The historian and the research in history education

O historiador e a pesquisa em educação histórica

Maria Auxiliadora Schmidt

ABSTRACT

One of the innovations in the field of research about History teaching is the foundation of investigations on philosophy and the theory of history, announcing a new paradigm for the nature of the research about the learning and teaching of History that has been denominated the field of History education. From these presuppositions, were taken as analysis objects 13 theses produced within the Postgraduate Program in Education at the Federal University of Paraná. They are indicative of investigations that have been carried out in Brazil and examples of this renovation. The analysis was based on epistemological, theoretical and technical criteria, supported by dialogue with the theory and philosophy of History from one side and methodological aspects of qualitative educational research on another side. Partial results indicate several issues to be taken into consideration, as to the learning of children and youths, whether in school or other learning environments. Furthermore, new investigative issues raised in this work were also highlighted.

Keywords: History Education. Learning History. History Didactics. Research on History Education. Teaching History.


* Federal University of Paraná. Postgraduate Program in Education. Curitiba, Paraná, Brazil. E-mail: dolinha@uol.com.br. https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4820-5913.
RESUMO

Uma das inovações no campo das pesquisas sobre ensino de história é a fundamentação das investigações na filosofia e na teoria da história, anunciando um novo paradigma para a natureza das pesquisas acerca da aprendizagem e ensino de História e que têm caracterizado o campo da educação histórica. A partir destes pressupostos, foram tomadas como objeto de análise 13 teses produzidas no âmbito do Programa de Pós-Graduação em Educação da Universidade Federal do Paraná, indicativas de investigações que vêm sendo realizadas no Brasil e indiciárias desta renovação. A análise foi realizada a partir de critérios epistemológicos, teóricos e técnicos, sustentados pelo diálogo com a teoria e filosofia da História, de um lado e aspectos da metodologia da pesquisa qualitativa em educação, de outro. Resultados, ainda que parciais, indicam várias questões a serem levadas em consideração, no que se refere à aprendizagem das crianças e jovens, seja em ambiente escolar ou outros ambientes de aprendizagem. Ademais, suscitam novas questões de investigação, que também foram apontadas neste trabalho.


Introduction

The consolidation of history as a science excluded History Didactics from the center of reflection of the historian about his or her own profession, being replaced by a methodology of history research, provoking a separation between the teaching and researching of History. During the process of the History ‘scientification’, teaching came to be viewed as an activity of lesser value, merely a secondary reproduction of academic knowledge, with the aim of fulfilling presupposed purposes in the processes and forms of schooling of each society. To the act of teaching History and to the product of such act are attributed the status of science since, while the scientific knowledge was produced exclusively by History professionals, the task of History Didactics was to transmit this knowledge without participating in the creation of discourse (RÜSEN, 2010: 27).

This separation ended up leaving a void for academic historical knowledge, a gap in its function, because starting from the “19th Century, when historians constituted their discipline, they began to lose sight of an important principle, that is, that History must be connected to the social need for life orientation within the temporal structure” (RÜSEN, 2010: 31). The existent erudite knowledge
was validated to serve as a basis for the teaching, but the teaching of History was not justified because its function for practical life had been lost.

A type of disconnection of the History discipline from a practical sense, if on the one hand it offered the status of an erudite discipline, on the other hand it generated a void in the History teaching function in school. This point of view reached its apex in the middle of the 20th Century, a time in which formal History was not focused directly on the essence of scholarly historical knowledge. The historians supposed that the discipline could be legitimized by its mere existence and compared historical studies and their production of knowledge to a tree that produces its leaves. ‘‘The tree lives as long as it has leaves, and it is its destiny to live and to have leaves’. It refused to assign to history any practical or real function in cultural areas where History can serve as a means to provide an explicit collective identity and an orientation for life.’’ (RÜSEN, 2010: 34).

Starting in the second half of the 20th Century, several countries – including Canada, England, Portugal and Spain – augmented their research studies on the teaching of History, which came to be conducted primarily by historians. In Brazil, the phenomenon is related to an expansion of postgraduate courses, starting in the 1990s, in both Education and in History as specific lines of research on the teaching of history. Thus, gradually, the inclusion and demands of research on History teaching included new challenges to the craft of the historian.

It is understood that there are different manners of explaining the relationships between the historian and the research in the learning and teaching of History. From the outset, the relationships can be considered, when taking the history of education as an object of investigation, a consolidated field today in Brazil and many other countries; in other words, when one opens the intricate path that the research studies have been conducting about the teaching of History, with their multiple objects and methodological options, such as the history of History teaching, training of teachers, school practices and didactic manuals, accomplished predominantly by historians.

The title of the work opens a path to be taken, in that it seeks to elucidate how the relationships between the historian and the domain of specific research are constituted in the area of History teaching that is history education. It can be affirmed that the field of History Education has a historically constructed tradition dating back to the 1970s in Europe and the 1990s in Brazil. Furthermore, a specific theoretical framework has been constructed, starting from a conjunction of productions that range from lecturing experiences carried out on the schoolhouse floor, to dissertations, theses and vast scientific production, disseminated in books, either in chapters or articles published in specialized periodicals, whose inventory is already found in various publications. (BARCA,
The relationships between history, philosophy and education has been structured from several possibilities within the scope of the school culture\(^2\), that is, in relation to the dynamic of the processes and forms of historical and socially determined schooling. The broadening of possibilities, however, has forged a form of allocation of this relationship, today denominated History Education, constituting a specific cut in the field of History teaching. Its presuppositions are subscribed from the references of the philosophy and theory of History, as well as the apprehension of elements of qualitative educational research, especially under the shelter of sociological and ethnographic theories.

In general, the research line that takes references from the theory and philosophy of History as a theoretical and methodological support to analyze how History is learned by children, youths and teachers, calling itself “History Cognition”, now constitutes the scientific field or domain of investigation denominated “History Education”. In this field, the dimensions and elements related to the nature of the science of History and its articulations with learning and, therefore, the teaching of History, has been the point of departure and the definer of the object of investigations, their purpose and contribution to the systematization of results.

It is important to emphasize that the debates on changing the paradigm about the concept of learning History, from the scope of psychology to the philosophy of history, are being conducted and publicized in several countries around the globe. In Brazil, for example, the analysis by Caimi (2009) indicates two predominant tendencies in investigations on History learning conducted in the country: the first reports on studies that this author denominated “cognition studies”, “that tend more towards cognitive psychology”, while the other one, “denominated history education, dialogues more directly with the reference frame of the epistemology of history” (CAIMI, 2009: 70). It is precisely in the research studies referenced in the epistemology of history and in the Rusen perspective, which considers history consciousness to be a place of history learning (RÜSEN, 2012), a production located in the History Education Group at the Universidade Federal do Paraná, according to systematizations indicated by Germinari (2011) and Fronza (2012). The selection of theses that were pro-

\(^2\) Taking part in school culture are all the elements representative of a set of contents destined for school teaching, such as didactic manuals and curricula. See: FORQUIN, Jean-Claude. School and culture: the social and epistemological bases of school knowledge. Porto Alegre: Artes Médicas, 1993.
ducedin the scope of the UFPR Postgraduate Program in Education is justified, therefore, because they fit into the second line of investigation indicated.

The Portuguese investigator Isabel Barca, in an article published in 2005, indicates a new area of investigation denominated History Education, which encompasses research studies on the learning and teaching of History. In this case, the focus is on the principles, sources, typologies and strategies of History learning, with views toward systematic knowledge of ideas and development of historical thinking of students and teachers. The theoretical framework of these investigations is the nature of historical knowledge, whose objective is the development of historical thinking. In the conception of Barca (2005), the investigations into History Education are in one category, anchored in different fields, namely the Epistemology of History and the Methodology of Investigation in the Social Sciences. In this sense, it refers to the pioneering study by Dickson and Lee (1978) – Understanding and Research – in which these authors questioned the non-historical logic that served as a basis for previous research studies on the learning of History, particularly those influenced by Piaget.

Theoretical and methodological frame of reference underlying object analysis

The research pertaining to the present work is documentary and qualitative in its nature, and takes as its object of analysis 13 theses produced in the scope of the Postgraduate Program in Education, research line Culture, School and Teaching, between 2005 and 2017.
### CHART 1 – THESES ON HISTORY LEARNING PRODUCED AT PPGE/UFPR FROM 2005 TO 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>AUTHOR</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The formation of history consciousness as a History teaching objective in High School Teaching: the place of didactic material</td>
<td>MEDEIROS, Daniel</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On how didactization separates History learning from its object: study based on analysis of school students’ notebooks</td>
<td>GRENDEL, Marlene Therezinha</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History Didactics: History Didactics: paths of a disciplinary code in Brazil and in Spain</td>
<td>URBAN, Ana Claudia</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical narrative as a means of teaching and learning history: a historical case from Paraná</td>
<td>GEVAERD, Rosi Terezinha Ferrarini</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The history of a city, historical consciousness and identity young scholars</td>
<td>GERMINARI, Geyso Dongley</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-subjectivity and truth in the history learning of young students from comic book stories</td>
<td>FRONZA, Marcelo</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young students and history learning: perspectives and methodological principles from a work on a popular song</td>
<td>AZAMBUJA, Luciano de</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship theory and practice in training history teachers: experiences from teaching laboratories in Brazil and from the Association of Teachers of Portuguese History (1980-2010)</td>
<td>MARIN, Marilu Favarin</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cinema and history education: youths and their relationship with history in films</td>
<td>SOUZA, Eder Cristiano de</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History formation (Bildung) as a principle of History Didactics in High School Teaching: theory and praxis</td>
<td>DIVARDIM, Thiago Augusto</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth versus history: clashes between proposals from official documents for high school teaching and the meaning of history as a scholarly discipline</td>
<td>LOURENÇATO, Lidiane Camila</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The new humanism as a guiding principle in History Didactics: reflections from historical consciousness of Brazilian and English youth</td>
<td>NECHI, Lucas Pydd</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training of history teachers: history education, research and production of knowledge</td>
<td>SOBANSKI, Adriane de Quadros</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In agreement with the investigations conducted in different countries since 2000, the History education group of the Postgraduate Program in Education at the Universidade Federal do Paraná has come to develop research studies that originated dissertations and theses (SCHMIDT & URBAN, 2016), produced since 2002. The ascertainment, on the part of the UFPR group, of investigations conducted by the English group and by the Portuguese group, has been adorned by the work of Jörn Rüsen, mediated principally by the influence of Estevão Martins (UnB), and by dialogue with Jörn Rüsen himself, particularly since 2010. As election criterion of the theses was also the fact of having as a research objective the History learning, referenced in the philosophy of History.

The reference used for constructing the analytic step of the investigation was works of Pimenta (2002). Thus, it was sought to verify how the question of historical learning /learning history has been approached in research studies, their themes, purposes, methodological elements and results. Thus, the research path was guided by a planning constituted of theorization (linking the study to theories substantiating the research questions), as well as the collection and analysis of data from academic productions. In addition, it was possible to infer data and analyze them from two main indicators constructed from the theoretical reference frame adopted: 1. Foundations that guided the methodologies of investigation; 2. Foundations that guided the dialogue with the philosophy and theory of History.

Foundations that guided the investigation methodologies

The theses analyzed propose a dialogue with the qualitative investigation methodologies, in the educational area. In this sense, the school comes to be considered a place from which the initial questions of the activities and investigations are posed, such as: What happens in history classes? How do the changes occur? How is the teaching processed there? What types of relationships do the subjects establish with historical knowledge? What are or how do the teachers and students elaborate their comprehension of historical knowledge? What meanings does the historical knowledge have for the subjects involved in the teaching/learning process? How do youths and children react to the processes of producing historical knowledge? What is the result of historical knowledge in the formation of historical consciousness in youths and children?

The questions evidence the importance of a systematic interaction with reference frames of research studies in education that permit the investigator
to always start from the experience of the subjects. The category experience, as
certained from perspectives of sociology and anthropology, which enable the
giving of visibility to the subjects and to their actions, when they are placed in
relation to the knowledge. For the French education researcher and sociologist
François Dubet (2011), the investigations must take into account the actors, their
commitments, their justifications and their different constructions of reality. “In
the first place, it is possible to ask how it is presented in practice, in classes,
in school trials, in the interactions between teachers and students, among the
students themselves, to establish their hierarchies.” (DUBET, 2011, p.64). For
history education research, this principally signifies that the relationship with
historical knowledge must always be studied starting from the teachers, the
students and their experience. On the other hand, the experience viewed by the
ethnographic perspective never supports separating the datum from the inter-
pretation, the context of discovery from the context of verification. In the wake
of reflections broached by Rockwell (2011), one must distinguish the necessary
empirical work from an empiricist epistemology, “posture that is characterized
by the supposed separation between theory and data, between conception and
observation” (ROCKWELL, 2011, p.21).

The questions also signify investigative approaches with different perspec-
tives, anchored in defining and ordering principles of investigative pathways of
an ontological nature – a manner of viewing the social reality of an investigated
phenomenon, the investigated objects and the social actions produced; epistemo-
logical – attempting an analysis of how the relationships have been positioned
between the investigator and what is investigated; methodological – explicating
the means by which the reality and researched object are known, what instru-
ments and techniques are utilized and what type of results are produced.

Foundations that guided the dialogue with the philosophy and
theory of History

The thinking of the German historian and philosopher Jörn Rüsen may
be considered the main support for changing the paradigm in research studies,
when the author affirms that the Didactics of History are not the science of the
transposition of historical knowledge into school knowledge, but rather the
science of history learning. Rüsen points out the intrinsic relationship between
the Didactics of History and the Science of History, starting from the nature and
status of this relationship. Furthermore, when one questions what signifies the
scientific nature of History for the learning of History, the science of History must be consulted for the diverse forms and contents of this learning (RÜSEN, 2007). The systematic realization of consulting the science from a reference, in charts of relative production, particularly the philosophy of History, is a work done by the historian which permits, among others, elucidating questions pertaining to relationships between historical thinking and the formation of historical consciousness (SEIXAS, 2017), having as a reference the theory of historical consciousness and its articulation with the learning and the teaching of History.

Upon reaffirming the historical consciousness as a place of learning, Rüsen (2012) posed new questions from the conceptual point of view and from theoretical elaboration. To him, this would require empirical investigations, while demanding an operationalization of investigations in heuristic, analytic and interpretative perspectives. From the heuristic point of view, it means that a theory of history learning requires investigations that take into account the enunciations of historical consciousness, identifiers and enablers (from a theoretical point of view) of the performances of history learning (how is it manifested?). Here it can include the processes or strategies of historical thinking, such as historical explication, evidence, empathy and narrative, constituents of the epistemological concept of History. The analytic perspective indicates that a theory of learning history provides the criteria and categories necessary for investigations of the material content of the statements enunciated, for example, the category of multi-perspectivity, which can be analyzed and also worked, starting from the substantive concepts or contents of History. Finally, an interpretative perspective starts from a theory of History learning that enables the formation of investigations hypotheses on the empirical correlations between the different factors and development of a historical consciousness, and the conditions in which such correlations occur. In this case, examples of investigations can be cited that have undertaken pathways in an attempt to uncover the complex conditions in which relationships occur between the subjects and history learning and how they can be explicative of manners in which they construct meanings and attribute significances to the relationships between past, present and future.

This paradigm of History learning supposes that a historical consciousness is revealed, principally, in and by language. Thus, the linguistic annunciations of a historical narrative can be prioritized as a research interest, but not exclusively, because other elements, such as imagery symbols, are also indicative of expressiveness of senses of interpretation of time and, therefore, revealers of historical consciousness. Interesting investigation problems have been postulated, for example: how are the different phases of life (childhood, youth) related as a form of their models of historical interpretation? Are the models of historical interpretation influenced by the contents to the point of provoking...
alterations in their interpretation? Do models of interpretation depend, and if so to what degree do they depend, on worldviews and the ethics of learners? Does the ability to utilize more complex and elaborate interpretation models in the apprehension of historical experience diminish or increase, to the extent that the contents of the experience touch on immediate personal questions of the subjects, or do they contest self-affirmations and / or deeply rooted points of view? (RÜSEN, 2012, p. 94-102).

Starting from the basic presupposition that historical consciousness is a place of learning, some investigations have been concerned with such questions as to what constitutes the definition, conceptualization, elaboration, investigation of functions, approach to conditions, driving forces and consequences of historical ideas present in the school culture, whether in the ideas of teachers and students, or in other places of school culture, such as didactic manuals and curricula.

**Analysis of theses**

The signed indicators, namely the aspects related to elements of methodology and to the theoretical foundations of the science of History, constituted the elaborated excerpts for the analysis of the selected theses. It was they who defined how their objects or the relationships proposed were characterized in the construction of the relationship with History learning, aspects of investigation methodology and the analysis of results.
CHART 2 - OBJECTS OR RELATIONSHIPS PROPOSED WITH HISTORY LEARNING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJECTS OR TYPE OF RELATIONSHIP WITH HISTORY LEARNING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relationship between didactic materials and formation of historical consciousness (MEDEIROS, 2005).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning and historical narrative (GEVAERD, 2009).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship of history learning with didactics strategies – (GREND, 2009).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantive history concept of the city of Curitiba, historical consciousness and identities of young scholars. (GERMINARI, 2010).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning based on the development of history cognition situated in schooling contexts. Dialogue between considerations on how youths construct their identity self-knowledge, from the German philosopher of history Jörn Rüsen and from ideas of the Hungarian philosopher György Lukács, referent to reaffirmation of an active creation of the subject as an intersubjective form of non-alienated self-knowledge.(FRONZA, 2012).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of learning from protonarratives written by young Brazilian and Portuguese students, taking as a reference the first readings and hearings of a song source derived from their musical tastes mediated by selection criteria and a historical question formulated by a teaching researcher, and from the juxtaposition and constitution of an original historical consciousness and primary historical identity rooted in daily practical life. (AZAMBUJA, 2013).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The learning of young students from a work with films in history classes. The choice of Nazism as a historical concept addressed in the work part of the notion of its relevance in history culture and its significance for young students. (SOUZA, 2014).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: the author, 2018

Examination of the excerpts proposed by investigators permits inferring elements utilized to define their objects of investigation and establishing frames of reference for the analysis of relationships that the subjects realize with knowledge in situations of teaching and learning. There are clear indications of the importance of knowing processes for the formation of historical knowledge of an epistemological nature evidenced, for example, in studies on the interrelations between the formation of narrative competence and History learning, as well as the presence of inter-subjectivity in these processes. The category of protonarrative, or of previous narratives expresses types of historical consciousness and needs to be considered a point of departure for history learning. The importance of substantive concepts, particularly relative to tense or difficult events in History, such as Nazism, is analyzed in its relation to competence of attributing meanings by subjects. It should be highlighted that the dialogue with the education sciences can be identified in different situations, such as delimitation of the population to be studied and the contexts in which the subjects are identified, as well as the specificity of their culture, such as youth culture.
CHART 3 – MAIN CATEGORIES UTILIZED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORIES UTILIZED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>History culture – school culture – culture of the school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical consciousness – youths – identity of belonging.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situated history cognition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praxis as a reference for history learning and formation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attributions of history meaning and learning of youths.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanism as meaning for learning and formation of history consciousness of youths.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The investigation as a principle for teaching practices of the history teacher.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The categories utilized indicate the existence of a conceptual network already structured, enabling one to speak of the existence of a situated theoretical framework, principally in the category of culture and historical consciousness. In theoretical terms, there are elements indicative of the theoretical framework being referenced in the philosophy of History, in sociology and in anthropology, as they indicate the predominance of such categories as: history culture, school culture, culture of the school, historical consciousness, practical life, meaning, historical identity, youth culture, historical thinking, hypertext, protonarratives, situated history cognition, historical literacy, evidence, history explication, historical sources, history competence and interpretation. The presence of these categories also indicates a dialogue between the foundations of the science of reference, history, and the sciences of education, such as educational sociology.

CHART 4 – METHODOLOGICAL ELEMENTS OF THE RESEARCH STUDIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>METHODOLOGICAL ELEMENTS OF THE RESEARCH STUDIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Documentary research in notebooks of students and other didactic materials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empirical research in schools and with youths utilizing an open questionnaire and field observation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaire with open questions seeking to ascertain how the youths comprehend the relationship between the stories in comic books and historical truth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research action with the application of life narratives, questionnaires and observation in the classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus group methodology developed with young high school students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studies of a descriptive nature and a predominantly qualitative approach, utilizing a survey questionnaire followed by an interview.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data analysis, processed according to Grounded Theory, constructing a conceptual model based on the responses of the students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research of a collaborative nature, developed in school environments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative research utilizing questionnaires and quantitative, qualitative and mixed approaches.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A relationship with a theory indicates some elements constituting the investigation methodologies adopted, with a predominance of and emphasis on the methodology of qualitative educational research, principally of a descriptive character, presenting influences from sociological and ethnographic research studies. It highlights a difference in relation to research that is essentially historic, in which it weighs the theoretical references being from the science of History itself. The use of documentary research is accessorial in relation to field research, utilized in the analysis of students’ notebooks and textbooks, for example. The field research presents various nuances, with elements originating from other fields of investigation, such as collaborative research and focus-group study, utilizing different investigative instruments, including surveys in the form of questionnaires, semi-structured interviews, as well as participative and non-participative observation. The reference to *Grounded Theory* is emphasized in various works.

**CHART 5 – ELEMENTS SUGGESTED FROM THE RESULTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ELEMENTS SUGGESTED FROM THE RESULTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Records from students evidenced forms of teaching History knowledge that do not correspond to or express forms and/or functions performed by strictly historical thinking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicators of contradictions between the History lived by youths of research studies and the articulation between their consciousness of a city’s past, strongly ornamented by the schooling process, by the official discourse on the city and the formation of their identities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explication of ideas on historical truth and the inter-subjectivity that aids in constructing some criteria for the constitution of History learning based on humanist principles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The results extracted, categorized and interpreted from narrative sources, indicated that the writing of protonarratives from the first readings and hearings of a source song originating from the musical tastes of the youths, can mobilize the temporalities, competencies and dimensions of an original historical consciousness and an underlying constitution of a primary historical identity of students, to configure a point of departure motivating a subsequent process of school formation of historical consciousness and historical identity of high school students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The treatment of the data revealed a tendency associating the use made by students of sources with the vision that they present about the past, which demonstrates the importance of an appropriate utilization of sources for the formation of an advanced historical consciousness.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The analysis of the results signals the predominance of teaching methodologies based on conceptions of learning focused on the pedagogy of objectives and the development of skills and competences. Thus, an approach to History teaching can be recognized as one not founded upon a feasible learning theory the formation of meanings of temporal orientation, interpretation, experiencing
of the past and motivation in relation to the present and to the future. However, the investigations also present indications of great potentialities of youths and children for learning and formation of historical thinking, based on such categories as truth, evidence, inter-subjectivity and significance, as well as the necessity of taking as a point of departure learning the protonarratives or previous narratives of the students.

**Considerations or what the analysis das theses tells us**

The research in the theses indicates several questions to be taken into consideration, in relation to the learning of children and youths, either in the school environment or other learning environments, such as museums and archives.

1. **Changes in the relationship between learning and teaching of history.**

   The investigations about the learning of substantive and metahistorical concepts corroborate research studies already carried out in other countries and suggest that underlying the content of history are ideas on how we can as certain and account for the past, and explain what transpired. This signifies that the historical ideas that the students bring to the classroom need to be identified and developed, otherwise history learning is not concretized efficiently. Taking the previous ideas and protonarratives of the students as a point of departure for the learning appears to be an important datum that has been extracted from the research studies.

2. **Towards a concept of history literacy or how to teach students to think historically.**

   The theses, founded upon precepts of the philosophy of History, principally on the fact that historical consciousness is a point of departure and of arrival for learning history, corroborate the importance of the concept of history literacy (LEE, 2006) and that learning history means transforming information into knowledge, appropriating historical ideas of an evermore complex form. The concept of historical literacy takes into account that the purpose of teaching History is to bring to the population the contents, themes, methods, procedures and techniques that the historian utilizes to produce historical knowledge, except that it does not transform all persons into historians, but rather teaches them to think historically. This implies grasping how to dialogue with other people who lived in other eras and places, seeking to know how they lived, what they did, why they did it, and what were their struggles and problems.
3. History learning as formation of historical consciousness.

On the other hand, the results of research studies, whose focus is mainly the study of the historical consciousness of children and youths, indicate that it is possible to develop historical literacy, whose purpose is learning for the formation of a more complex historical consciousness. This means that it can achieve the objective of formation of a historical consciousness that surpasses traditional and exemplary forms of historical consciousness, responsible for consolidation of narratives based on linear organizations of time, as well as the view that history is the master of life. At the same time, in addition to avoiding the formation of critical consciousness founded on narratives that break with any possibility of reviewing the past. The possible objective to be reached, as the results presented in the theses indicate, is a critical-genetic consciousness, where the relationship between present and past would be founded on more complex narratives that lend themselves to a temporal orientation toward the present life, based on some principles such as liberty, democracy and human rights.

The formation of historical consciousness, the main purpose of teaching history, takes into consideration that both teachers and students take part in a collective and a social time. The investigations concretized in different theses are indictors that the three dimensions of history learning suggested by Jörn Rüsen (2012) – experience, interpretation and orientation– are always intimately related, since there is no historical experience without meaning or historical orientation without experience, which implies some consequences, one of which is the fact that history learning can never be dissociated from the subject that apprehends, for example the youth and the youth culture and, therefore, the learning dynamic does not take place when history is taught as something given. Thus, it may be concluded that knowing history is not the same thing as correctly thinking historically, since the historical knowledge that is only learned as something given does not develop the capacity of giving meanings to history and guide the ones who learn according to their own historical experience.

New questions for investigation

Results from the investigations explicated that the 13 theses analyzed suggest some issues for deeper examination, such as: explore how the students construct significant narratives on long periods of history, relating past, present and future, investigating the presuppositions that lead them to construct their narratives of some determinate forms and not of others. Another exciting theme
refers to the importance of investigating different influences such as those from the media, the family and the internet, in a manner by which the children and youths relate to history.

Questions like these refer to two tendencies currently present in debates on history education. The first points out the need to qualify History learning starting from the concept of transformative History, that is, taking into account the set of questions that address the concern with the relation to aspects of History learning and, therefore, the teaching of History, that transform the manner in which the students are able to see the world in which they live. In this sense, it would be important to maintain such questions as: To what point does historical knowledge change the ideas of the students as to suitable responses to current diplomatic, political, economic, environmental and cultural problems? And how long can these changes last?

The second, on the paths of Jörn Rüsen thought, indicates the importance of thinking toward the formation of historical consciousness in the perspective of a humanist didactic approach to History (NECHI, 2017). This presupposition instigates new themes for debate, such as the proper meaning of History Education Didactics, its theoretical scope, nature and dimensions. In addition, they demand that comparative analyses be carried out in different countries and historical moments, as well as their interfaces with contemporaneous questions, such as the new relations with nature and the different interpellations applied to the past.

In the same form, the category of interculturality (FRONZA, 2012), has brought new and complex challenges to history education, in the sense that when investigating the presence of interculturality as a presupposition for analyzing the inequalities constructed throughout history, between different sociocultural groups, including ethno-racial and gender ones. Furthermore, they enable the foundation of an interculturality that leads to the construction of a society that assumes the differences as constitutive of democracy and is capable of constructing newtruly egalitarian relationships among the different sociocultural groups, like an utopia that signifies real empowerment of all who were exploited historically. These are important principles to be considered by the historian thinking of what to do in History Education Research and why to do it.
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