



Preparing Preservice Teachers to Implement Holocaust Curriculum in Elementary Grades: A Study that Shows the Effects on Undergraduate Students' Cognitive, Reflective, Affective, and Active Domains

*Ilene Allgood, Florida Atlantic University
Rachayita Shah, The Corella & Bertram F. Bonner Foundation¹*

Washing one's hands of the conflict between the powerful and the powerless means to side with the powerful, not to be neutral
Paulo Freire (1985)

Abstract

Recognizing the need to prepare elementary education teacher-candidates to implement state-mandated curriculum, a Genocide Studies Unit was developed. This study evaluated the effectiveness of the Unit in building preservice teachers' knowledge-base and efficacy levels with a mind toward preparing teachers to implement difficult content more effectively. Participants reported increased content knowledge about genocide studies, and expressed confidence in teaching sensitive and challenging topics in their classrooms.

Keywords: *anti-bias and Holocaust education; genocide studies; preservice teacher preparation; multicultural education; curriculum development; prejudice reduction; teaching controversial issues; elementary grades*

Introduction

With a renewed incentive to teach and apply the moral lessons of the Holocaust, along with the growing trend across the nation to mandate some form of genocide or Holocaust education in schools, the imperative to enhance teacher competency in this area increases. Research verifies that the principles of critical multicultural education and Holocaust education have a mitigating effect in reducing prejudice and bigotry (Anti-Defamation League, 2013; Marttila 2011; Shoham, Shiloah, & Kalishman, 2003). Researchers in both fields have argued that extremism, terrorism, and tyranny, some of the consequences of unchecked prejudice, need to be combatted through education and legislation. The result has been that a number of states have mandated the teaching

1. The authors are grateful to Dr. Rose M. Gatens who contributed to this effort through her counsel and expertise on the subject having served as the Director of the Center for Holocaust and Human Rights Education at Florida Atlantic University at the time of this study. We appreciate her genuine interest in this study and her insightful valuable feedback on this project.

of the Holocaust so that students can learn from that history how to prevent such atrocities from occurring again. Indeed, Representatives Boyle, Ros-Lehtinen, Deutch, and Fitzpatrick in April 2017 introduced bipartisan legislation mandating nationwide Holocaust Education similar to the Holocaust Education Bill (F.S. 1003.42) which was passed by the Florida Legislature in 1994. The law strengthens the mandates in that it requires all school districts to incorporate lessons on the Holocaust as part of public school instruction, kindergarten through twelfth grade. The effectiveness of the Florida mandate's integration and the quality of the curriculum and methodology for genocide studies rest on the preparation of teachers.

According to Lindquist (2007), the Holocaust is perhaps the most compelling topic studied in U.S. schools. Moreover, scholars argue that social studies teachers see the benefit in teaching controversial issues in the classroom in that this heightens students' critical consciousness, civic mindedness, and socio-political activism, however, they feel constrained by perceived disruptions in the classroom and consequences to their job by doing so (Byford, Lennon, & Russell, 2009). Considering the heightened significance of this topic in schools and society, and the research that supports teaching controversial issues to stimulate critical engagement, it is crucial that teachers have the necessary support to develop a strong knowledge-base in the history of the Holocaust and to adopt sound pedagogical approaches to educate students about this subject-matter. Today, there are some resources and curriculum support for in-service teachers who infuse genocide studies into their curriculum. At the preservice level, however, there are a number of challenges to preparing teachers who can effectively implement Holocaust and Genocide Education in schools. First, there is a dearth of opportunities for preservice teachers in undergraduate teacher education programs to learn the content and pedagogy of this subject matter. Second, preservice teachers feel unprepared to handle the difficult and controversial topics arising from studying the Holocaust and genocide Bartlett (2009). Donnelly (2006), pointed out that this weakness could be overcome through high-quality professional development in the area of Holocaust education. As Ellison (2002) and Shah (2012) indicated, teachers who receive this training are more likely to implement the lessons. This position is supported by the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum (USHMM), which considers vital, the historical significance of the Holocaust, its pedagogical value, and its potential to spread awareness on human rights issues. Researchers observed that in order for teachers to understand how to teach the Holocaust effectively, they need to experience good pedagogy first (Borko, 2004; Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1999). A third challenge faced by preservice and in-service teachers is the phenomenon of "Holocaust Fatigue" a term introduced by Simone Schweber, (2006) to describe more recent student resistance to learning about the Holocaust and genocide and the potential for trivialization of the event to the extent that it loses its pedagogical value; and thereby results in the reduction of the power of Holocaust study to deepen students' capacity for moral reasoning.

Recognizing the need to prepare elementary education teacher-candidates to implement state-mandated curricula and to address the challenges that thwart effective teaching practices, a faculty member in Florida Atlantic University's Department of Curriculum, Culture and Educational Inquiry (CCEI) developed and implemented a Genocide Studies Unit (GSU), and concurrently formed a research collaboration with the Program Manager of the Center for Holocaust and Human Rights Education (CHHRE) at Florida Atlantic University to evaluate the efficacy of the unit. The unit (GSU) was designed and implemented in a required undergraduate multicultural education course. The study's intent was to evaluate the effectiveness of the GSU in building preservice teachers' knowledge and efficacy with regard to genocide education. The researchers were interested in identifying the specific components of the unit that resonated most with students and

in determining whether the delivery format (either face-to-face or fully online) made any difference in the participants' knowledge acquisition or efficacy levels.

Research indicates that when it comes to culturally responsive teaching, preservice teachers sometimes may harbor deficit perspectives about victims of violence (Castro, 2010). If these perceptions and attitudes are not examined or challenged, participants (students) may think of victims as passive human beings without any sense of agency (Fogelman, 1994; Oliner & Oliner, 1988). Such prejudices could possibly be eroded by asking preservice teachers to analyze victims' and survivors' narratives through diaries, memoirs, and films, along-side the historical narrative of mass atrocities. In addressing this concern, the GSU was designed as an integral part of a multicultural education course focused on studying genocides by analyzing "counter narratives" (Schneider, 2014), which means understanding historical events from less dominant perspectives. In Schneider's (2014) words, "Counter-narratives are important to push back against the Dominant Discourse (the language of those in power) of history that celebrates only the ones who were able to "win"."

The counter-narrative helps learners move beyond "what happened" or how many were murdered (statistics) and highlights individual's experiences and circumstances. For the GSU, the instructors presented the history of the Holocaust, which not only discussed the historical context, but also individuals' experiences of dehumanization. The pre-service teachers were shown examples of victims' narratives through diaries, poems, and testimonies (e.g. *Harmonica*, *Hannah's Suitcase*, *I Never Saw Another Butterfly*, documentaries and excerpts from Anne Frank's diary etc.) and were guided to adapt a similar approach while studying other genocides. See appendix B for suggested readings for the GSU. These types of narratives have the potential to help preservice teachers comprehend the complexity of the situation and the dilemma that individuals faced regarding making choices during those unprecedented times, and to encourage them to be more reflective. As noted by Shah (2012), effective professional development approaches facilitate examination of diverse perspectives (narratives), engage participants in self-reflection, and create curricular spaces for participants to connect the past and the present. The GSU curriculum was designed keeping in mind these approaches to encourage students to comprehend the complexity of the genocide, to think critically about individual choices under dire circumstances, and to examine the historical and social contexts under which prejudicial attitudes take shape. While deficits in millennial preservice teachers' experiences are noted, these teacher-candidates also express a type of naïve egalitarianism—in particular they also are somewhat naïve about the complexity of structural and institutional inequalities. Additionally, they often are still developing the skill of critical awareness (Castro, 2010; Mueller & O'Connor, 2007). These findings support the imperative for direct and deep genocide education. While examining the Holocaust/Shoah as a case study of genocide, the researchers discussed the impact of prejudice and the role of propaganda in mobilizing groups of people to commit atrocities. The goal was to help the participants understand how institutional racism is fueled by socially accepted prejudices, even in "well-developed" and "modern" societies.

While there is a limited amount of research comparing the efficacy of fully online (FOL) to face-to-face (F2F) instruction especially when dealing with sensitive topics, researchers have found that educators believe that F2F is more effective because in part that format can provide experiential learning and in-person collaborative opportunities. Stauss, Koh, & Collie (2018) looked at students taking a Human Diversity course in a F2F format and in a FOL format (with 3 synchronous sessions) and found that both groups showed increases in multicultural awareness and oppression issues with no statistical difference. The authors were also interested in looking at the effectiveness of FOL/synchronous instruction agreeing in part that real time "live" interaction

was necessary for students to process and reflect on the content, which is why the online course was developed as a 12-week live (highly interactive) synchronous format where students were required to attend regularly scheduled class sessions and participate. In fact, attendance and participation were factored in their grades.

The study of genocides can be daunting for students due to the sensitivity of the subject-matter and in some cases, due to the claims of denial from individuals and groups. The ultimate goal of genocide education is to leave the learners feeling empowered and activated, never hopeless or stymied as to what to do. Within the framework of multicultural education, the goals of Holocaust/genocide education include developing empathy among people and encouraging individuals to become advocates for peace and justice (Banks & Banks, 2016; Gorski, 2009). In that context, the GSU also offered examples of role models who were engaged in rescue, resistance, and advocacy efforts with a view to encouraging students to reflect on their own roles as advocates for building solidarity in a diverse society. The research questions that guided our study were:

- What is the role of a Genocide Studies Unit (GSU) in building preservice teachers' knowledge-base about genocide education?
- What is the role of a Genocide Studies Unit (GSU) in developing preservice teachers' efficacy levels in implementing genocide education?
- Does the delivery format of instruction (i.e. face-to-face or fully on-line), make any difference in preservice teachers' knowledge and comfort levels with genocide education?

Methodology

Overview of the Genocide Studies Unit (GSU)

The Genocide Studies Unit (GSU), embedded within a critical multicultural framework, was designed to guide preservice teachers through a focused study of a particular genocide which they selected. The GSU asked them to reflect on the complexity of the causes of genocide, the imperative for activism, and the curriculum and methodology for teaching these universal themes in their future classrooms. The GSU was infused as the major critical assignment in an upper-division, undergraduate course which relied heavily on the theories of critical multicultural education and critical race theory (Sleeter & Bernal, 2004; Ladson-Billings, 2004). Other topics of this multicultural course included an in-depth look at various examples of oppression and systemic injustices, such as racism, heterosexism, and faithism (Allgood, 2016), since they may be problematic and cause contention in classrooms.

Components of the GSU

There were four scaffolding components that organized the GSU process:

1. The initial component prepared students to conduct a Critical Analysis (CA)—a focused and comprehensive study of a genocide. Students learned the terminology of genocide (e.g. prejudice, stereotyping, dehumanization, etc.) and the theoretical framework (i.e. Stanton's (2012) Ten Stages, Rummel's (2001) concept of democide, and the Anti-Defamation League's (2005) Pyramid of Hate). The Holocaust was presented

- as a case study to demonstrate the method and criteria of the research project. The focus was on fundamental causes, the lessons, and legacy.
2. The second component was the Critical Assignment (CA), an investigation of a particular genocide, chosen by students. They were required to examine the underlying political, social, and economic factors that triggered the genocide, and analyze its immediate and current impact.
 3. The third component focused on implications for teacher-practice by discussing grade-appropriate children's literature (e.g. the Ugly Duckling—Kindergarten and the Sneetches—2nd grade) and connected these resources to the key themes (e.g. similarities and differences, respecting differences, finding commonalities, empathy, overcoming prejudice, advocacy etc.). Methodology was supported by the USHMM guidelines ("Guidelines for Teaching," n.d.) and the imperatives for teaching this content (i.e. to inspire civic/social activism and meeting the mandate) were included.
 4. The final component required students to reflect on what they learned and to assess their own confidence with their content knowledge and comfort levels in teaching this subject matter.

Participants

Undergraduate students who were enrolled in the upper-division undergraduate level Multicultural Education class were invited to participate in the study (N = 60). Participants (juniors and seniors) were pursuing bachelor's degrees in Education at the time the study was conducted. Participants' majors included Elementary Education as well Exceptional Student Education. All the participants were females, and their ages ranged from 23–51. A total of 26 out of 60 participants responded to the survey; however, 5 of them did not complete the survey. 12 out of 26 participants took the course in a fully online (FOL) format, whereas the others were enrolled in a Face to Face (F2F) section.

Research Instrument 1: Survey

After Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval and the pilot test, the survey was sent out to all the participants (N = 60). The consent form was included in the survey. In order to remain anonymous, the participants were asked to sign the consent form digitally. The administration of the survey was done online through Survey Monkey Software. Descriptive statistics was used for all the survey items pertaining to participants' levels of awareness, levels of efficacy, and usefulness of the GSU components. A 4-Point Likert-type scale was used for these items. After individual item analysis, a composite score analysis was also conducted. The score on the items was analyzed in terms of percentages. Due to the limited sample size and low response rate, paired t-tests could not be used to determine the significance of the findings. Finally, the scores for the FOL and F2F groups were compared to see if the delivery format played any role in these scores.

Research Instrument II – Reflective Essay

Participants' responses to the prompt for a reflective essay were analyzed. The initial analysis of these data consisted of coding the individual responses according to ideas that pertained to the key components of genocide education such as content knowledge, pedagogical knowledge, preparedness, and willingness to teach. Following the axial coding, the data pertaining to each

construct were analyzed to identify emerging themes that revealed the nature of the GSU and its role in developing participants' knowledge and efficacy levels. These themes also helped to identify the strengths and the weaknesses of the GSU components.

Data Analysis

Participants' responses to survey questions and reflective essays were analyzed to ascertain the impact the GSU had on their own perceived cognitive development and confidence levels which resulted from exposure to all the elements of the GSU. Participants' responses about their knowledge of the subject-matter and pedagogical approaches to Holocaust and genocide education provided insight into their knowledge-base and their abilities to apply this learning to understand current social issues. Participants' attitudes were measured based on the perception of their preparedness to introduce this subject matter to their students, their confidence levels and willingness to teach, and their readiness to become human rights advocates.

We arranged our data into four domains based on a construct that measured curriculum effectiveness in reducing prejudice and dogmatism levels in undergraduate students (Allgood, 1998). Regarding participants' knowledge level, the first two domains were the Cognitive Domain (CD) and the Reflective Domain (RD). The CD sought to capture specific content and concept knowledge, whereas the RD highlighted critical thought processing and application of the concepts and content acquired through exposure to the GSU. We attempted to study participants' efficacy and empowerment through the Affective Domain (AfD), which encompassed the participants' emotional response to the GSU (i.e. their willingness to teach and concerns about teaching the content). The fourth domain was the Active Domain (AcD), which encompassed the participants' expression of willingness to advocate for victims of genocide or to take action to prevent genocide.

Results and Discussion

The findings within the Cognitive Domain and the Reflective Domain corresponded to research question one (contributions of the GSU to participants' knowledge-base); whereas the findings within the Affective Domain and the Active Domain corresponded to research question two (contributions of the GSU to participants' attitudes). One of the survey items asked participants to indicate the delivery mode of the course (Fully-Online or Face-to-Face) in which, they experienced the GSU. Based on participants' responses, scores were arranged in two groups to determine whether the difference in participants' knowledge and comfort levels with genocide education was related to the delivery format of instruction (i.e. face to face or fully online).

Cognitive Domain

Survey Findings: Understanding the Root Causes and Concepts Related to Genocide:

Survey items 7a to 7n (as shown in *Table 1*) dealt with participants' perceptions of their knowledge about the concepts and causes related to genocide before and after their participation in the GSU. Table 1 indicates the composite score of each of these items for both groups: students enrolled in a fully online course and students in a face to face class. These scores indicate participants' knowledgebase before and after their participation in the GSU. A composite score of these individual items after their participation in the GSU was 3 or above, indicating participants' in-

creased levels of awareness after the GSU intervention. The survey items that particularly corresponded with the qualitative findings are: 7a (genocide), 7b (ethnic cleansing), 7c (human rights), 7d (propaganda), and 7e (root causes of genocide), which will be discussed in the next section.

Table 1

	Survey Items	Fully online		Face to Face	
		Before	After	Before	After
a	Genocide	2.3	3.8	2.4	3.8
b	Ethnic Cleansing	1.7	3.6	2.0	3.4
c	Human Rights	2.5	3.4	2.8	3.7
d	Propaganda	2.3	3.4	2.3	3.4
e	Root Causes of Genocide	1.7	3.7	1.6	3.5

Reflective Essay Findings: Understanding the Root Causes and Concepts Related to Genocide

Participants identified the underlying causes of various genocides as racism, xenophobia, discrimination, hatred, European imperialism, ultra-nationalism, communism, and colonization. They reported religious, social, and economic factors that contributed to such atrocities, and applied the concept of scapegoating, brainwashing/propaganda, and ethnocentrism to analyze various stages of genocide. For example, the following response reflects a participant’s understanding of the root causes of genocide: “I have learned that power, greed, control and selfishness can create the right environment for genocide and these characteristics can appear anywhere and anytime” (The participant studied the Rwandan genocide).

Survey Findings: Understanding the Legacy of Genocide

A composite score of survey item 7h “After-effects of genocide” indicates an increased level of awareness about understanding the legacy of genocide. This result was also confirmed in participants’ reflective essays; a more detailed discussion of which will be discussed in the next section.

Table 2

	Survey Item	Fully online		Face to Face	
		Before	After	Before	After
h	After-effects of genocide	1.8	3.7	2.0	3.4

Reflective Essay Findings: Understanding the Legacy of Genocide

Participants discussed the legacy of the genocide that they studied in terms of policy implications, the effect on the victims, and the effects on respective countries in which genocides took place. Some of the students referred to the United Nations' role during and after these atrocities, the change in U.S. immigration policies after the Holocaust, and government accountability (e.g. a bill was passed in Cambodia that made it illegal to deny the horrific events, whereas Turkey still denies the Armenian genocide). Participants were also able to recognize the long-term effects of physical, mental, social, and psychological problems among victims. Economic struggles and reconstruction were also viewed as major problems facing countries in which genocides took place. Participants also referred to current events that raise concern; the emotional scars with which survivors live, the importance of the message "never again," and fair treatment for all. These findings reflected participants' ability to connect the past and current events and examine an issue from diverse perspectives.

Survey Findings: Understanding World Response

Survey responses indicated increased levels of awareness among participants regarding the response of the U.S. and the world; whereas, reflective essays demonstrated participants' analysis and expanded understanding on these topics.

Table 3

	Survey Items	Fully online class		Face to face class	
		Before	After	Before	After
i	The United States' Response to Genocides	1.6	3.4	2.0	3.5
j	The Global Response to Genocides	1.6	3.3	1.9	3.3

Reflective Essay Findings: Understanding World Response

Participants described the world response to genocide mainly in terms of "a lack of intervention" or "delayed response." They acknowledged the help from some countries and the role of the UN in these events; however, a major point of concern was the absence of intervention. There was a comparison of the role of the U.S. during the Armenian genocide to its response during the

Holocaust. Participants also critiqued immigration policies, the use of weapons, attack methods, and interrogation tactics in context of the role of the U.S. during various genocides.

Reflective Domain

Reflective Essay Findings: Contributions of the GSU to Participants' Critical Thought Processing

Whereas survey item 7e helped identify participants' knowledge of root causes of genocide, reflective essays provided an insight into participants' analysis of those root causes. Participants analyzed the historical contexts under which various genocides took place. References were made to government policies, guerilla supports of communism (Cambodian), eugenics, Nazi ideology (the Holocaust), World War I (Armenian), colonialism and racism (Rwandan), scapegoating, and government sponsored propaganda. They clearly identified the role that respective governments played in these genocides. In fact, students were able to categorize the type of genocide they studied (e.g. democide, politicide, and ethnic cleansing). Participants' ability to apply the learning of these concepts to analyze their respective case studies demonstrated their growth under reflective domain. Some of these concepts such as politicide and democide were not listed on the survey, yet students identified them in their reflections, which helped to substantiate the quantitative findings regarding knowledge acquisition. These findings are significant, because they address the concern that was raised in the literature regarding the degree to which participants' lack of understanding of historical context contributed to the formation of "deficit perspectives," especially in the context of genocide victims. These findings demonstrate participants' enhanced understanding of the role of respective governments in creating environments that lead to genocide, and the complex situations under which, victims are pressured to make "choiceless choices."

Survey Findings: Understanding Human Behavior

Survey items in *Table 2* echo similar findings, i.e., participants reported an increased level of awareness about the causes and effects of prejudice, the importance of recognizing and combating prejudice in schools and society, and finally individuals' roles and responsibilities in a multicultural society. These findings shed light on how important each individual's role is in recognizing and combating prejudice.

Table 4

	Survey Items	Fully online		Face to Face	
		Before	After	Before	After
g	Causes and Effects of Prejudice	2.1	3.6	2.3	3.8
k	Recognizing and combating prejudices in schools and society	2.1	3.4	2.1	3.4

1	Individuals' roles and responsibilities in a democratic/multicultural society	1.8	3.1	1.8	3.1
---	---	-----	-----	-----	-----

Reflective Essay Findings: Understanding Human Behavior

Participants wrestled with the complex nature of human behavior, while studying genocides. When participants were given examples from the “Some Were Neighbors” exhibit by the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, they wondered what prompted individuals to make choices about being silent or being a collaborator with the Nazis. One participant struggled with this and stated, “Human Behavior fascinates and terrifies me...I couldn’t grasp how someone could go from being a neighbor, friend or pastor one day and on the next day, willingly commit murder against another.”

Moreover, participants referred to the bystanders’ roles multiple times in their responses, and reflected upon various reasons for this behavior. Fear, intimidation, prejudice, and a quest to gain material benefits (e.g. confiscated property or jewelry) were identified as some reasons for this behavior. Participants explained that fear of being judged or being different was often a major reason for people to hesitate to stand up against injustices. Intimidation was understood in context of the authoritarian tactics used by a person in power to discourage people from opposing her/his actions. Prejudice, discrimination, and propaganda were also identified as major reasons for bystander behavior. It encouraged participants to avoid classifying people as bystanders, perpetrators, upstanders (active advocates), and victims; rather, it prompted them to ask how and why an individual may be a friend or an advocate in one situation, but the same person may choose to be silent in another situation. Was that choice a result of one’s fear, expected political or social gain, prejudice, propaganda, or something else? These findings demonstrate the importance of exploring “counter-narratives,” as discussed by Schneider (2014), because the process enabled the participants to examine the complexity of human behavior, the influence of manipulation and political power in a society, and one’s susceptibility to such influence in certain situations.

Reflective Essay Findings: Understanding Pedagogical Approaches

There were no survey items to identify participants’ growth in this area; however, participants’ reflective essays demonstrated their knowledge about various pedagogical approaches to implement genocide education. When the participants’ change in knowledge of pedagogical approaches was analyzed, it was noticed that students often drew their analyses from the principles of multicultural education. For example, some principles of multicultural education include the consideration and acceptance of diverse groups and perspectives; and standing up against prejudice. Participants pointed to the importance of using topics of diversity and racism to facilitate discussions on genocides, and the need to treat others respectfully. They discussed how crucial it is to understand racism and imperialism, to be compassionate of others, and to preserve the history and culture of oppressed people. Other ideas that echoed the principles of multicultural education were the necessity to embrace differences and protect human rights.

Affective Domain

Reflective Essay Findings: Willingness to Incorporate Genocide Education in Curriculum and Connect with Students

Students reported how they would use genocide studies to connect to their students (especially those from oppressed groups). They reported how important it was to advocate against prejudice and instill respect for those who are different. One student reported how crucial it is to teach children to analyze all perspectives of an event, “I intend to encourage students to ‘see beyond’ the information initially presented. I want my students to take initiative to learn about the world...and question what can be done to improve it.”

This example provides an insight into how the principles of MCE, such as an analysis of diverse perspectives and challenging the status quo, are integrated into this participant’s thinking pattern. This finding is significant in the context that many national organizations such as the Anti-Defamation League and the Southern Poverty Law Center advocate for anti-bias and anti-racist pedagogy and curriculum. Both organizations explain the importance of applying multicultural philosophy to reduce biases such as racism. Multicultural curriculum encourages a deep understanding of social problems and stresses social activism. An informed knowledgebase on issues and their underlying causes is a mandatory starting point for the teacher who wishes to be a critical multicultural educator.

Survey Findings: The Contributions of the GSU to Participants’ Attitudes

As previously mentioned, participants’ attitudes were measured based on their perceived level of preparation to introduce genocide studies to their students and their confidence levels to teach and advocate in this area. Their reflections demonstrated self-awareness of their own aptitude for Holocaust/genocide pedagogy (reflective domain) as well as their confidence-level to integrate that pedagogy (affective domain). Because the findings provided more insight into the affective domain (i.e. the emotional impact), it is discussed in this section. The following table indicates participants’ confidence levels in teaching some of the topics of genocide studies, before and after the GSU:

Table 5

	Survey Items	Fully online		Face to Face	
		Before	After	Before	After
8e	Root causes of genocide	1.5	3.1	1.6	3.2
8f	Stages of genocide	1.6	3.2	1.6	3.2
8g	Causes and effects of prejudice	1.8	3.2	2.0	3.3
8h	After-effects of genocide	1.6	3.1	1.8	3.2

8k	Recognizing and combating prejudice in schools and society	1.8	3.1	2.0	3.3
8l	Individuals' roles and responsibilities in a democratic/multicultural society	1.7	3.0	2.1	3.2

Though the survey findings helped to identify participants' attitudinal shifts in terms of their confidence to teach this subject matter, the findings from the reflective essays enhanced the researchers' understanding of other areas as well. For example, the reflective essays shed light not only on participants' confidence levels with teaching certain topics, but also with their concerns and willingness to teach. These are discussed in the following sections.

Reflective Essay Findings: Self-Reflection on One's Knowledge-Gap

When asked to think about the gaps in their prior knowledge, participants expressed the need for more pedagogical knowledge of how to provide a historical context when teaching about genocide. They wanted to know how to choose age-appropriate resources, how much detail should be provided, and how to form a safe classroom environment to navigate genocide studies. One student reflected, "I was never given the opportunity to understand the 'why' behind it, nor was I challenged to critically analyze the impact genocide had around the world." Students also asked about how to teach the role played by prejudice or discrimination in individuals' choices (e.g. bystander attitudes). They reported how important it was for them to conduct background research and to understand curriculum guidelines to implement genocide education.

This is an interesting finding, because though participants' survey responses indicated that they felt moderately confident about teaching some of the above-mentioned topics, they also felt the need for more knowledge and guidance in this matter. This echoes Bartlett's (2009) finding regarding preservice teachers' concern to mediate through difficult and controversial topics, and offers implications in terms of designing more opportunities, where participants could practice these skills.

Reflective Essay Findings: Teaching Concerns

One of the major concerns among students was how to approach this topic in an age-appropriate manner. The overwhelming majority of these students were enrolled in an elementary education degree program, so their strong concern in teaching this subject matter to young children was clearly evident. Some students felt that it was important for them as teachers to hold back emotions and to reflect on their own prejudices in order to create a safe environment for learning and to facilitate discussions. Other concerns included how to handle disagreements among students due to diverse perspectives, and how to address genocide denial.

Data were collected before the final session on curriculum and pedagogy of genocide studies. Based on students' questions gathered in previous components, researchers were able to ascertain what students needed or what their concerns were in implementing genocide education and these concerns were incorporated into the final component of the assignment. Part III of the GSU

entailed collaboration among the instructor, the school district's multicultural department's professional staff, and the CHHRE staff who jointly presented grade-appropriate curriculum resources and pedagogical methodology to inform the participants of approved curriculum and methodology for implementing Holocaust education in early grades. The session also included multiple activities including a case study and discussion opportunities where students navigated different approaches to teaching about genocides in age-appropriate ways. The survey data indicate that the case study approach was very well received with 89% of participants rating it very useful with the remaining 11% rating it moderately useful in developing an understanding of genocide.

Active Domain

Reflective Essay Findings: Attitudes in Context of Human Behavior

Students frequently expressed their bewilderment at the atrocities, the lack of compassion, and bystander attitudes. They expressed moral outrage and found it difficult to understand inhumane behavior. Their emotions ranged from compassion to anger. They referred to empathy, ethics, and respect as important aspects of a society. One of the participants expressed, "It upsets me because sometimes the ignorance of people is a choice. This ignorance and choice to not at least acknowledge this event makes it worse because it shows that they still don't care about the Armenians." Though this is not a direct indication of their willingness to act on behalf of others (or the vulnerable groups), it is indicative of their willingness to engage in conversations around advocacy and solidarity.

Reflective Essay Findings: Attitudes in Context of Empowerment

These findings reflect participants' readiness to become advocates for justice, shedding light on their responses in the active domain. Many scholars agree that the central tenet of critical multicultural education is identifying, exposing and challenging "isms" (racism, antisemitism, etc.) and the hegemonic undercurrents which cause oppression, while also empowering a citizenry that will actively work to prevent systemic injustices and bring about a transformation of society. It is imperative that classroom teachers conceptualize the broader vision of multicultural education as creating bastions of social justice (Schoorman & Bogotch, 2010). Here lies the overlap of genocide studies and multicultural education. To learn about a historically oppressive event such as the Holocaust, requires the learner to engage with the same issues. The participant added, "The most important lesson I learned is to stand up for what you believe."

The study yielded findings that reflected students' emerging empowerment and willingness to be a voice for those who could not speak for themselves. A strong personal desire to become advocates was evident in their reflective essays. Further, participants also expressed an imperative to teach their students the importance of advocacy, activism and social justice.

Their statements reflected commitment to advocacy and the prevention of injustice and prejudice. Empowerment was also reflected in their statements about teaching for activism and advocacy. Some students reported that they would teach students to be involved and to question injustice. They referred to anti-bias education to help students become advocates of justice.

...events such as the [H]olocaust are too gruesome to teach children, but this genocide studies unit has brought a new light. I have now realized that teaching genocide is a form of preserving the identity, culture, and history of those oppressed people.

These findings reaffirm the principles of critical multicultural education and Holocaust education as having a mitigating effect in reducing prejudice and bigotry (Anti-Defamation League, 2013; Marttila 2011; Shoham, Shiloah, & Kalishman, 2003).

The Differences between Face-to-Face and Fully On-line Delivery Format

Another area of interest to the researchers was whether the participants' knowledge and attitude scores were mediated by the delivery format – Face-to-Face (F2F) and Fully-on-line (FOL). It is important to note that the FOL content delivery was accomplished during weekly, real-time (synchronous) sessions on the Blackboard Collaborate platform. This delivery platform allows for live verbal discussions that imitate a F2F classroom setting. Data were collected in a survey which measured participants' overall satisfaction with the GSU and included questions on teaching methodology and professorial support. Due to a small sample size, it was difficult to run t-tests with statistically significant findings; however, in conducting a comparison of mean scores, there appears to be a slightly higher satisfaction level in the F2F format on survey items related to content knowledge. It was striking that in the category of confidence to teach about genocide, students in the FOL format reported higher confidence levels compared with students in the students in F2F format. At this point, it is difficult to draw any definitive conclusions in terms of the role of the delivery format in mediating these scores. However, knowing that any effective delivery system whether it be FOL or F2F, requires best practices such as providing students with comprehensive and multi-dimensional learning opportunities, social interaction, real-time feedback, validation and empowerment (Woodley, Hernandez, Parra, & Negash, 2017) and we see no reason why these strategies cannot be incorporated in a synchronous online course.

In examining the individual components of the GSU, the mean score on every item was slightly higher (indicating *very useful*) within the F2F group when compared with the FOL group. Although one cannot conclude that the difference in the instructional format is significant, it may be useful to explore ways to make the FOL format even more effective.

Conclusion

The findings of the study show that there was a remarkable gain in students' attainment after completing the GSU. On a four-point scale where cognizance of topics was rated as 1=being completely unaware, 2=slightly aware, 3=moderately aware and 4=extremely aware, reported knowledge gains almost doubled from 1.8 (prior to GSU) to 3.5 (subsequent to the GSU). The overall awareness of the topics was between moderately and extremely aware following the GSU intervention. Interestingly, compared with other topics, there was greater awareness of human rights and individual responsibilities before the Unit (above 2), but this also increased after the GSU.

With reference to the first research question, the survey items mainly focused on content knowledge. For future research, it is recommended that the items on pedagogical knowledge (e.g. instructional strategies) be included in the survey. With reference to research question two, it is recommended that statements reflecting participants' attitudes towards genocide education be included in the survey. Also, more than 60 students were enrolled in the GSU study; however, fewer than 30 students responded to the survey. The small sample size limited the statistical significance of the findings. The researchers had to stick to the mean scores to report findings. Going further, the researchers may consider offering an incentive to the participants to complete the survey in

order to increase the response rate. The other recommendation is to offer some class time to the participants to complete the survey.

In addition to the survey findings, participants' reflective essays also demonstrated their increased knowledge of the historical events surrounding the genocides (cognitive domain). Furthermore, their responses showed how principles of multicultural education were evident in the ways in which they analyzed their case studies (reflective domain), how they reacted to the information (affective domain), as well as how they drew conclusions about implementing genocide education (affective domain). For example, Stanton's Ten Stages of Genocide were referred to during implication of the GSU in order to explain the process of genocide. This included multiple references to prejudice in society, denial of such acts and its repercussions, and using topics of diversity to facilitate discussions on current issues. Within the affective domain, there was strong emphasis on the importance of reducing prejudice and protecting human rights. Similar to what Byford et. al. (2009) found in their study, the participants in this study also reported that the incorporation of such challenging topics was valuable and important in a pedagogical and humanistic sense. Finally, within the active domain, participants showed commitment to advocacy and anti-bias education. This is an important finding which reflects the potential of genocide studies and critical multicultural pedagogy to not only stimulate effective teaching practices among new teachers, but to create opportunities to engage in conversations around creating an inclusive society.

Implied within the four domains is the issue of moral/ethical understanding. In the tenuous political climate of 2017 dubbed the "post-truth" era (Lewandowsky, Stephan, et. al., 2017) by academics, it becomes even more imperative to explicitly incorporate moral reasoning across the domains in this course. Recent researchers have compiled many instruments to assess levels of moral/ethical values thinking, decision-making and action (Vaisey, n.d.). Future research should incorporate this body of research to measure the extent to which Genocide Studies impacts moral/ethical behaviors of teachers.

Our qualitative analysis not only reflected the participants' growth in the above-mentioned four domains, but also areas where participants may need more direct instruction or guidance. These areas are: misconceptions or misinformation about historical events, surface level analysis, overgeneralization, and vague or simplistic solutions. The following statements by some of the participants illustrate their misconceptions:

Victims were taken straight to the crematorium upon arrival to camps. (Holocaust/Shoah)

Hitler killed all the Jews. (Holocaust /Shoah)

Germans divided people, and favored those with lighter skin. (Rwandan Genocide)

In other instances, some participants' comments were vague:

Terrorist groups come in and are train(sic) and plans are put in place to get rid of certain groups of people or to exterminate them.

To me it (genocide) was all about hate, but there is so much more involved in this...

These responses reflect the need to modify the GSU to include more opportunities for formative assessments to address these issues.

It is vital that teachers acquire the content knowledge and pedagogical skills to be able to effectively handle sensitive or even controversial content to not only meet the objectives of mandated Holocaust and genocide instruction, but also to contribute to the broader mission of encouraging citizens who are concerned about human rights and who work to ensure equity for all people regardless of their diversity. These findings reaffirm previous findings that those who receive professional development in Holocaust education are more likely to implement it (Ellison, 2002 and Shah, 2012).

The GSU design could serve as a model for designing units, interconnecting the principles of multicultural and genocide education. At the same time, it is clear that teacher-educators and trainers need to enhance and sometimes adapt conventional Holocaust and genocide education to invigorate the goal of using the lessons of history to improve our ability to effectively respond to contemporary situations that threaten democracy. Teaching to change the world by recognizing the injustices of the past should never cause “fatigue” if done well.

References

- Allgood, I. (2016). Faith and freedom of religion in U.S. public schools: Issues and challenges facing teachers. *Religious Education*, 111(3), 270-287.
- Allgood, I. (1998). *The development, implementation and evaluation of a strategic prejudice reduction framework and its effect on dogmatism levels of college students*. Doctoral Dissertation, Florida Atlantic University.
- Anti-Defamation League (2005). *Pyramid of hate*. Retrieved from <https://www.adl.org/sites/default/files/documents/assets/pdf/education-outreach/Pyramid-of-Hate.pdf>
- Anti-Defamation League (2013). *How do children learn prejudice?* Retrieved from: <https://www.adl.org/sites/default/files/documents/assets/pdf/education-outreach/How-Do-Children-Learn-Prejudice.pdf>
- Bartlett, T. A. (2009). *Teaching Teachers to Teach Peace: A Reflective Preservice Case Study*. Master's Thesis. University of Toronto.
- Banks, J.A. & Banks, C.A.M. (2016). *Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives*. Seattle: John Wiley and Sons.
- Borko, H. (2004). Professional development and teacher learning: Mapping the terrain. *Educational Researcher*, 33(8), 3-15.
- Broido E. M. (2004). Understanding diversity in millennial students. *New Directions for Student Services*, 106, 73–85.
- Byford, J., Lennon, S. & Russell, W.B. (2009). Teaching controversial issues in the Social Studies: A research study of high school teachers. *The Clearing House*, 165-170.
- Castro, A.J. (2010). Themes in the research on preservice teachers' views of cultural diversity: Implications for researching millennial preservice teachers, *Educational Researcher*, 39, 198-210.
- Cochran-Smith, M., & Lytle, S. L. (1999). Relationships of knowledge and practice: Teacher learning in communities. *Review of Research in Education*, 24, 249-305. doi: 10.3102/0091732X024001249
- Donnelly, M. B. (2006) Educating students about the Holocaust: A survey of teaching practices. *Social Education*, 70(1), 51-54. Retrieved from <http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ751146>
- Ellison, J. (2002). *From one generation to the next: A case study of Holocaust education*. Doctoral dissertation. Retrieved from Dissertations & Theses @ Florida Atlantic University - FCLA. (Publication No. AAT 3041190).

- Florida Statute 1003.42(f) (1994).
- Fogelman, E. (1994). *Conscience and courage: Rescuers of Jews during the Holocaust*. New York, NY: Doubleday Publishing Group.
- Freire, P. (1985). *The politics of education: Culture, power, and liberation*. Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.
- Gorski, P. C. (2009). Cognitive dissonance as a strategy in social justice teaching. *Multicultural Education*, 17(1), 54-57.
- Kiesa A., Orlowski A. P., Levine P., Both D., Kirby E. H., Lopez M. H., & Marcelo, K. B. (2007). *Millennials talk politics: A study of college student political engagement*. College Park, MD: Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement. Retrieved from <http://www.civicyouth.org/PopUps/CSTP.pdf>
- Ladson-Billings, G. (2004). New directions in multicultural education: Complexities, boundaries, and critical race theory. In J.A. Banks (Eds.). *Handbook of Multicultural Education Research*. (pp. 50-65). San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons.
- Lewandowsky, S, Eckerb, Ullrich K.H., and Cooke, J. (2017, Dec.). Beyond Misinformation: Understanding and Coping with the “Post-Truth” Era. *Journal of Applied Research in Memory and Cognition*. V. 6, Issue 4, Pp 353-369
- Lindquist, D. H. (2007). A necessary Holocaust pedagogy: Teaching the teachers. *Issues in Teacher Education*, 16(1), 21-36.
- Marttila, S. (2011). The mood of the country. Retrieved from <http://marttilastrategies.com/wp-content/uploads/Anti-Defamation-League-survey.pdf>
- Mueller, J. & O'Connor, C. (2007). Telling and retelling about self and “others”: How preservice teachers (re)interpret privilege and disadvantage in one college classroom. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 23(6), 840–856.
- Oliner, S. P., & Oliner, P. M. (1988). *The altruistic personality: Rescuers of Jews in Nazi Europe*. New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Rummel, R.J. (2001). When and why to use the term democide for “genocide”. *Idea: A Journal of Social Issues*, 6(1). Retrieved from <http://www.ideajournal.com/articles.php?id=26>
- Schoorman, D., & Bogotch, I. (2010). Moving beyond ‘diversity’ to ‘social justice’: The challenge to re-conceptualize multicultural education. *Intercultural Education*, 21(1), 79-85.
- Shah, R. (2012). *The contributions of a Holocaust and human rights education program to teacher learning*. Doctoral dissertation. Retrieved October 11, 2016, from Dissertations & Theses @ Florida Atlantic University - FCLA. (Publication No. 3356014).
- Sleeter, C.E., & Bernal, D.D. (2004). Critical pedagogy, critical race theory, and antiracist education: Implications for multicultural education. In J. A. Banks (Ed.). *Handbook of Multicultural Education Research*. (pp. 240-257). San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons.
- Schneider, S. (2014). Teaching the unthinkable: Counter-narratives, pedagogy, and genocide. *Theory in Action*, 7(1), 23-45. Retrieved from <http://transformativestudies.org/wp-content/uploads/10.3798tia.1937-0237.14002.pdf>
- Schweber, S. (2006). “Holocaust fatigue:” Teaching it today. *Social Education*, 7(1), 44-50.
- Shoham, E., Shiloah, N., and Kalishman, R. (2003). Arab teachers and Holocaust education: Arab teachers study Holocaust education in Israel. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 19, 609-625.
- Stanton, G. (2012). *Ten stages of genocide*. Retrieved from <http://www.genocidewatch.org/genocide/tenstagesofgenocide.html>
- Stauss, K. Koh, E. and Collie, M. (2018). Comparing the effectiveness of an online human diversity course to face-to-face instruction. *Journal of Social Work Education*. 54 (3), 492-505.

- The United States Holocaust Memorial Museum Exhibit (n.d.). *Guidelines for Teaching about the Holocaust*. Retrieved from <https://www.ushmm.org>
- The United States Holocaust Memorial Museum Exhibit (n.d.) *Some Were Neighbors: Collaboration and Complicity in the Holocaust*. Retrieved from <http://somewereneighbors.ushmm.org/>
- Vaisey, S. (n.d.). *Moral attitudes and decision making*. Retrieved from <http://kenan.ethics.duke.edu/attitudes/resources/measuring-morality/>
- Woodley, X., Hernandez, C. Parra, J. and Negash, B. (2017). Celebrating Difference: Best practices in culturally responsive teaching online. *Tech Trends*. 61: 470-478.

Ilene Allgood, Ed.D., is Senior Instructor in the College of Education, Department of Curriculum, Culture and Educational Inquiry at Florida Atlantic University where she has been teaching pre- and in-service teachers in critical multicultural education courses for two decades. Her primary areas of specialization and research include Genocide Education, Religion and Public Schooling, and Culturally Responsive Pedagogy and Curriculum to Mitigate Prejudice. She has published several national peer-reviewed articles and book chapters on these topics and has presented her work at the National Association for Multicultural Education (NAME), the Florida Council for the Social Studies (FCSS), and the American Educational Research Association (AERA) conferences. She is the recipient of two prestigious awards that recognize outstanding teaching at Florida Atlantic University -- The University Award for "Excellence and Innovation in Teaching Undergraduates" and the North Campus Achievement Award for "Exceptional Faculty." Before her teaching career at FAU, she was the Regional Director for the Anti-Defamation League, an international civil rights organization, where she oversaw a one-million-dollar grant to implement anti-bias education programs throughout South Florida. Dr. Allgood is dedicated to Tikkun Olam (healing the world) by working for social justice and equity in education.

Rachayita Shah, Ph.D. is Community-Engaged Scholarship Director at the Bonner Foundation. Her responsibilities in this role include dissemination of evidence-based best practices in campus-wide community and civic engagement, development of curriculum and training to support Bonner campuses in creating a culture of service leadership, and successful implementation of foundation's strategic initiatives. Her areas of research include community-engaged curriculum / service learning, teacher professional development, multicultural education, and Holocaust education. Before joining the Bonner Foundation, she worked at Florida Atlantic University (FAU) as Visiting Instructor and as Program Manager at FAU's Center for Holocaust and Human Rights Education, where she taught courses on multicultural education, facilitated teacher professional development, provided curriculum consultations to K-12 teachers, and managed Holocaust and human rights-oriented events.

Appendix A

Required readings, videos, and links, taken from the syllabus for the Genocide Studies Unit (GSU).

Mindes, G. (2005) *Social Studies in Today's Early Childhood Curricula. Beyond the Journal – Young Children on the Web*. http://ocw.umb.edu/early-education-development/eec-pre-school-learning-standards-and-guidelines/social-science-readings/Social%20Studies%20in%20Early%20Childhood%20Curricula.pdf/at_download/file.pdf

Stanton, G. (2016, 1986) *Ten stages of genocide*. <https://www.genocidewatch.com/ten-stages-of-genocide>

European Antisemitism: <https://www.ushmm.org/antisemitism/what-is-antisemitism/why-the-jews-history-of-antisemitism>

What is Ethnic Cleansing? <http://www.history.com/topics/ethnic-cleansing>

What is Genocide? <http://www.history.com/topics/what-is-genocide>

Appendix B

Suggested Curricular Resources for the Genocide Studies Unit

Grade Level	Themes	Suggested Books	Author
Kindergarten	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understanding similarities and differences • Respecting differences • Finding commonalities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bread, bread, bread • I'm like you, you're like me • It's okay to be different • The peace book • The ugly duckling • We're different, we're the same 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ann Morris • Cindy Gainer • Todd Parr • Todd Parr • Hans Christian Andersen • Bobbi Jane Kates
1st - 3rd Grade	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Empathy • Self-reliance • Being a change agent/advocate • Overcoming prejudice 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Big Al and Shrimpy • One green apple • Molly's pilgrim • Spaghetti in a hot dog bun: Having the courage to be who you are • The name jar • The brave little boat • crayon box that talked • The sneetches and other stories 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Andrew Clements • Eve Bunting • Barbara Cohen • Maria Dismondy • Yangsook Choi • Stephen Ollendorff & Kenneth Sawyer • Shane Derolf • Dr. Seuss
4th-5th Grade	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Being an upstander • Rescue • Standing in solidarity with victims • Providing safe haven to refugees 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hannah's suitcase: The quest to solve a Holocaust mystery • Half spoon of rice: A survival story of the Cambodian genocide • Listen to the wind: The story of Dr. Gregg & three cups of tea • Number the stars • Terrible things: An allegory of the Holocaust • The bracelet • The harmonica • Who belongs here? An American story • Wonder 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Karen Levin • Icy Smith • Greg Mortenson • Lois Lowry • Eve Bunting • Yoshiko Uchida • Tony Johnston • Margy Burns Knight • R J Palacio