

Aspects of Historical Thinking in the Latest Greek Primary School History Curriculum. A Critical Discourse Analysis

Kyriaki Fardi

University of the Aegean, Rhodes, Greece

This paper refers to the concept of “historical critical thinking” as it appears in the three versions of the recent Greek History Curriculum for primary school. It is a comparative study of the discourse of the three versions of the recent history curriculum for primary school, which were published during three consecutive school years, in the pilot phase of their implementation. The method of analysis of this study is Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). The main purpose of this paper is to explore the meaning and context of this term as presented in the three versions of the history curriculum and to compare the findings of the study with corresponding references in international literature. The main conclusion of this study is that this term refers much more to the development of general skills and competences with cognitive characteristics and much less to the critical understanding of the historical past.

Keywords: teaching history, history curriculum, primary school, critical discourse analysis (CDA), historical thinking

Introduction

In 2021 in Greece a “new” curriculum for history in primary school was published. This curriculum replaced the previous one after the 2019 national elections in which the central government changed, with the result being a shift from a left-wing party (2015-2019) to a conservative one (2019 to date, even after the new national elections in 2023). The reference to the last two elections is of particular importance and cannot be omitted because in Greece it is common political practice when the leadership team of the central government changes to also change ministers and legislation in important ministries such as the Ministries of Education, Religion, and Sports. Related changes also occur in the curricula, especially those of history in primary and secondary education.

The 2021 curriculum for history in primary school was published in three official versions: (a) OGG/1963/v. 2/14-5-2021, (b) OGG/1367/v. 2/23-5-2022, and (c) OGG/507/v. 2/2-2-23 (OGG: Official Government Gazette of the Hellenic Republic). The reason for these changes was because the period from 2021 to 2023 served as a pilot period for the implementation of the curriculum in a few selected schools in the country, the so-called “experimental” schools. The school year in which the implementation of this curriculum will be generalized in the country is the current one in which this article is being written (2023-2024). This means that this curriculum is now the official curriculum for history in primary school. During the pilot implementation of this curriculum from the first year of its publication, it was criticized by scientific institutions (academics, scientific journals,

Kyriaki Fardi, Post-doc in History Didactics, Faculty Member at the Department of Primary Education, University of the Aegean, Rhodes, Greece.

workshops, etc.) who were not involved in the creation or pilot application of this curriculum but who have specialized knowledge about history teaching and history education (Mavroskoufis, 2022; Fardi, 2022). In spite of the absence of a statement from the official bodies in charge of the Greek curriculum, such as the IEP (Institution of Educational Policy), the study of the three different versions of the curriculum reveals the existence of significant changes between the different versions.

Since 2022, a research is being conducted by the author of this article entitled “Historical thinking in the history curricula (HC) 2021-2022 for primary school: Critical Discourse Analysis in institutional and non-institutional texts”. In the context of this research, all three versions of the history curriculum for primary school were studied in detail, as well as the Greek and international literature of the last fifty years regarding the concept of Historical Thinking, in order to provide a comparative approach between the discourse of the curriculum text (the three versions) and the scientific meaning of the concept “Historical Thinking”. Also, the discourse of this curriculum in all three versions was studied and investigated in detail using the method of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). Interesting observations emerged from this study which will be commented on in the main part of this article. Before that, however, we should mention some interesting facts about the teaching of history in Greek primary schools in order to understand the Greek educational system and the content of history teaching in Greek schools.

In Greece, children are introduced to history education since kindergarten at the age of 4-5 years (OGG 5961/v 2/17-12-2021). Attendance at primary school begins at the age of 6, but duly constituted history teaching begins in the third year of primary school. The autonomous curriculum for the teaching of history, which is taught as a separate subject, the history course, is in effect from the third year of primary school. History textbooks are written for the last four grades of primary school (third, fourth, fifth, and sixth). The content of history in the Greek primary school curriculum (declarative knowledge, content knowledge) according to grade is as follows: (a) in the third grade: Mythology and Prehistory, (b) in fourth grade: Ancient times—Ancient Greek history, (c) in fifth grade: Byzantine period—Byzantium, and (d) in sixth grade: Modern and Contemporary Greek History.

Historical time in the Greek primary school curriculum follows a linear form, from Prehistory to Modern times. The reference to the teaching of Ancient Greek Mythology precedes Prehistory. At first sight, we can see that Mythology and Prehistory are both taught in the third grade, the former after the latter, such that the narrative time of Mythology precedes the historical time of Prehistory. According to the information available at present, none of the previous or current curricula provide for a distinction between these two forms of time. The possibility of making this distinction exist only in educational practices and school textbooks. This linear approach is traditional in Greece and is in accordance with the central national comprehensive narrative regarding the connection between the different periods of life in Greece from Ancient Times to the present and by people of the same genealogical base with roots in the Ancient Greeks. The methodological and epistemological validity of this approach is not examined in the Greek history curriculum.

In the following, we will mention the theoretical framework of this study, the working hypothesis and research questions as well as the method of investigating these questions. Then a section is devoted to the analysis of key discourse elements of the three versions of the curriculum and key conclusions of this study are formulated. Finally, limitations and suggestions for further research are discussed.

The Significant Character of Contemporary Historical Thinking

The questions “how do we think about the historical past” and “how do we think about history” have created fields of study and “schools of thought” that have been expressed in numerous articles and books in international academic literature. Issues such as the themes and aspects we illuminate from the past, the documentation of versions and interpretations of historical narrative, the search for, use, reading, and integration of historical sources in combination with the historical narrative, the perspective from which we look back in time, and many others have influenced the orientation of scholars of historical thinking.

The 1970s was a milestone in the study of historical thinking. From its beginning, countries such as Britain (especially England), Canada and the USA (L'évesque & Clark, 2018), as well as countries such as France (Moniot, 2002) and Germany (Brecher & Gläser, 2018), were distinguished for developing research programs and theoretical studies specializing in historical thinking. Significant contributions to the study of the relationship between historical thinking and historical education and culture have been made by scholars and researchers such as Shemilt (1983; 2009; 2018), Lee and Shemilt (2003; 2004; 2007; 2009), Ashby and Edwards (2010), Barton and Levstik (2008), Seixas (1994; 2017a; 2017b), and Chapman (2021). Themes such as historical understanding, historical empathy and historical consciousness have come to the forefront of global literature. A large number of scholarly articles and books have made the interest of contemporary scholars in the relationship between culture, society, education and history known to the global community.

Other issues addressed included children's perceptions and understandings of the historical past and the limits of their knowledge as children develop (von Heyking, 2004), historical conceptions, the methodical documentation of historical narratives, the use and integration of historical sources into the educational process, and other issues related to history, history writing and history education. There was a connection between the development of historical education, culture and citizenship, especially the cultivation of democratic awareness and the pursuit of the formation of the behavior and thinking of active citizens (Barton & Levstik, 2008; Wilschut, 2019).

The German historian Jörn Rüsen (2004; 2008; 2012; 2017) has influenced the study of historical thinking in his country and internationally by approaching the human relationship with the past through philosophical lenses (L'évesque & Clarke, 2018). By providing a definition of historical consciousness, he linked it to an awareness of the three dimensions of time (present, past, and future) and the interactive relationship between them in people's thinking and formulated a model for the types and forms it can take in human culture and historical education. For Rüsen (2012; 2017) there are four types of historical narrative: traditional, paradigmatic, critical, and genetic. The decisive criteria for changing the model of historical narrative are: (a) historical time and (b) the patterns of human thought as expressed mainly in the social sphere. In traditional historical narrative, time is perceived and expressed as fixed and unchanging in all its three dimensions (past, present, and future). In paradigmatic, time has the same meaning as in traditional, that is, it is fixed and immutable, but past patterns serve as examples for the present and the future; in critical there is a questioning of past patterns. In critical, time is altered and changed in its three dimensions and past patterns are questioned. In genetic, historical narrative (the “genetic” from “genus”), time is altered but perceived, as are its patterns, through the judgments and filters of scientific approaches to history.

Reflecting on Rüsen's analysis of the forms of historical consciousness, we can draw an analogy between

the forms of historical narrative and the nature of historical consciousness that each of them shapes. For the purposes of this article, we agree that there are four corresponding forms of historical consciousness—traditional, paradigmatic, critical, and genetic—which are shaped by criteria similar to those of historical narrative. Rüssen's schema of forms of historical narrative and consciousness offers us a network of concepts with which we can create patterns of study of historical thinking as expressed in the discourse of historians and in institutional texts such as curricula.

Historical thinking has been studied as a complex cognitive phenomenon, as a way of perceiving human activity in the past (Anglo-American school of thought) and as an experience of existing historically through human activity and the way it is expressed in the three dimensions of time (past, present, and future) (European-German school of thought) (Albornoz & Sebastian, 2022). In both cases, the critical dimension of historical thinking is mentioned, discussed, and studied. In the first case, through the knowledge of how to approach and document the historical past, resulting from the research and study of historical sources (Seixas, 2017b), and in the second case, through the development of critical historical consciousness, that is, the questioning of given patterns of thinking from the past, through the study of opposing views on the historical past and historical sources with different or opposing perspectives and interpretations.

In the first case (historical thinking as a cognitive phenomenon), the Anglo-American school of thought (Wineburg, 1998; Lee & Shemilt, 2003; Seixas, 2017b) focused, in particular, on historical concepts. Indeed, the concepts were divided into “first-order concepts” that are incorporated into the historian's discourse by culture and society (such as the concept of “nation”) and second-order concepts that organize historical discourse and run through it in all its manifestations (such as “historical time” and “historical space”, “historical significance”, “causes” and “effects”, “continuity” and “change” over time, “ethics”, “interpretation”). In addition, the same school of thought focused on historical narrative and the use of sources as evidence of historical discourse, rhetoric, and interpretation (Seixas, 2017a, 2017b). In the second case (Rüssen, 2017; 2012) in which historical thinking is studied in relation to human experience both as an experience and as a way of being in the past and in the present, critical historical thinking develops when the perception of the historical past is shaped through questions about it and through reflection and study on patterns of human behavior over time.

In the following study, in order to be able to orient ourselves in the extensive international literature on historical thinking, we will focus on the data that these two schools of thought (Anglo-American and German) give us about it. Specifically, for the concept of critical historical thinking, we will focus on the use of evidence in the teaching of primary history, that is, historical sources and their integration into the educational process (historical research and documentation in history lesson). We will also look at the four forms of historical consciousness, particularly critical historical consciousness, as it is, by definition, closer to critical historical thinking. Next, we will examine the way in which critical historical thinking is expressed in the discourse of the Greek history curriculum for primary schools in all three versions (2021, 2022, 2023). In particular, we will examine its references to historical sources and the documentation of historical narrative, as well as the form of historical consciousness it cultivates. The following sections formulate the research questions of our study, its methodological approach, which is critical discourse analysis (CDA), the presentation of the research findings, conclusions, limitations, and suggestions.

Research Questions

This paper examines the working hypothesis that the recent history curriculum for primary school attempts to incorporate the concept of “critical historical thinking” into its discourse, but in a peculiar way, as if to formulate it from the beginning (ontogenesis). In order to examine this working hypothesis, the following research questions are formulated:

- (1) Is the term “critical historical thinking” mentioned in the recent history curriculum for elementary school?
- (2) Is it mentioned in all versions of the history curriculum for elementary school, and if not, in which, specifically, is it observed?
- (3) How is the term referred to in the history curriculum for elementary school? (Definition and context).
- (4) What form of historical consciousness is fostered in the history curriculum for elementary school in all three versions of the history curriculum?
- (5) What is the relationship between the historical consciousness which is formed by the curriculum and “critical historical thinking”?
- (6) What is the relationship between “historical critical thinking” in the primary school curriculum and the meaning of the term in contemporary literature?

In order to respond to the previous questions, the three versions of the history curriculum for primary school were read very carefully and repeatedly. All the passages referring to the term “critical historical thinking”, “historical thinking”, and “critical thinking” were extracted. The definitions and contexts of the term were studied. In addition, the curriculum in all three versions was studied in detail in order to form a view of the form of historical consciousness that this curriculum advocates. For the purposes of this study there are recordings, qualitative analyses of the discourses and reflective notes in special files kept in the research protocol. This article will summarize part of this analysis. The method used for this study is Critical Discourse Analysis which will be presented below.

Methodology

Critical discourse analysis (CDA) is a method of analysing, reading, and understanding the discourse of a text, and has a qualitative character. It is an in-depth study of discourse as a socio-cultural phenomenon and in relation to its deeper meanings and contexts. CDA looks at the relationship between words and the representations and ideological patterns of the time and society to which a text belongs, and examines the meanings of words, phrases, and contexts, especially when they have meanings and symbols that are intended to manipulate the reader, that is, to exercise “power” over him. The purpose of critical discourse analysis is to identify, analyse, and critique these elements in the discourse of a text in order to reflect on specific themes and issues.

Furthermore, CDA is a way of thinking, understanding, and interpreting the world, a perspective on our perceptions of how the world is expressed in human discourse. It is aligned with other theories including Critical Social Research and Critical Theory (M. Bloor & T. Bloor, 2013; Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2007; Fairclough, 2013a; Jorgensen & Phillips, 2002; Wodak, 2001). Scholars such as Foucault, Habermas, Freire, and Moniot (Moniot, 2002; Segall, 1999; Tyson, 2006) have influenced theoretical approaches and research processes of CDA (Fairclough, 2013; Wodak, 2001).

This method of analysis is appropriate for the study of institutional texts such as history curricula because it allows deepening the discourse and linking it to social phenomena such as educational policy and its ideological

nuances. It is also an appropriate method of analysis, especially for the Greek case, because it allows comparisons between the three different versions of this curriculum. The analysis of this article (CDA) following the three-dimensional model proposed by Norman Fairclough (2013b), which distinguishes between text, discursive practice, and social practice.

An initial open coding phase identified all references to “historical thinking”, “critical thinking”, and “critical historical thinking” across the three version of the primary school history curriculum, including related conceptual formulations. At the textual level, the analysis focused on vocabulary, semantic use, and the construction of the “critical historical thinking”, examining whether it appears as a coherent concept or as a loose combination of “historical” and “critical” thinking. At the level of discursive practice, the data have been organized into thematic categories (e.g. skills, knowledge, citizenship, interculturalism, multiculturalism, historical consciousness) in order to explore how the terms are articulated and recontextualized within the curriculum discourse. At the level of social practice, the findings were interpreted in relation to broader educational and ideological frameworks. In this context, “critical historical thinking” was approached as a concept associated in contemporary literature with the critical investigation of the past, the analysis of sources, and the development of reflective historical consciousness. The coding process was iterative and comparative, supported by detailed data collection memorandum that informed the interpretation of the data.

Critical Analysis

In this section, the term “historical-critical thinking” is critically analyzed using the method of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), as it appears in the three versions of the “new” history curriculum (OGG/ 1963/v. 2/14-5-2021, OGG/1367/v. 2/23-5-2022, and OGG/507/v. 2/2-2-23) for primary school. The first observation we can make without reservation is that the term does not appear in all versions of this curriculum, and not in the same way.

The term “historical-critical thinking” appears in the second version of the History Curriculum for Primary School (OGG/1367/v. 2/23-5-2022) and in the third version (OGG/507/v. 2/2-2-23) the reference to it is repeated, identically as in the second version. In particular (OGG/1367/v. 2/23-5-2022, 13859 and OGG/507/v. 2/2-2-23, 4837):

...the teaching of history aims to cultivate and develop historical-critical thinking and historical consciousness among students. Through its teaching method (formulation of questions and critical approach to sources), it also contributes to the formation of autonomous and democratic citizens, with the ability to reflect, critically approach the past, understand the present and act and participate in contemporary events.

In the previous example, we notice that the term “historical critical thinking” is mentioned next to the term “historical consciousness”. However, the second term “historical consciousness” is mentioned in general terms without specifying its type, a fact that is of great importance and will be commented on in the concluding part of this paper. The notion of “historical-critical thinking” is related to the teaching process, that is, the formulation of questions and the critical approach to sources, as well as to the formation of democratic consciousness and the preparation of children for active participation in the public sphere as active and democratic citizens.

In the first version of the History Curriculum (OGG/ 1963/v. 2/14-5-2021) for primary school, the term “historical thinking” and the term “critical thinking” are mentioned distinctly, namely there is no term “historical critical thinking”, but each of the strands of “historical” and “critical” (thinking) corresponds to distinct content. In particular, the following are mentioned:

The development of historical thinking involves the knowledge of significant historical events, phenomena and developments and the understanding of the changes that human societies experience in the passing of time. (OGG/ 1963/v. 2/14-5-2021, p. 22777)

and

...the teaching of history aims to foster the cultivation of critical thinking, self-awareness, communication and research skills, as well as the activation of students' emotions and imagination. (OGG/ 1963/v. 2/14-5-2021, p. 22777)

From the above it is clear that in the last two versions of the History Curriculum there has been a revision of the concepts. However, this revision is not based on the relevant epistemological approaches to the concepts. This is not mentioned anywhere in the curriculum, nor is it consistent with the meaning of "historical thinking" as briefly presented in the theoretical part of this paper, namely historical thinking as a cognitive phenomenon or as an expression of human experience and its philosophical dimensions.

In the second and third versions of the history curriculum for primary schools (OGG/1367/v. 2/23-5-2022 and OGG/507/v. 2/2-2-23), in which the term "critical historical thinking" is revised and merged, it is associated with the cultivation of students' skills and abilities in general and not specifically with the historical past and historical consciousness cultivated in the context of history teaching in primary schools.

Elsewhere in the two revised versions of the history curriculum for primary schools, among the aims of history teaching are:

...(the purpose of the history lesson is to enable children) cultivate their critical thinking by developing correlations of evaluation, analysis of causes and generalizations, under the guidance of the teacher and at the level of maturity and perceptive capacity of their age. (OGG/1367/v. 2/23-5-2022, p. 13860 and OGG/507/v. 2/2-2-23, p. 4838)

From the way in which the concept of historical thinking is outlined in the three versions of the History Curriculum, it is evident that it is more related to the development of skills and abilities in children's thinking and personality and less to the development of a critical attitude in the study and formation of knowledge about the historical past. That is, "critical historical thinking" is associated with the development and cultivation of cognitive processes, in general, in children's thinking and personality, without this necessarily being accompanied by a historical orientation and a critical approach to the historical past. The difference and distinction between the two different kinds of thinking, namely between "critical thinking" and "critical historical thinking", does not seem to emerge in any of the versions of the Curriculum for History in Primary School.

The same conclusion is reached if we examine the kind of historical consciousness that the curriculum aims to cultivate. There is no mention of the kind of historical consciousness that is sought to be cultivated in any of the versions of this curriculum, so that we can clearly understand what it is. Instead, there are only minimal references to the term "historical consciousness"—namely a simple reference to the term, next to the term "historical thinking"—(as we saw earlier). However, we can still understand the kind of historical consciousness by observing other elements of the curriculum.

Indicatively and briefly, within the scope of this article, we can mention the following:

- the perception of historical time using linear and measurable characteristics
- the unchanging patterns from the past (e.g., the behavioral heroic patterns as an example for the behavior of the people in the future and not as a reason for study, critical approach, and reflection)
- the correlation of elements between history and folklore
- the ignoring of the history of other people

- the failure to incorporate the concept of historical time as a method of approaching the historical past and other second-order historical concepts.

And the general reference that:

The cultivation of historical consciousness involves understanding the actions of people in specific situations and the formation of values and attitudes that lead to responsible behavior in the present and the future. (p. 13860/OGG 23-5-22, p. 4838/OGG 2-2-23)

These and many other references incorporated in the discourse of the last two versions of the history curriculum for primary school demonstrate that the form of consciousness that is sought to be cultivated is the traditional and paradigmatic historical consciousness.

This means that the development of a critical historical consciousness, in which children are taught to ask questions, to examine historical sources critically and, where appropriate, to criticize and dispute patterns of the past, is not sufficiently encouraged. Furthermore, the primary history curriculum's focus on cultivating a traditional and exemplary historical consciousness tends to weaken the development of "critical historical thinking", resulting in a hierarchical relationship between the two concepts, namely between "historical thinking" and "historical consciousness", each of which has a different orientation.

Conclusion

As we mentioned in the theoretical part of this paper, contemporary international literature has highlighted two paths through which historical thinking can be expressed in history education: one is cognitively oriented (Anglo-American school of thought, Wineburg, 1998; Lee & Shemilt, 2003; Seixas, 2017b) and the other is oriented towards human experience and philosophical considerations of the historical past.

According to this paper's brief analysis, the concept of "critical historical thinking" appears in the last two versions of the History Curriculum for Primary School (OGG/1367/v. 2/23-5-2022 and OGG/507/v. 2/2-2-23). This term is associated with the development of cognitive processes such as questioning and problem solving, reflection, and evaluation, processes that do not necessarily focus on the development of critical historical consciousness, a fact that orients them more towards the concept of "critical thinking" (Halpem, 2013; McPeck, 2016).

The development of historical thinking is limited to fixed patterns from the past and to a mechanistic, process-oriented approach to historical knowledge. This is a situation in which children's creative thinking is trapped and is only liberated by the teacher. The role of the teacher is important, because depending on the learning objectives he sets on his initial training and education, on the available teaching time, and on the abilities and skills he himself possesses, he can shape his lessons in such a way that the elements of critical and historical thinking are increased in his lessons. In addition, the factor of freedom that the teacher has in relation to the history curriculum is also important. In Greece, the whole educational system is centralized and guided either by the general educational policy, by the curricula or by the textbooks, so that the teacher is very limited in his/her work.

Based on the example of the three different versions of the new History Curriculum for primary school, the Greek educational system understands the importance of introducing the concept of "historical thinking" and "critical historical thinking" in the history lesson for primary school children. Nevertheless, the way of integrating the concept into the educational process needs to mature. It seems that the Greek History Curriculum tries to

formulate the concept of “critical historical consciousness”, straddling the line between the development of critical thinking abilities and skills in children and the preservation of tradition by cultivating traditional and paradigmatic historical consciousness. The relationship between the term “critical historical thinking” and the term “historical thinking” as it appears in contemporary literature is cognitive and, indeed, is not so much oriented towards knowledge of the historical past and the formation of a perspective on the historical past as towards the development of general abilities and skills.

The Greek primary school History Curriculum in effect at the time of writing this paper (the school year 2025-2026) is the third version of this curriculum (OGG/507/v. 2/2-2-23). In fact, in May 2026, new textbooks for primary and secondary education were posted on the official digital platform for textbooks, “Melispi” (<https://ebooksdl.cti.gr/>, retrieved 27/4/2026) following a process of writing and evaluation by specialized teams of scholars. These textbooks follow the “multiple textbook” principle, which is based on offering several textbooks for a given school subject, so that teachers have the opportunity to choose between two or three textbooks. These books have been created based on the current history curriculum for elementary school. Some innovations in these books, such as the use of hypertext with the inclusion of QR codes and their enrichment with numerous historical sources, the use of timelines, modern graphic elements, and contemporary child-friendly language do not undermine the basic conclusions of this study regarding the elementary school history curriculum. These innovations align with the principles and ideas of this curriculum (OGG/507/v. 2/2-2-23). The new textbooks will be used starting next school year. We hope that future studies and research will illuminate how they are taught in the classroom.

Regarding the limitations of the present study, we will mention the following: (a) there are no published results from the pilot implementation of the History Curriculum before its generalized application and after the widespread use in Greek education, (b) the new books have been uploaded to the digital textbook platform (“Melispi”) based on this Curriculum were only recently made available and the scholarly community has not yet had a chance to study them, and (c) the new books have not yet been taught. In coming years, we hope to see new studies and research so that we have the opportunity to study how the concept of “critical historical thinking” is perceived and how it is diffused in the school environment. We hope new studies and research will investigate the elements of historical thinking that are developed in relation to the development of critical thinking, critical historical thinking, but also in relation to the forms of historical consciousness and, especially, critical historical consciousness.

Acknowledgement

Thanks to Mr. Panagiotis Koutroubelis for the detailed supervision in English.

Conflict of Interest

No financial or other substantive conflict of interest that might be construed to influence the result or their interpretation in the manuscript.

References

- Albornoz, N., & Sebastián, C. (2022). Tensions, articulations and novelty in the ontogenetic development of historical thinking: Contributions of cultural-historical psychology. *Theory & Psychology*, 32(2), 243-262. <https://doi.org/10.1177/09593543211028912>
- Ashby, R., & Edwards, C. (2010). Challenges facing the disciplinary tradition. Reflections on the history curriculum on England.

- In I. Nakou and I. Barca (Eds.), *Contemporary public debates over history education* (Vol. 3, pp. 27-46). Charlotte, NC: Information Age.
- Barton, K., & Levstik, L. (2008). *Teaching history for the common good*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Routledge.
- Bloor, M., & Bloor, T. (2013). *The practice of critical discourse analysis. An introduction*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Brecher, A., & Gläser, E. (2018). HisDeKo: A study about the historical thinking of primary school children. *History Education Research Journal*, 15(2), 264-275. <https://doi.org/10.18546/HERJ.15.2.08>
- Chapman, A. (2021). Introduction: Historical knowing and the “knowledge turn”. In A. Champan (Ed.), *Knowing history in schools: Powerful knowledge and the power of knowledge* (Vol. 1, pp. 1-31). London: UCL Press.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. C. (2007). *Research methods in education*. New York: Routledge.
- Fairclough, N. (2013a). Critical discourse analysis. In J. P. Gee and M. Homdford (Eds), *The Routledge handbook of discourse analysis* (Vol. 1, pp. 9-20). London: Routledge.
- Fairclough, N. (2013b). *Critical discourse analysis. The critical study of language*. London: Routledge.
- Fardi, K. (2022). Critical reading of the new history curriculum (HC) for the primary education (OGG/ 1963/v. 2/14-5-2021). *Nea Paideia*, 181, 34-46.
- Halpern, D. (2013). *Thought and knowledge: An introduction to critical thinking*. Cambridge: Psychology Press.
- Jorgensen, M., & Phillips, L. (2002). *Discourse analysis as theory and method*. London: Thousand Oaks; New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- Lee, P., & Shemilt, D. (2004). “I just wish we could go back in the past and find out what really happened”: Progression in understanding about historical accounts. *Teaching History*, 117, 25-31.
- Lee, P., & Shemilt, D. (2003). A scaffold, not a cage: Progression and progression models in history. *Teaching History*, 113, 13-23.
- Lee, P., & Shemilt, D. (2007). New alchemy or fatal attraction? History and citizenship. *Teaching History*, 129, 14-19.
- Lee, P., & Shemilt, D. (2009). Is any explanation better than none? Over-determined narratives senseless agencies and one-way streets in students’ learning about cause and consequence in history. *Teaching History*, 137, 42-49.
- L'évesque, S., & Clark, P. (2018). Historical thinking: Definitions and educational applications. In S. A. Metzger and L. M. A Harris (Eds.), *History teaching and learning* (Vol. 5, pp. 119-147). Hoboken, New Jersey: Wiley Blackwell.
- Mavroskoufis, D. (2022). The “Frankenstein Curriculum” of the history lesson. *Nea Paideia*, 181, 13-26.
- McPeck, J. (2016). *Teaching critical thinking. Dialogue and dialectic*. London: Routledge.
- Moniot, H. (2002). *Didactics of history (Didactique de l'histoire)*. (E. Kanner, Trans. in Greece). Athens: Metaixmio.
- Official Government Gazette of the Hellenic Republic. (2021). OGG 5961/v 2/17-12-2021.
- Official Government Gazette of the Hellenic Republic. (2021). OGG/ 1963/v. 2/14-5-2021.
- Official Government Gazette of the Hellenic Republic. (2022). OGG/1367/v. 2/23-5-2022.
- Official Government Gazette of the Hellenic Republic. (2023). OGG/507/v. 2/2-2-2023.
- Riisen, J. (2008). *Narration, interpretation, orientation*. New York-Oxford: Berghahn Books.
- Riisen, J. (2012). Tradition: A principle of historical sense-generation and its logic and effect in historical culture. *History and Theory*, 51, 45-59. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2303.2012.00646.x>
- Riisen, J. (2017). *Evidence and meaning. A theory of historical studies* (D. Kerns & K. Digan, Trans.). New York-Oxford: Berghahn.
- Riisen, J. (2004). Historical consciousness: Narrative structure, moral function and ontogenetic development. In P. Seixas (Ed.), *Theorizing historical consciousness* (Vol. 4, pp. 63-85). London: University of Toronto Press.
- Segall, A. (1999). Critical history: Implications for history/social studies education. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, 27(3), 358-374. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00933104.1999.10505885>
- Seixas, P. (1994). Students’ understanding of historical significance. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 22(3), 281-304. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00933104.1994.10505726>
- Seixas, P. (2017a). Historical consciousness and historical thinking. In M. Carretero, S. Berger, and M. Grever (Eds.), *Palgrave handbook of research in historical culture and education* (Vol. 3, pp. 59-72). London: Palgrave Mcmillan.
- Seixas, P. (2017b). A model of historical thinking. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 49(6), 593-605. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131857.2015.1101363>
- Shemilt, D. (1983). The devil’s locomotive. *The Philosophy of History Teaching*, 22(4), 1-18. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2505213>
- Shemilt, D. (2009). Drinking an ocean and pissing a cupful. How adolescents make sense of history. In L. Symcox and A. Wilschut (Eds.), *National history standards: The problem of the canon and the future of teaching history* (Vol. 8, pp. 141-209). Charlotte, NC: Information Age.
- Shemilt, D. (2018). Assessment of learning in history education: Past, present, and possible future. In S. A. Metzger and L. M. A.

- Harris (Eds.), *History teaching and learning* (Vol. 17, pp. 449-471). Hoboken, New Jersey: Wiley Blackwell.
- Tyson, L. (2006). *Critical theory today*. New York and London: Routledge.
- von Heyking, A. (2004). Historical thinking in the elementary years: A review of current research. *Canadian Social Studies*, 39(1), 1.
- Wilschut, A. (2019). Historical consciousness of time and its societal use. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 51(6), 831-849. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220272.2019.1652939>
- Wineburg, S. (1998). A partial history: An essay review of teaching and learning history in elementary schools. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 14(2), 233-243. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X\(98\)00006-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X(98)00006-7)
- Wodak, R. (2001). What CDA is about-a summary of its history, important concepts and its developments. In R. Wodak and M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (Vol. 1, pp. 1-13). London, Thousand Oaks; New Delhi: Sage Publications.