a fourth person for a long trip on a train. Students listed different people, including Roma, former inmates, or people of different races. The discussion helped them acknowledge their own prejudices and discuss how they were formed. Another exercise widely adopted from the training was the “Anthropologists and natives” which helped students understand the roots of biases and recognize the need to interpret misunderstandings without attributing negative features to outgroups.

Several teachers addressed gender stereotypes, stressing that gender stereotypes are formed from childhood based on societal expectations. This discussion helped students recognize the equal rights of all citizens and then apply it to equality based on ethnicity and race. Another teacher asked girls to write down several features of the ideal boy and similarly, boys had to define several features of the ideal girl. The ensuing discussion revealed that the lists of the best qualities are the same, thus gender is not important in assessing the other person’s qualities.

Debate vs dialogue. Some teachers introduced the differences between debates and dialogue in their classrooms. For example, one teacher used these ideas to discuss the results of the first war and how they were different for each country, varying from just to unjust outcomes. The teachers introduced dialogue as a tool for understanding each other. They acknowledged that for many students it was harder to engage in dialogue than in debate. However, this exercise demonstrated that there were no winners in the war, and peace is the main value that can arrive from dialogue as a foundation of societal relations. Another teacher used the example of Crimea and Crimean Tatar's Council—Kurultai (Potichnyj, 1975)—to discuss how dialogue, and not debate, helps people listen to the other side. Addressing the aggressive and radical reaction of students toward the occupation of Crimea and the perception of Crimeans as traitors who did not fight Russia, she encouraged students to think about Crimea after return and how to deal with the multicultural identity of the Crimean population.

Conflict mapping. Many teachers used conflict mapping in their teaching about conflicts. For example, one teacher applied the conflict map for describing religious conflicts. She discussed how the celebration of holidays depends on religious meanings. It helps students acknowledge

cultural violence as part of religious beliefs and develop tolerance toward different religious groups. Another teacher required students to collect oral histories of families, identify conflicts within the family, and create a map of these conflicts. This exercise developed students' skills in conducting and analyzing interviews and increased their capacity to deal with conflicts.

Trainings for other teachers. Many teachers shared that they conducted short training sessions for other teachers and school administration. Some of them used the form of “World café – peace café” introduced during the training. They involved their colleagues in a discussion on how to teach peace through multiple disciplines. They concentrated on critical thinking in understanding zones of conflict in geography, the role of conflicts in literature and the use of the game “Anthropologists and natives” in many disciplines.

Challenges of training history teachers in societies affected by violence

During the first meeting with the teachers, we asked them to discuss how they teach about ongoing conflict and what aims of peace education they are able to accomplish in this context. The reports of the small discussion groups were very technical if not simplistic. They all provided examples of critical approach to history and multi-perspectivity as a method of successful teaching about peace. However, when we opened the discussion to the issues of perceptions of Russia, Donetsk region, and Crimea, as well as relationships between the Russian speaking and Ukrainian speaking populations in the region, many teachers acknowledged that they tend to avoid these controversial topics because of their concerns for emotional reactions and even the safety of students in a classroom (as discussed by De Baets, 2015; Helmsing, 2014; Miles, 2019; Martinez-Keel, 2021; Skårås, 2019). Many teachers stated that discussions related to the ongoing conflict in classrooms became contentious due to identity-based loyalties and conflictual intergroup perceptions rooted in the ongoing violence in the country. Other teachers stated that their attempts to engage students in discussions of issues related to the occupation of Crimea and self-proclaimed Republics had provoked controversial statements by students and even deepened the conflict. They all stressed the importance of learning how to address the violence in society in their teaching of history.

Another problem that arose during the training was teachers' use of concepts of identity and conflict to reinforce their own biases and conflict positions. While it was observed with only a few training participants, it became clear that some teachers are so embedded in the social and political context of conflict that it is extremely hard for them to change their biased view on the

Other and engage with complexities of ingroup relations. These in-group loyalties were still defining their choices of presenting and interpreting history of intergroup conflict, reproducing negative stereotypes and hostility toward other groups (as described by Korostelina, 2015; Podeh, 2010; Skårås & Breidlid, 2016; Torsti, 2009; Popovska, 2012). To address this persistent issue, we engaged these teachers in one-on-one conversation about their position in conflict, provoking deeper self-reflection and encouraging motivation to promote peaceful solutions to teaching controversial history.

Future directions

A discussion of future directions and strategic planning was organized in the form of a fishbone exercise. The participants worked in ten groups to identify the main problems associated with textbooks, curricula, teacher training, teachers' personalities, school resources, students, parents, local communities, societal divisions, and war. After assembling all problems in one model, every participant was able to select the three most important problems from their view. The problems that were selected by the most participants can be organized within seven clusters.

The first group of clusters reflected issues related to the wider society. Cluster 1—The War—included (1) controversies around teaching about reconciliation as a result of the ongoing armed conflict and (2) the absence of a clear definition of the armed conflict in Donbas (is it a war, a separatism, an invasion?). Cluster 2—Society—was described through the slow processes of adaptation to new liberal ideas and democratic values. Cluster 3—Local Community—was represented by intergroup relations between ethnic groups as well as between IDPs and local communities.

The second cluster group represented issues related to history education. Cluster 4—the Personality of the Teacher—included the need to develop tolerance to different views and approaches and comfort with the multiplicity of interpretations of history. Cluster 5—Education of History Teachers—stressed the importance of understanding dynamics of peace and conflict as well as special didactics on how to teach about these complex topics. Cluster 6—Textbooks and Program—highlighted the importance of a general orientation for a peaceful future. Cluster 7—Resources—stressed the need to further develop internet resources for teaching about peace and conflict.

Then, participants worked in groups with the task of identifying several clusters and addressing them through triangles of “What to do? Why? How?”. The results of these discussions

were presented to the entire group and three main areas for future work were identified: (1) Training for trainers on specific methods/didactics for teaching colleagues as well as teachers of other disciplines; (2) Training for history teachers on how to work with parents/community (dialogues, workshops); (3) A course for pedagogical departments/local institutes for continued education.

Conclusion

The results demonstrate the importance of concentrating on teachers' attitudes toward conflict prevention and management of societal conflicts and on preparing teachers to effectively address complex issues of peacebuilding and violence reduction. Identity-based training promotes the transformation of teachers' assessments of conflict dynamics, increases teachers' appreciation of peace, and provides knowledge and understanding of the roots and mechanisms of conflict, discrimination, and violence. It also develops skills that aid in the promotion of tolerance, appreciation of diversity, dialogue, and multi-perspectivity on peace and conflict among students. This study does not only show that knowledge on identity-based conflicts advances teachers' current practices of designing and implementing classroom teaching in societies affected by violence but also increases the capacity of history teachers to reflect on and increase their own power in teaching about peace, reconciliation, and justice. This empowerment process includes increase in teachers' self-esteem, positive emotions leading to enhanced self-efficacy, and a strong motivation to bring about change to their societies through both teaching and engagement with local communities. Many teachers shared that they developed and conducted short trainings and teaching modules to educate their fellow teachers in schools. Thus, this multidimensional process of teachers' empowerment beyond increasing skills and knowledge should be further investigated in different settings.

The main practical recommendation of this study is inclusion of identity-based training in the traditional methods of teacher education. It provides knowledge and skills that many teachers lack in addressing historical events related to ongoing conflict and violence. However, it is important to acknowledge that teachers are embedded in the conflictual intergroup relations and might use knowledge of identity-based conflicts to solidify their negative perceptions of the other, deepening the spiral of moral duality. Thus, special attention should be given to deep reflections on personal positions of teachers. Incorporation of Kohlberg's (1984) theory of moral development that emphasizes the importance of contemplations on a person's positions within social groups can

aid in this process. Understanding of intergroup and interethnic dynamics, stereotypes, biases, and discrimination will help incorporate lessons and exercises on peace and conflict resolution into curricula and increase the active role of teachers in conflict resolution processes.

References

- Abadia, L. & Collins, J.M. (2018). Imperial ideas and ideologies of empire: British imperial history in educational books for K-3 history. In J. Nieuwenhuys, K. Valentim (Eds.), *The colonial past in history textbooks historical and social psychological perspectives* (pp. 51–70). Information Age Publishing.
- Alexander, C., & Weekes-Bernard, D. (2017). History lessons: Inequality, diversity and the national curriculum. *Race, Ethnicity and Education*, 20(4), 478–494.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13613324.2017.1294571>
- Allers, K.S. (2020, February 21). Beyond slavery and civil rights: What parents need to know about Black History Month. *The Washington Post*.
<https://www.washingtonpost.com/lifestyle/2020/02/21/beyond-slavery-civil-rights-what-parents-need-know-about-black-history-month/>.
- Anderson Worden, E. (2011). The “mock reform” of history education in Moldova: Actors versus the script. *Comparative Education Review*, 55(2), 231-251.
- Apsel, J. (2004). Moral dilemmas and pedagogical challenges in teaching about genocide. *Human Rights Review*, 5(4), 104-129.
- Barton, K. C. & Levstick, L. S. (2015). “Why don’t more history teachers engage students in interpretation?” In W.C. Parker (Ed.), *Social Studies Today* (pp. 45-52). Routledge.
- Bellino, M.J., Paulson, J., & Worden, E.A. (2017). Working through difficult pasts: Toward thick democracy and transitional justice in education. *Comparative Education*, 53(3), 313–32.
- Bentrovato, D., Schulze, M., & Korostelina, K.V. (2016) *History can bite: History education in divided and post-war societies*. V&R Unipress.
- Borger, J. (2020, February 25). Landmark second world war ceremony in Moscow poses dilemma for UK and US. *The Guardian*.
<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2020/feb/25/russia-world-war-ii-75th-anniversary-uk-us>.
- Cajani, L., Lässig, S., & Repoussi, M. (2019). *Palgrave handbook of conflict and history education in the post-Cold War era*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Cameron, S. (2018). *The hungry steppe: Famine, violence, and the making of Soviet Kazakhstan*. Cornell University Press.

- Carretero, M., Berger, S., & Grever, M. (Eds.) (2017). *Palgrave handbook of research in historical culture and education*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Castro, A. J. & Aguayo, R. C. (2013). Global citizenship and the complexities of genocide education. In L. Nganga, J. Kambutu, & W. B. Russell, III (Eds.), *Exploring globalization opportunities and challenges in social studies: Effective instructional approaches*. Peter Laing.
- De Baets, A. (2015). Post-conflict history education moratoria: A balance. *World Studies in Education, 16*(1), 5–30.
- Eckmann, M. (2010) Exploring the relevance of Holocaust education for human rights education. *Prospects, 40*(7), 7-16.
- Eckmann, M. & Stevick, D. (2017). General Introduction. In M. Eckmann, D. Stevick, J. Ambrosewicz-Jacobs (Eds.), *Research in teaching and learning about the holocaust: A dialogue beyond borders*. International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance (IHRA).
- Edele, M. (2020). Who won the Second World War and why should you care? Reassessing Stalin’s War 75 years after victory. *Journal of Strategic Studies, 43*(6-7),1039-1062.
- Edling, S., Sharp, H., Löfström, J., & Ammert, N. (2020). Why is ethics important in history education? A dialogue between the various ways of understanding the relationship between ethics and historical consciousness. *Ethics and Education, 15*(3), 336–354. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17449642.2020.1780899>
- Eid, N. 2010. “The inner conflict: How Palestinian students in Israel react to the dual narrative approach concerning the events of 1948.” *Journal of Educational Media, Memory & Society, 2*(1), 55–77.
- Epstein, T. & Shiller, J. (2005). Students’ identities and affiliations influence what and how much they learn from school subjects. Understanding this can help teachers build on students’ perspectives. *Social Education, 69*(4), 201-204.
- Esses, V. M., Dovidio, J. F., Jackson, L. M., & Armstrong, T. L. (2001). The immigration dilemma: The role of perceived group competition, ethnic prejudice, and national identity. *Journal of Social Issues, 57*, 389–412.
- Foster, S.J., Pettigrew, A., Pearce, A.R., Hale, R., Burgess, A., Salmons, P., Lenga, R. (2016). [What do students know and understand about the Holocaust?: Evidence from English secondary schools](#). UCL Centre for Holocaust Education.

- Johnson, D., Terry, D. J., & Louis, W. R. (2005). Perceptions of the intergroup structure and anti-Asian prejudice among White Australians. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 8, 53–71.
- Galtung, J., Jacobsen, C.G., & Brand-Jacobsen, K.F. (2002). *Searching for peace: The road to TRANSCEND*. Pluto Press.
- Gaertner, S.L., & Dovidio, J.F. (2000). *Reducing intergroup bias: The common ingroup identity model* (1st ed.). Psychology Press. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315804576>
- Gee, J.P. (2000). Identity as an analytic lens for research in education. *Review of Research in Education*, 25, 99-125.
- Gitelman, Z. (Ed.) (1997). *Bitter legacy: Confronting the Holocaust in the USSR*. Indiana University Press.
- Glanvill-Miller, S. (2017). ‘Teaching maths is easier than this!’: Pre-service educators confront the challenges and opportunities of teaching emotive and contested pasts in post-Apartheid history and social science classrooms. *South African Historical Journal* 69(1), 52–69.
- Goldberg, S.W. & Petrović, N. (2019). From sensitive historical issues to history teachers’ sensibility: A look across and within countries. *Pedagogy, Culture & Society*, 27(1), 7-38. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14681366.2019.1566165>
- Gross, M.H. & Terra, L. (Eds.) (2019). *Teaching and learning the difficult past: Comparative perspectives*. Routledge.
- Gurr, T. R. (1970). *Why men rebel*. Routledge.
- Helmsing, M. (2014). Virtuous subjects: A critical analysis of the affective substance of social studies education. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, 42(1), 127-140.
- Hilferty, F. (2007). Theorising teacher professionalism as an enacted discourse of power. [*British Journal of Sociology of Education*](#), 29(2), 161-173.
- Jansen, J. D. (2009). On the clash of martyrological memories. *Perspectives in Education* 27(2), 147–57.
- Katchanovski, I. (2016). The separatist war in Donbas: A violent break-up of Ukraine. *European Politics and Society*, 17(4), 473-489.

- Keough, P. (2020, February 20). In focus: The persistence of memory powers Patricio Guzmán's Chile trilogy. *The Boston Globe*. <https://www.bostonglobe.com/2020/02/20/arts/focus-persistence-memory-powers-patricio-guzmans-chile-trilogy/>.
- Khanin, V. (Ed.). (2003). *Documents on Ukrainian Jewish identity and emigration, 1944–1990*. Routledge.
- Kitson, A. & McCully, A. (2005). 'You hear about it for real in school.' Avoiding, containing and risk-taking in the history classroom. *Teaching History*, 120, 32–37.
- Klid, B. & Motyl, A.J. (2012). *Holodomor reader: A sourcebook on the famine of 1932-1933 in Ukraine*. CIUS Press.
- Klymenko, L. (2016). Narrating the second World War: History textbooks and nation building in Belarus, Russia, and Ukraine. *Journal of Educational Media, Memory, and Society*, 8(2), 36–57.
- Kohlberg, L. (1984). *The psychology of moral development: The nature and validity of moral stages (Essays on moral development, Volume 2)*. Harper & Row.
- Korostelina, K.V. (2017) Constructing identity and power in history education in Ukraine: Approaches to formation of peace culture. In M. Carretero, S. Berger, & M. Grever (Eds.), *Handbook of Research in Historical Culture and Education* (pp. 311-33). Palgrave.
- Korostelina, K.V. (2015). Reproduction of conflict in history teaching in Ukraine: A social identity theory analysis. *Identity* 1(3), 221–40. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15283488.2015.1057283>.
- Korostelina, K. V. (2013). Constructing nation: National narratives of history teachers in Ukraine. *National Identities*, 15(4), 401–16.
- Korostelina, K.V. (2013) *History education in the formation of social identity: Toward a culture of peace*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Korostelina, K.V. (2010). War of textbooks: History education in Russia and Ukraine. *Communist and Post-Communist Studies*, 43(2), 129–37.
- Landrieu, M. (2019). *In the shadow of statues: A White southerner confronts history*. Penguin.
- Levine, J. M., & Hogg, M. A. (Eds.). (2010). *Encyclopedia of group processes & intergroup relations*. SAGE Publications. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412972017>

- Levinson, S. (2018). *Written in stone: Public monuments in changing societies* (2nd ed.). Duke University Press.
- Louis, W. R., Duck, J. M., Terry, D. M., Schuller, R. A., & Lalonde, R. N. (2007). Why do citizens want to keep refugees out? Threats, fairness and hostile norms in the treatment of asylum seekers. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *37*, 53–73.
- McCully, Alan1. (2012). History teaching, conflict and the legacy of the past. *Education, Citizenship & Social Justice*, *7*(2), 145–59.
- Makkawi, I. (2002). Role conflict and the dilemma of Palestinian teachers in Israel. *Comparative Education*, *38*(1), 39-52.
- Manfra, M. & C. Bolick. (2017). *The Wiley handbook of social studies research* (1st ed.). John Wiley & Sons.
- Martinez-Keel, N. (2021, May 26). 'A conspiracy of silence': Tulsa race massacre was absent from schools for generations. *The Oklahoman*. www.oklahoman.com
- Metzger S. & Harris, L.A. (Eds.). (2018). *The Wiley international handbook of history learning and teaching*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- Miles, J. (2019). Seeing and feeling difficult history: A case study of how Canadian students make sense of photographs of Indian Residential Schools. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, *47*(4), 472-496.
- Noor, M., Brown, R., Gonzalez, R., Manzi, J., & Lewis, C. A. (2008). On positive psychological outcomes: What helps groups with a history of conflict to forgive and reconcile with each other. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *34*, 819–832.
- Pettigrew, A., Salmons, P., Foster, S. (2009). *Teaching about the Holocaust in English secondary schools: An empirical study of national trends, perspectives and practice*. Institute of Education, University of London.
- Pettigrew, T. F. (2015). Samuel Stouffer and relative deprivation. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, *78*(1), 7–24.
- Pettigrew, T. F. & Tropp, L. (2011). *When groups meet: The dynamics of intergroup contact*. Psychology Press.
- Podeh, Elie. (2010). Univocality within multivocality: The Israeli-Arab-Palestinian conflict as reflected in Israeli history textbooks, 2000-2010. *Journal of Educational Media, Memory & Society*, *2*(2), 46–62.

- Popovska, Biljana. (2012). The role of teaching history for a nation-building process in a post-conflict society: The case of Macedonia. *Connections*, 12(1), 51–64.
- Popson, N. (2001). The Ukrainian history textbook: Introducing children to the ‘Ukrainian Nation.’ *Nationalities Papers* 29(2), 326–50.
- Potichnyj, P. J. (1975). The struggle of the Crimean Tatars. *Canadian Slavonic Papers / Revue Canadienne Des Slavistes*, 17(2/3), 302–319. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40866872>
- Potter, C.B. & Romano, R.C. (Eds.). (2012). *Doing recent history: On privacy, copyright, video games, institutional review boards, activist scholarship, and history that talks back*. University of Georgia Press.
- Rogers, P. (2022) Putin’s attack on Ukraine isn’t going as planned. What will happen next? *Open Democracy Net*. <https://www.opendemocracy.net/en/odr/russia-putin-attack-ukraine-not-going-as-planned-what-will-happen-next/>
- Rothbart, D. & Korostelina, K. V. (2006). *Identity, morality and threat*. Lexington.
- Rousso, H. (2016). *The latest catastrophe: History, the present, the contemporary* (J.M. Todd, Trans.). The University of Chicago Press.
- Santora, M. (2019, September 4). In Poland, where history is a weapon, leaders commemorate World War II. *The New York Times*. <https://www.nytimes.com/2019/09/01/world/europe/poland-world-war-2.html>.
- Schlund-Vials, C. (2020, February 15). Comics and culture: Illustrating social attitudes and battlefield memories from the Vietnam War. *Milwaukee Independent*. <http://www.milwaukeeindependent.com/syndicated/comics-culture-illustrating-social-attitudes-battlefield-memories-vietnam-war/>.
- Skårås, M. (2019). Constructing a national narrative in civil war: History teaching and national unity in South Sudan. *Comparative Education*, 55(4), 517-535.
- Skårås, M., & Breidlid, A. (2016). Teaching the violent past in secondary schools in newly independent South Sudan. *Education as Change*, 20(3), 98–118.
- Schissler, H., & Soysal, Y.N. (2005). *The nation, Europe, and the world: Textbooks and curricula in transition*. Berghahn Books.
- Shepler, Susan, and James H. Williams. (2017). Understanding Sierra Leonean and Liberian teachers’ views on discussing past wars in their classrooms. *Comparative Education* 53 (3), 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03050068.2017.1338641>.

- Shin, J. Y. (2018). Relative deprivation, satisfying rationality, and support for redistribution. *Social Indicators Research*, 140(1), 35-56.
- Shveda, Y. & Park, J. H. (2015). Ukraine's revolution of dignity: The dynamics of Euromaidan. *Science Direct Journal of Eurasian Studies*, 7(1), 85-91.
- Skårås, M. (2019). Constructing a national narrative in civil war: History teaching and national unity in South Sudan. *Comparative Education*, 55(4), 517-535.
- Skårås, M., & Anders, B.. (2016). Teaching the violent past in secondary schools in newly I=independant South Sudan. *Education as Change*, 20(3), 98–118.
- Skårås, M., Carsillo, T., & Breidlid, A. (2020). The ethnic/local, the national and the global: Global citizenship education in South Sudan. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 68 (2), 219–39. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00071005.2019.1598540>.
- Smith, M. E. (2005). *Reckoning with the past: Teaching history in Northern Ireland*. Lexington.
- Stearns, P., Seixas, P., & Wineburg, S. (Eds.) (2000). *Knowing, teaching and learning history: National and international perspectives*. New York University Press.
- Stephan, W. G., Boniecki, K. A., Ybarra, O., Bettencourt, A., Ervin, K. S., & Jackson, L. A., (2002). The role of threats in the racial attitudes of blacks and whites. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 28, 1242–1254.
- Sung, P.-F. & M.-L. Yang (2009). National identity and its relationship with teachers' historical knowledge and pedagogy: The case of Taiwan. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 29(2), 179-194.
- Tajfel, H. & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W. G. Austin and S. Worchel (Eds.), *The Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations*. Brooks/Cole.
- Taylor, D. M. & Moghaddam, F. M. (1994). *Theories of intergroup relations: International social psychological perspectives* (2nd ed.). Praeger.
- Torsti, Pilvi. (2009). Segregated education and texts: A challenge to peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina. *International Journal on World Peace*, 26(2), 65–82.
- Turner, J. C. (1975). Social comparison and social identity: Some prospects for intergroup behavior. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 5, 5–34.
- Turner, J. C. (2000). Social identity. In A. E. Kazdin (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of psychology*, vol. 7. American Psychological Association.

- Vickers, E., & Jones, A. (Eds). (2005). *History education and national identity in East Asia*. Routledge.
- Wisler, A. (2010) Portraits of peace knowledge in post-Yugoslav higher education. *Journal of Peace Education*, 7(1), 15-31.
- Zembylas, Michalinos. (2017). Teacher resistance to engage with ‘alternative’ perspectives of difficult histories: The limits and prospects of affective disruption. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 38(5), 659–75.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/01596306.2015.1132680>.
- Zembylas, M., Charalambous, C., & Charalambous, P. (2016). *Peace education in a conflict-affected society: An ethnographic journey*. Cambridge University Press.
- Zembylas, Michalinos & Claire McGlynn. (2012). Discomforting pedagogies: Emotional tensions, ethical dilemmas and transformative possibilities. *British Educational Research Journal*, 38(1),41–59. doi: 10.1080/01411926.2010.523779.