Université de Montréal

Historical Consciousness and the Construction of Inter-Group Relations: The Case of Francophone and Anglophone History School Teachers in Quebec

par
Boghos Zanazanian

Département d'administration et fondements de l'éducation
Faculté des sciences de l'éducation

Août, 2009

Université de Montréal
Faculté des études supérieures et postdoctorales

Cette thèse intitulée :

Historical Consciousness and the Construction of Inter-Group Relations: The Case of
Francophone and Anglophone History School Teachers in Quebec

présentée par
Boghos Zanazanian

a été évaluée par un jury composé des personnes suivantes :

Claude Lessard
président-rapporteur

Marie McAndrew
directrice de recherche

Jean-Pierre Charland
co-directeur

Sirma Bilge
examinatrice interne

Jocelyn Létourneau
examinateur externe

Marc-André Éthier
représentant du doyen

Résumé

Cette thèse s'intéresse aux effets de la conscience historique sur les négociations de l'ethnicité et la structuration des frontières intergroupes chez les enseignants d'histoire nationale au Québec. L'ambiguïté de dominance ethnique entre Francophones et Anglophones contextualise la façon dont les enseignants de ces groupes historicisent les significations du passé pour se connaître et s'orienter « ethniquement. » Selon leurs constructions des réalités intergroupes, ils peuvent promouvoir la compréhension intergroupe ou préserver une coexistence rigide.

Le premier article théorise comment les capacités à historiciser le passé, ou à générer des formes de vie morales pour une orientation temporelle, soutiennent la construction de l'ethnicité. En développant un répertoire des tendances de conscience historique parallèles et égales afin de comprendre les fluctuations dans le maintien des frontières ethniques, l'article souligne l'importance de la volonté à reconnaître l'agentivité morale et historique des humains à rendre les frontières plus perméables.

Le deuxième article discute d'une étude sur les attitudes intergroupes et les traitements mutuels entre des enseignants d'histoire Francophones et Anglophones. Alors que la plupart des répondants francophones sont indifférents aux réalités sociales et expériences historiques des Anglo-québécois, tous les répondants anglophones en sont conscients et enseignent celles des Franco-québécois. Cette divergence implique une dissemblance dans la manière dont les relations intergroupes passées sont historicisées. La non-reconnaissance de l'agentivité morale et historique des Anglo-québécois peut expliquer l'indifférence des répondants francophones.

Le dernier article présente une étude sur la conscience historique des enseignants d'histoire francophone à l'égard des Anglo-québécois. En mettant le répertoire de conscience historique développé à l'épreuve, l'étude se concentre sur la manière dont les répondants historicisent le changement temporel dans leurs négociations de l'ethnicité et leurs structurations des frontières. Tandis que leurs opinions sur

l'« histoire » et leurs historicisations des contextes différents les amènent à renforcer des différences ethnoculturelles et à ne pas reconnaître l'agentivité morale et historique de l'Autre, presque la moitié des répondants démontre une ouverture à apprendre et transmettre les réalités et expériences anglo-québécoises. La dépendance sur les visions historiques préétablies pour construire les réalités intergroupes souligne néanmoins l'exclusion de ce dernier groupe dans le développement d'une identité nationale.

Mots-clefs

mémoire collective; pensée historique; ethnicité; frontières ethniques; dominance ethnique ambiguë; sociétés parallèles; curriculum d'histoire; identité nationale; socialisation; éducation.

Abstract

This three-article thesis looks at the effects of historical consciousness on the negotiation of ethnicity and the structuring of group boundaries among national history teachers in Quebec. The province's ambiguous ethnic dominance between Francophones and Anglophones sets the stage for revealing how teachers from Quebec's parallel history classrooms historicize meanings of the past for ethno-cultural awareness and agency. Depending on how inter-group realities are constructed, these educators can either promote inter-group comprehension or preserve rigid co-existence.

The first article theorizes how social actors' differing capacities to historicize the past, or to generate moral life patterns for temporal orientation, underlie their negotiations of ethnicity and agency toward the "significant Other." By developing a repertory of parallel and equal tendencies of historical consciousness for grasping fluctuations in ethnic boundary maintenance, the article moreover argues how social actors' willingness to recognize human moral and historical agency is central to group boundary porosity.

The second article discusses the findings of an exploratory study conducted on inter-group attitudes and mutual in-class treatments between Francophone and Anglophone educators in Montreal national history classrooms. Whereas most Francophone respondents are indifferent to Anglo-Québécois social realities and historical experiences, all Anglophone ones know and transmit those of the Franco-Québécois to their students. Mirroring each group's sociological status, this divergence implies a dissimilarity in how past inter-group relations are historicized. Possible non-recognition of Anglo-Québécois moral and historical agency moreover explains the prevalent indifference among Francophone respondents.

The last article touches upon an in-depth study conducted on Francophone national history teachers' historical consciousness of the Anglo-Québécois. By testing my

aforementioned repertory, the study analyzed how respondents historicize temporal change when negotiating ethnicity and structuring group boundaries. While their views on "history" and their historicizing of different thematic contexts overwhelmingly lead respondents to reinforce ethno-cultural differences and to not recognize human moral and historical agency, half of them nonetheless demonstrate openness to learning about and transmitting Anglo-Québécois social realities and historical experiences. Despite such willingness, reliance on pre-established historical visions for constructing inter-group realities nevertheless highlights the exclusion of the latter when respondents set out to develop a national identity among students.

Key words

Collective Memory; Historical Thinking; Ethnicity; Group Boundaries; Ambiguous Ethnic Dominance; Parallel Societies; History Curriculum; National Identity; Socialization; Education.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

List of Abbreviations

MELS – Ministère de l'Éducation, du Loisir et du Sport

MEQ – Ministère de l'Éducation du Québec

Dedication

I would like to dedicate this thesis to my loving parents, Yervant and Svetlana Zanazanian. Thank you for everything. Stay tuned though: I plan on dedicating other similar works to both of you in the near future, with or without your generous support☺.

Acknowledgments

First and foremost, I would like to thank my thesis director, Marie McAndrew, for her unconditional "tough love." Not only did she give me excellent advice over the years, but she also generously accommodated my academic endeavours at many different levels. She believed in me from the start and always encouraged me to do better. My thesis co-director, Jean-Pierre Charland, equally deserves such due attention. He was always well disposed to offering me sound counsel whenever the need arose.

Deep gratitude further goes out to the other members of my jury, Sirma Bilge, Marc-André Éthier, Claude Lessard, and Jocelyn Létourneau, for their interest and patience in reading and commenting on my work.

My colleague and friend Sabrina Moisan moreover deserves special mention. Her critical insight regarding the many aspects of my work was always greatly appreciated. I would also like to acknowledge the contributions of Henda Ben Salah, Israel Fortin, Juliette Gosselin, Marie-Claire Légaré, Christine Paré, Josefina Rossell, Chantale Simard, Amina Triki-Yamani and Maia Yarymowich, who all variously and invaluably participated in the different stages of the production of this dissertation.

In terms of funding, I would like to particularly thank the FQRSC (*Fonds québécois de recherche sur la société et la culture*) as well as the *Chaire de recherche du Canada sur l'Éducation et les rapports ethniques*, the CEETUM (*Centre d'études ethniques des universités montréalaises*), the *Département d'administration et fondements de l'éducation*, and the *Faculté des études supérieures et postdoctorales*, all based at the *Université de Montréal*. Their generous support enabled me to carry out this important life project in its entirety.

And on a final note, I would like to express my warmest gratitude to my family and my friends for their undying support and relentless patience.

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

Teacher historical consciousness greatly influences how students are socialized in the national history classroom. Structuring their values and perspectives for understanding and defining social reality, the significations that educators give to the past inform their knowledge and handling of the history program. When employed to make sense of time, historical consciousness generally serves to construct identity and to guide agency, shaping educator beliefs and ideals for living life (Seixas 2004; Rüsen 2005; Straub 2005). When specifically referring to the mobilization of the past for fulfilling moral obligations in a social relationship (Rüsen 2005), the impact of teacher historical consciousness on the processes of socialization becomes clearer. The transfer of social standards within the history program's prescribed space of national agency varies according to educators' ethical or political predispositions to improving the quality of common future life. At play here is the manner in which their historical consciousness harmonizes history teaching's two main social functions: the promotion of critical thinking skills and patriotic allegiance to the state. Since the two could fundamentally oppose each other, teacher historical consciousness examines and resolves the adequate measure of each, forming a reasonable symbiosis between them. This decisiveness in strengthening a national identity may, however, clash with certain interest groups' own imperatives of imputing students' lives with social coherency.

While teacher propensities to improve common future life may already be heightened and partisan in democratic societies where one ethno-cultural group controls the state, they may nonetheless be additionally strenuous and contentious in those where two or more distinct and politically mobile groups co-exist through sustained contact. Fearing potential assimilation into the more dominant community, certain interest groups may instigate a competition to ensure their own group's cultural maintenance and development. Surely, such oppositions inform teachers' historical consciousness and their treatment of competing groups' social realities and historical experiences in the history classroom. Depending on how their community is portrayed in the national history program, educators risk contradicting what is prescribed. If they feel that their group's perspectives are side-stepped, they may instead focus more on their

community's linguistic and cultural reproduction than on contributing to formal processes of common socialization. When harmonizing history teaching's two main social functions, the promotion of teachers' collective memory and identity may be emphasized more than boosting students' capacity to construct personal perspectives on common past events through the examination of a multitude of viewpoints (McCully et al. 2003; Barton and McCully 2003; 2004; Kitson 2007). Inadvertently, the workings of teacher historical consciousness may thus encourage out-group prejudice and alienation rather than advance inter-group reconciliation. Likewise, educators may either engage or disengage students' agency in common future societal projects, depending on whether these are deemed conducive or, in contrast, incompatible with in-group maintenance and development.

Quebec's context of ambiguous ethnic dominance, where Francophones and Anglophones variously share parallel social enclosure and institutionalism (McAndrew 2002; 2003; Breton 2005), offers fertile ground for examining the performance of teacher historical consciousness in such instances of group rivalry. Mirroring a specific sociological scenario of inter-ethnic relations, neither the French nor the English speaking community fundamentally holds a perfect linguistic, cultural, economic and socio-political hegemony over the province's national resources and institutions. Instead, largely due to Quebec's association with Canada, they both co-exist with loose sociological status demarcations and fear mutual hindrances to their respective cultural development. Furthermore, they compete to preserve their collective identity through linguistic reproduction instead of inter-group reconciliation, as is illustrated by Quebec's school system, separated along linguistic lines since 1998 (McAndrew 2002; 2003; McAndrew and Janssens 2004). Of particular interest, however, is their common but non-consensual national history program, the collective identity narrative framework of which ultimately configures Francophone visions of the past to the detriment of Anglophone ones.

Keeping in mind memories of often unequal power relations between these two communities in Canada, such a politicized setting undoubtedly informs teacher

historical consciousness, which in turn potentially shapes student attitudes toward competing groups. Accordingly, uncertainty may arise between teachers' emotive and loyal allegiance to reinforcing ethno-cultural group markers and their responsibility for maintaining a state that may be perceived as contradicting the interests of their group's collective identity. Teacher historical consciousness could thus inform how students apprehend inter-group relations by delineating past, present, and future visions of the nation's collective identity (be it Quebec or Canada) that challenge those of either the competing group or the more conciliatory of in-group members (be they Francophone or Anglophone). This may be done either by excluding the other community's social realities and historical experiences when discussing common past events in the history classroom or by including them.

It is within such a mind frame that this three-article thesis looks at the workings of historical consciousness among Quebec national history teachers, especially with regard to inter-group relations between Francophones and Anglophones. As an endeavour that has not yet been attempted, it has four principle objectives. At a theoretical level, it aspires to first correlate emerging conceptualizations of historical consciousness with constructivist perspectives of ethnicity. Second, it aims to develop a repertory of tendencies of historical consciousness to explain how different moments of historicizing past events for temporal orientation influence fluctuations in ethnic boundary maintenance. Third, following from this groundwork and at an empirical level, it seeks to understand the extent to which Quebec national history teachers from both communities are aware of and transmit the other's social realities and historical experiences to their students. And finally, it aspires to discern whether Francophone national history teachers tend to recognize the moral and historical agency of Quebec's Anglophone community when historicizing different aspects of their common past. Put together, all of these objectives focus on how social actors signify past inter-group relations to negotiate their ethnic identities and agency. In the context of the history classroom, they relate to the extent to which these meanings encourage educators to either embrace the "significant Other" in a common historical

vision, hence in a collective national identity, or to instead exclude them for ethical, political, or even practical reasons.

Before getting to the articles that deal with the four thesis objectives, I will first set the general tone that binds them together. Seeing as the format of this dissertation is not a traditional one, the goal of the following chapter is to better contextualize the preliminaries that led to the conceptualization of historical consciousness and to the implementation of the two qualitative studies, all of which are presented later on. Chapter Two thus elaborates on the general problem statement and addresses the implications of history teaching's two main functions in Quebec's scenario of sociological parallelism and ambiguous ethnic dominance. It then briefly looks at the role of historical consciousness in harmonizing these two functions, leading to an ensuing section that establishes an epistemological framework for better understanding the concept. The same chapter also contains three important literature reviews. Starting with the study of historical consciousness in the field of history education, it then touches upon the general state of research on history teachers and ends with a specific look at the latter in both Quebec and Northern Ireland, a society where ethnic dominance is similarly ambiguous. On a concluding note, the chapter also briefly discusses the logic behind the methodological strategies employed for discerning respondents' constructions of social reality.

Focusing on the first two thesis objectives, Chapter Three comprises the only theoretical article. It argues that introducing the notion of historical consciousness into the field of ethnicity offers new possibilities for discovering how "history" -as opposed to collective memory alone- impacts both ethnicity delineations and fluctuations of boundary maintenance. It shows that by encapsulating the many forms of commemoration as well as the different dimensions of historical thinking, the pertinence of historical consciousness in these processes depends on the manner in which group members historicize the past, or rather see emerging from it meaningful moral life patterns for orientation in time. The chapter concludes by suggesting that, through their ability to assign meaning to past events in order to negotiate their

ethnicity and agency towards the "significant Other," social actors can transform group delineations and can render ethnic boundaries more porous, depending on their capacity and willingness to recognize the "significant Other's" moral and historical agency in the flow of time.

Chapter Four focuses on the third thesis objective. It deals with the findings of an empirical, exploratory study conducted on both Francophone and Anglophone national history teachers. Investigating their treatments of common but non-consensual historical events when teaching the History of Quebec and Canada course, it evaluates their mutual apprehensions and in-class dealings. While all the Anglophone respondents demonstrated an awareness of Franco-Québécois social realities and historical experiences and a willingness to transmit such information to students, their Francophone counterparts did not reciprocate, and in contrast, seemed to instead be "insensitive" or "indifferent." Keeping in mind my conceptualization of historical consciousness and its correlation with constructivist perspectives of ethnicity, the chapter concludes by suggesting that this lack of openness possibly resides in the Francophone respondents' inability or even unwillingness to fundamentally recognize and embrace Anglo-Québécois moral and historical agency throughout Quebec's past.

Concentrating on the final thesis objective, Chapter Five discusses the findings of another qualitative study conducted specifically to verify the results of the preceding inquiry. It looks specifically at Francophone national history teachers' tendencies with respect to historical consciousness regarding Quebec's Anglophone community, which were elucidated by testing the effectiveness of the repertory discussed in the theoretical article. By discerning the ways in which respondents historicize different aspects of Quebec's past, I was able to gauge the extent of their capacity to recognize Anglo-Québécois historicity. In all, while some of the respondents seem to be aware of a few perspectives, the vast majority do not know Quebec Anglophone history, thereby confirming their overall ignorance of the out-group's social realities and historical experiences. Furthermore, despite both a general openness to acquiring

such knowledge, especially if given the opportunity, and a small number who recognize Anglo-Québécois historical and moral agency in the flow of time, there is no clear indication that the respondents embrace the "significant Other" in an inclusive historical vision of the past and thus in a common collective national identity.

Finally, as a general discussion, the concluding chapter of this dissertation looks at the overall consequences of my work on the four thesis objectives outlined above. It summarizes and compares the central points and findings of all three articles, highlighting their relevance for comprehending the role of historical consciousness in both the construction of inter-group realities and the teaching of national history in Quebec. To these ends, a first section reflects on my main contributions that theorize the effects of historical consciousness on the negotiations of ethnicity, the structuring of group boundaries, the promotion of mutual group openness, and the recognition of human moral and historical agency. An ensuing section then discusses my principal contributions in assessing mutual group attitudes between Franco and Anglo-Québécois national history teachers, while also touching upon the consequences of history teaching that bolster both language groups' parallelism. By further offering two important recommendations for improving reciprocal comprehension in the national history classroom, the chapter then ends with a look at a couple of limits inherent in my work as well as some main prospects for future research, the over-all aim being to develop new opportunities for encouraging inter-group dialogue and the eventual creation of a common historical vision for both communities.

References

Barton, Keith C. and Alan McCully. 2003. History Teaching and the Perpetuation of Memories: the Northern Ireland Experience. In *The Role of Memory in Ethnic Conflict*, eds. Ed Cairns and Michael D. Roe, 107-124. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Barton, Keith C. and Alan W. McCully. 2004. History, Identity, and the School Curriculum in Northern Ireland: An Empirical Study of Secondary Students' Ideas and Perspectives. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*. 36, no. 6: 1-32.

Breton, Raymond. 2005. *Ethnic Relations in Canada. Institutional Dynamics*. ed. With an introduction by Jeffrey G. Reitz. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Kitson, Alison. 2007. History Teaching and Reconciliation in Northern Ireland. In *Teaching the Violent Past: Reconciliation and History Education*, ed. E. Cole, 123-154. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

McAndrew, Marie. 2002. Ethnic Relations and Education in Divided Societies: Belgium, Catalonia, Northern Ireland, Quebec. *Kolor, Journal on Moving Communities*. 1: 5-19.

McAndrew, Marie. 2003. Should National Minorities/Majorities Share Common Institutions or Control Their Own Schools? A Comparison of Policies and Debates in Quebec, Northern Ireland and Catalonia. In *The Social Construction of Diversity: Recasting the Master Narrative of Industrial Nations*, eds. Danielle Juteau and Christiane Harzig, 369-424. New York: Berghahn Press.

McAndrew, Marie and Rudi Janssens. 2004. The Role of Schooling in the Maintenance and Transformation of Ethnic Boundaries between Linguistic

Communities: Contrasting Quebec and Belgium. *Canadian Ethnic Studies/Études ethniques au Canada*, special issue, ed. G. Bourgeault et al., *Ethnic Relations and Education in Divided Societies: Comparing Belgium and Canada*. 36, no. 3: 61-83.

McCully, Alan et al. 2003. *Teaching History in Societies Emerging from Conflict.* Report of an International Seminar Held in the UNESCO Centre, University of Ulster, Coleraine, Northern Ireland, September 9-13, 2002. University of Ulster: UNESCO Centre, August.

Rüsen, Jörn. 2005. *History: Narration, Interpretation, Orientation*. New York: Berghahn Books.

Seixas, Peter. 2004. Introduction to *Theorizing Historical Consciousness*, ed. Peter Seixas, 3-20. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Straub, Jürgen. 2005. Telling Stories, Making History: Toward a Narrative Psychology of the Historical Construction of Meaning. In *Narration, Identity, and Historical Consciousness*, ed. Jürgen Straub, 44-98. New York: Berghahn Books.

CHAPTER TWO

Laying the Groundwork for the Three Articles

1. **National History Teaching in Quebec**

In Western, democratic nation-states, history teaching holds two important social functions, the applications of which exert pressure on both educators and program developers to adequately balance the measure of each so as to dynamically preserve the social system in perpetuity. The first function involves the transmission of a national or, as is increasingly the case today, a civic identity reference framework, the main aim of which resides in aiding students locate their moral and socio-political agency within the ongoing story of the nation. This involves promoting a historical narrative that encapsulates the state's vision of its past, present and future. Incorporating important historical dates, events, figures, and myths, such a narrative usually reflects the values and other cultural norms of the dominant ethno-cultural group that controls the state's resources and institutions. While this process potentially excludes the social and historical experiences of ethnic or other minorities, the democratic system nonetheless encourages their respective interest groups to lobby the government to include their own perspectives in the national historical narrative transmitted in schools (Fullinwider 1996; Nash et al. 1997; Stearns et al. 2000; Barton and Levstik 2004; Seixas 2004a; Vickers 2005).

Through the transferral of notions of disciplinary history, the second function of history teaching consists of endowing students with the capacity to think critically and autonomously. Among other objectives, this involves openly questioning, debating, constructing and appreciating different interpretations of the past. In terms of future civic participation, the development and honing of such skills prepares students to make independent decisions about policy or moral issues instead of automatically accepting what is presented from above at face value. While ultimately invigorating for democracy, excess in critical and autonomous thinking could, however, produce an adverse effect. Relativity of all opinions could endorse a determinist, blind surrender to disguised authoritarian control, thereby threatening democratic stability and perpetuity (Nash et al. 1997; Stearns et al. 2000; Barton and Levstik 2004; Seixas 2004a; Vickers 2005).

Overall, applying an adequate measure of history teaching's two social functions lies on balancing out the transmission of a national historical narrative and the promotion of critical thinking skills. The first offers the bare minimum of a referential framework for a national identity that counters student apathy to state mores and institutions. The second advances tools of democratic agency for countering illegitimate abuses of authority. It is in the logic of such a symbiosis, which ultimately aims to establish acceptable social norms for improving the quality of common future life, that history teaching in Western societies occasionally instigates "healthy" debates among the public. To the detriment of both functions, such contentions may, however, destabilize the virtuous qualities that each affords the other (Fullinwider 1996; Nash et al. 1997; Stearns et al. 2000; Barton and Levstik 2004; Seixas 2004a; Vickers 2005).

While harmonizing the two main functions of history teaching in Quebec is a top priority for many educators and program developers (MEQ 1996; 1998a; MELS 2003), those concerned with preparing students for common future life constantly face pressure from certain interest groups over how to do so properly. One prominent reason for this is the general insecurity that both Francophones and Anglophones demonstrate over the maintenance and development of their respective groups. Undoubtedly contributing to on-going ambiguities over *Québécois* identity and unity, this anxiety over the issue of survival consequentially impedes the creation of a common historical vision shared by both communities. Underlying these uncertainties are memories of past and perceptions of current inter-group relations, as well as mutual fears of eventual assimilation into the other's fold. These factors not only inform educators' ethical and political predispositions toward conciliating history teaching's two main functions, but also give public figures, as well as the average lay person, the seeming moral authority to interject and comment on how to teach history and to what social ends.

By conceptualizing Quebec as a parallel society with ambiguous ethnic dominance, the influence of both Francophone and Anglophone group insecurities on history

teaching's two main social functions becomes clear, as does the resulting lack of a unified historical vision.

Breton's (2005) theoretical framework explaining Francophone and Anglophone relations in Canada proves very insightful for understanding Quebec's sociological parallelism. To conceptualize the association between both groups, he assesses their structural form and capacity for concerted action. These are related to the degrees to which each community can, on the one hand, offer its members social, economic and political institutions within which their lives can be ethnically fulfilled, and on the other, mobilize collective concerted socio-political action within and without the boundaries that differentiate them. Implicit in such a competition is the degree of parallelism between French and English Canadians, where their respective competing communities have both social enclosure along ethnic lines (the existence of separate networks of social relations that can perpetuate themselves autonomously) and compartmentalization (the existence of institutional completeness that is "analogous, parallel, non-complementary but distinguishable") (Breton 2005, p5).

In the context of Quebec, both communities actually do form sub-societies within the province, especially in Montreal for Anglophones, both do variously tend to have "continuity and tradition, autonomy, organization, and common affairs" (Breton 2005, p21), and both groups' members' lives can be fulfilled within their own ethno-cultural milieu without necessarily any contact with the other parallel, competing one. Such an analogy of intergroup relations for the province, however, does have its limits. The pronounced level of group interaction between Francophones and Anglophones in Quebec as well as the historical trajectory of their mutual exchanges differ from those in the rest of Canada. The degree of parallelism between the two is thus more complex and varies according to the type of institution. For example, whereas considerable cooperation exists today regarding health care and municipal politics, institutional segregation nonetheless persists in the realm of education. Furthermore, it is important to note that, overall, Anglophone institutional completeness in Quebec is slowly eroding. Due to the Francophone community's

continued political capacity to secure a sociological majority status in the province, Anglo-Québécois means of autonomous self-fulfillment are effectively weakening (McAndrew 2010).

In its turn, the notion of Quebec's ambiguous ethnic dominance emerges from the awkward structuring of French-English power relations in the province, which McAndrew (2000, 2002, 2003) elucidates through her appropriation of Schermerhorn's (1978) analysis of ethnic relations. Regarding group status, in terms of demography and strength, ambiguous ethnic dominance refers to a society where no clear dominant majority group can be identified due to a demographic, socio-political, linguistic, cultural or economic competition between two or more constituent groups. While such competition between Francophones and Anglophones in Quebec today revolves around certain group identity markers such as language, in and of itself epitomized by high institutional parallelism as in the cases of education and health, Quebec's association with Canada complicates matters, for each group can claim to be part of either a majority or a minority depending on their identity referent, be it Quebec or Canada (McAndrew 2000, 2002, 2003).

From constituting a "subordinate majority" throughout the country since the Conquest of 1760 -a large demographic group that did not necessarily hold considerable power to authoritatively preserve or transform Canada's value systems or to dispense economic and symbolic rewards to other groups (Schermerhorn 1978)-, French Canadians, or the Franco-Québécois today in Quebec, now tend to increasingly form a "dominant majority," comprising the largest demographic ethno-cultural group with considerable power and authority over state structures and resources in the province. In parallel, while Quebec Anglophones, of mostly British descent, used to comprise a "dominant minority" (especially the economic elite), they, as well as previous newcomers that were assimilated into their fold, currently are a "privileged" one. As a small demographic group with some political power, these Anglo-Québécois possess some economic clout and some institutional completeness (Levine 1990; McAndrew 2002; 2003).

When comparing Quebec Francophone and Anglophone power structures in this sociological framework, it becomes clear, despite moments of past and present collaboration between them, that both communities are in some respects engaged in identity politics and are concerned with their own collective regeneration or linguistic and cultural reproduction. Consequentially, these self-interests limit their capacity to communicate at an educational level and impede the development of concrete initiatives for inter-group comprehension (McAndrew 2002, 2003; McAndrew and Janssens 2004). Of pivotal importance here regarding the transmission of a national history program is the influence that such a precarious co-existence could exert over educator predispositions to harmonizing history teaching's two main social functions. Critical thinking skills may well be pushed aside by the necessity of maintaining each group's collective identity, particularly if the political climate between the two communities becomes tense or basically non-conducive to their free development. Instead of encouraging students to autonomously construct personal perspectives of a common past, teachers could thus reinforce the main markers of their group's experiences.

Under such circumstances, meanings attributed to feeling and being *Québécois* inadvertently risk being divisive and limited to group peculiarities. In some instances, Francophone educators may promote their community's historical experience as the only viable collective identity framework for socializing their students. And in contrast, Anglophone teachers may overwhelmingly emphasize how their social realities and historical experiences have constantly been ignored in Quebec's common history programs since the 1960s. Despite running counter to recent government policy objectives as well as to the aspirations of many history educationalists, teachers and curriculum designers (MEQ 1996; 1998a), such neglect may undermine Anglophone allegiances (as well as that of their sympathizers) to responsibly maintain the Quebec state as a democratic, plural and French speaking society (MICC 1990). Consequentially, such a feeling of alienation may impede them from properly integrating into and benefitting from the larger population.

2. Historical Consciousness and Quebec History Teacher Predispositions to Improving Common Future Life

Intrinsic to harmonizing history teaching's two central functions in Quebec's parallel classrooms is how educators historicize the common past between Francophones and Anglophones. According to how they view and mobilize history in order to make sense of inter-group relations, teachers may thus see the past as calling them, at one extreme, to blindly and rigidly reproduce pre-established visions of their group, or at the other, to creatively and openly use it as a means of transforming and adjusting themselves to the changing realities of the world around them. Underlying these different predispositions of historical consciousness is the emergence of significant life patterns that offer educators a sense of responsibility and conscience for orienting themselves in time. This implies the inevitable mobilization of moral values when teachers draw upon past power relations to construct inter-group realities. In the national history classroom, this would suggest that the socializing of students for common future life varies according to educators' ethical, political and even practical motivations for improving the quality of inter-group existence.

Of crucial importance here for promoting a mutually inclusive collective identity is teachers' ability to recognize their own and others' moral and historical agency in the flow of time, where to do so would suggest their potential openness to integrally accepting the competing group's realities and experiences when teaching about the development of Quebec. In light of constructivist perspectives of ethnicity, such an outcome, however, depends on how educators negotiate between the specific visions of the past that community power holders and grassroots movements usually mobilize for defining and regulating group sentiments and coherency throughout the times (Weber 1968; Buckley 1989; Nash 1989; Peel 1989; Eriksen 1993; Hutchinson and Smith 1996). While certain interest groups from both sides aim to control social actors' "ethnic" identity and agency toward the "Other", teachers' refusal of such pre-established notions for making sense of the past may counteract such attempts. Instead of preserving essentialized views of shared historical memories for

indefinitely maintaining inter-group dichotomies (Weber 1968; Schermerhorn 1978; Hutchinson and Smith 1996), teachers may historicize the past differently and decide to evolve with the changing times. When making moral decisions in social relationships with the competing group, they may decide to thus expand group boundaries and be more receptive to creating a larger and more inclusive common collective identity when transmitting the national history program.

In this logic, teachers' historical consciousness governs how the "significant Other" is both espoused in constructions of inter-group realities and dealt with in the history classroom. Regarding their anticipations of common future life, the way educators historicize the past likewise determines whether they transmit the competing group's social realities and historical experiences or not. As mentioned earlier, it is according to their strategies for maintaining and developing their group that they may thus either encourage inter-group respect and comprehension for the future or, on the contrary, may devise ways to preserve in-group existence within a common territory through mutual exclusion.

3. The Dissertation's Epistemological Framework

As a relatively new domain of research in North America that is increasingly being conceptualized and studied by historians and educationalists, historical consciousness offers a plethora of opportunities and angles for inquiring into "history's" role in informing human identity and agency. Every person has some form of it or another: referring to the past to fundamentally understand current actuality, to look for answers to explain why certain things are the way they are, to see what should be expected of them tomorrow and to determine what actions to take to attain personal goals as effectively as possible. In this sense, the importance of the past develops from one's relationship with time, which offers provisional assurances for surviving in the world. Accordingly, it involves structuring a scheme for remembering events strategically or purposefully for living life. When constructing knowledge of today, consciousness of the usefulness and meaningfulness of things past in the present

affords security for tomorrow (Becker 1932; Scheider 1978; Marcus 1980; Lukacs 1985; Gadamer 1987; Seixas 2004b; Rüsen 2005; Straub 2005a).

It is within this general view that the interpretive underpinnings of this dissertation's epistemological approach can be located. Although preferring to avoid counter-productive and even unfeasible labels, my theoretical framework nonetheless falls into what should be construed as wide understandings of the phenomenological, social constructionist and cultural studies' approaches to the social sciences (Berger and Luckmann 1966; Bogdan and Biklen 1992; Van der Maren 1996; Mason 2002). As an outcome of current times, my views have both willingly and unknowingly borrowed bits and pieces from these traditions. And as an active user, the meanings I give to them may possibly, in turn, even contribute to their general evolution. Instead of attempting to define each tradition individually, I will simply present my own vision of things. This will unwittingly prove that, as humans, we are all products of our times and that the meanings we give to our existence and surroundings result from and feed already-present, pre-configured notions for interpreting social reality.

I thus fundamentally believe that individuals are moral and historical actors. They are conscientious beings that actively contribute to the making of history, constructing the meanings they give to their own and surrounding realities for the ultimate aim of surviving in the world and thus living life. They are moral, because faced with imminent death they need to use certain standards or value principles to situate themselves in the absurdity of existence. And they are historical because at the heart of this ludicrous reality lies their relationship with time, their configurations of which amount to nothing more but mere means of making sense of their illogical existence. To tame the evolving nature of time and to thus counter unjust but yet inevitable mortality, they not only signify lived time (being-in-the-world) but also place it in a dimension of signified eternal time (being-out-of-the-world), affording them a glimmer of hope for validating both their existence and constructions of social reality for survival (Berger and Luckmann 1967; Marcus 1980; Ricoeur 1984; 2004; Lukacs 1985; Gadamer 1987; Chartier 1988; Nietzsche 1997; Wrzosek 2000; Black and

MacRaild 2000; Lagueux 2001; Lemon 2003; Rüsen 2005; Straub 2005a; Gergen 2005).

Underlying this approach is a self-fulfilling symbiosis of two important elements that cannot be separated from individual processes of structuring one's world. While these components should be seen as highly interrelated, they can nonetheless be viewed as two different items. The first refers to our a priori notions for apprehending and signifying our existence in the world -such as our cultural baggage or traditions, knowledge, filters or values as well as other norms for making sense of reality- which predispose socio-historical actors to ascertain and negotiate between all the intricacies involved in the construction of social reality. These ideas are basically handed down through the workings of both primary (immediate surroundings, family) and secondary (community, society) socialization (Berger and Luckmann 1967; Ricoeur 1984; 2004; Chartier 1988; Wrzosek 2000; Assmann 2001; Lagueux 2001; Lemon 2003).

The second component concerns the influence and socio-historical agency of cultural trendsetters over these notions of sense making, referring namely to the intellectual, political, economic, spiritual, communicational and even grassroots elite. While these informers are socialized into larger collective mores in a manner more or less similar to the average layperson, they nevertheless set the tone for signifying reality. For example, as philosophers and academics contribute to the theoretical frameworks for comprehending the world, the same can be said of politicians or social dissenters who potentially instill certain identities or modes of life onto their fellow citizens (Berger and Luckmann 1967; Ricoeur 1984; 2004; Chartier 1988; Wrzosek 2000; Assmann 2001; Lagueux 2001; Lemon 2003).

While both informer guidelines and our a priori notions for making sense of life or for constructing social reality evolve dynamically, they are nonetheless bound by the limits of human ingenuity. So, although individuals are fundamentally free to structure and signify the world, their creativity and imagination are limited by the

evolving mutualism of both these sources of knowledge. This raises the fundamental question of whether one can ultimately "think outside the box" of such a symbiosis. Can one's identity and agency be conceived outside what is deemed permissible by the mutualism of our a priori notions and the authority and prestige of our cultural trendsetters? Bringing this thought in line with that of individuals' moral and historical agency reinforces my view that constructions of social reality are nothing but mere constructions holding no "Truth" but rather strategies for confronting death, the absurdity of which amounts to our own existence.

4. General Research on Historical Consciousness and History Teaching in Education

Interest in theorizing and studying historical consciousness has gained momentum among researchers in the last decade or so, permitting history educationalists to complement other achievements in their field of study. Reflecting the lack of a strict consensus on its definition, most research has, however, seemingly focused on the many different aspects of historical consciousness individually, rather than looking at its concrete manifestations as an integral whole. In so doing, it would be fair to say that researchers have consequently disregarded its effects on human agency, which constitute the fundamental ingenuity of the concept's relevance for the social sciences and the humanities. With such an important void in the research literature, my ultimate interest in better understanding how national history teachers signify past events for knowing and guiding themselves toward the "significant Other" becomes quite challenging. A review of pertinent works in the field of history teaching and particularly on history educators will nevertheless set the stage for my work. As a prelude to the following section's exclusive focus on history teachers, I will first discuss the state of research on historical consciousness, followed by a brief look at what has been done in history teaching at large.

To date, English and French language researchers have mostly discussed the concept's theoretical aspects (Létourneau 2004; Simon 2004; Seixas 2004a, 2005;

Rüsen 2005; Straub 2005b), questioned some of its fundamental issues regarding both Western historical thought and its political uses within states or larger political unions (Macdonald; Laville 2004), and more recently have also conceptualized its narrative properties (Wertsch 2004; Straub 2005b). Work has moreover been conducted on certain facets of its development and articulation among students and adults, namely how they remember, understand and signify the past, and this at times without necessarily referring directly to the term historical consciousness itself (Angvik and Von Borries 1997; Leeuw-Roord 1998; Rosenzweig and Thelen 1998; Kölbl and Straub 2001; Charland 2003; Tutiaux-Guillon and Nourrisson 2003; Létourneau and Moisan 2004; Lee 2004; Wineburg et al. 2007).

Demonstrating and summing up these eclectic approaches, Kölbl and Straub (2001) offer a concise synthesis of the research conducted on the many aspects of historical consciousness. The fact that they include work from the German-speaking world proves to be extremely useful, especially since a more integrated scholarly tradition of both theorizing and researching historical consciousness can be found there than in other Western countries. While these authors distinguish eleven studied aspects, the most relevant ones concern the following: students' historical content knowledge and their learning processes; the ontogenetic or biographical development of historical consciousness among both adults and children; the processes of historical thinking among professional historians, teachers and laymen; the role of the media in transmitting and influencing historical knowledge; and the different potential methodologies for data collection. Once again, it becomes clear that research on direct manifestations of historical consciousness as an integrated whole seems to be lacking.

In terms of history teaching, educationalists have conducted invaluable work on many of its aspects since the 1990s. They have generally focused on such topics as the inception and development of programs, the controversies over transmitting adequate collective narrative frameworks and the connections between history and its civic virtues (Roy et al. 1992; Fullinwider 1996; Nash et al. 1997; Brighouse 2003;

Charland 2003; Barton and Levstik 2004; Cardin 2004; Laville 2004; Lévesque 2004; Seixas 2004a; Wertsch 2004; Vickers 2005; Sandwell 2006; BHP 2007; Éthier 2007; Éthier et al. 2007). History educationalists have also looked closely at student limits and potentials in knowing and doing history as well as at educators' professional aptitudes (Carretero and Voss 1994; Stearns et al. 2000; Wineburg 2001; Barton and Levstik 2004). Wineburg (2001) succinctly points out that studies conducted on students have generally addressed their historical misconceptions, their reading of history textbooks and their learning processes, with a specific look at the beliefs and conceptions they use as filters. In terms of historical thinking, work has also been done on their understanding of historical significance, continuity and change, progress and decline, historical empathy, on their ideas about time, perspective, and on the use of evidence (Carretero and Voss 1994; Stearns et al. 2000; Seixas 2004a).

Regarding research on history teachers, historical content and method knowledge as well as overall classroom practices have been touched upon (see below for more details) (Carretero and Voss 1994; Stearns et al. 2000; Wineburg 2001; Seixas 2004a). In addition to these, other recent studies have also looked at narrative expressions as "cognitive achievements," at technology's role in enhancing historical understanding, and at new directions for developing student and teacher assessments (Wineburg 2001). And finally, from a different angle, history educationalists have further sought to better understand such issues as "public memory," "vernacular history," "social memory," "commemoration," and other uses of history among adults. They have moreover tried to comprehend the dynamics of continuing conflicts over how the past is represented and have looked at the value of history for overcoming them (Barton and Levstik 2004).

5. General Research on History Teachers

From the outset of this chapter, it has been suggested that educators' historical consciousness constructs their social reality and their predispositions to apprehending and dealing with the "significant Other" in the national history classroom. Since

analytical studies are still rather nascent, empirical research on the manifestations of historical consciousness as an integrated whole are as yet practically non-existent. This, however, is not an obstacle to acquiring a general picture of educator practices, which constitutes an important part of setting the stage for such work. On the whole, among other factors, researchers have looked at the theoretical, practical, cultural, environmental, civic, institutional, moral and other personal influences that affect history teachers' pedagogical realities (Carretero and Voss 1994; Stearns et al. 2000; Wineburg 2001; Barton and Levstik 2004; Van Hover and Yeager 2005; Barton 2007; Kitson 2007). Put together, all demonstrate that their classroom agency is fairly complex and that all these factors fundamentally need to be taken into account when assessing teachers' overall performance. Nevertheless, for our purposes here, only the most pertinent influences will be looked at.

Of central importance in this regard are history educators' disciplinary knowledge and memories of the past, personal goals and strategies for instruction, as well as social pressures on national identity. Looking at the first two more closely, it becomes clear that the manner in which teachers apprehend historical content and form impacts their decisions about pedagogy. When juxtaposed with other types of commemoration, this awareness of the past surely affects the general workings of their historical consciousness, especially since a symbiosis of all such modes of remembering contribute to educator constructions of social reality. As Wineburg (2001) has demonstrated, what teachers know or don't know about history ultimately informs both the manner in which they teach it and use it for interiorizing new information for future transmission to students. What they teach is thus based on their knowledge of subject-matter content, which is as much a product of their beliefs as an accumulation of facts and interpretations. In its turn, how they teach stems from their perspectives on disciplinary history, which shape their mental framework for understanding subject-matter meaning and function. This seems to be the case especially with respect to factual content, the role of interpretation, the significance of chronology and continuity, and the substance of causation.

In light of teacher goals and strategies, Van Hover and Yeager's (2005) work further supports the pertinence of studying educators' historical consciousness, particularly since it touches upon the mobilization of individual moral principles, which we have already seen as forming the bedrock of the concept. Both researchers demonstrate that teachers' values and beliefs about life and education (as gained through personal experience), content (the nature of history), and students (abilities and limits) play a central role in shaping their pedagogical practices, more so than what they learned as student teachers. History educators thus make daily decisions on both the subject matter and the experiences to which students are exposed. In all, the authors find that beliefs about students, content and instruction, knowledge of curriculum content and pedagogy, teacher goals and purposes, as well as discipline-specific notions all variously inform instructional gate-keeping. These, moreover, complement what teachers are fundamentally expected to do in class: to cover curriculum and maintain control. In this logic, Van Hover and Yeager argue that teacher purpose has more impact on practice than curricular content knowledge. Educators with strongly held and clearly articulated goals make instructional decisions consistent with these purposes.

A final study supporting research on teacher historical consciousness, particularly in terms of social pressures on identity and inter-group relations, is Levstik's (2000) work on educator and teacher candidate perceptions of ethno-cultural diversity in the U.S. history curriculum. It sheds light on their attitudes toward both the historical narrative implicit in the national history program and the place of contentious issues within it. It reveals that teachers of American history prefer transmitting a positive vision of the nation instead of dealing with the alternative histories that may reflect their multicultural classrooms. Teachers feel "safe" in promoting social cohesion and consensus, and rather uncomfortable when dealing with contentious issues (divisive and coercive aspects of the past). "Negative" aspects of U.S. history are considered as aberrations from the norm, and developmentally inappropriate to teach since not all students are mature enough to handle an ambiguous past that undermines the formation of their national identity.

In all, Levstik's respondents condone an inclusive and civic national identity but not necessarily a plural and social one, where, for example, the civil rights' movement would be embraced over moments of ethno-racial and socioeconomic repression and resistance. Despite their general awareness of student desires to learn alternative histories or deal with contentious issues, most teachers and teacher candidates believe that they are ill-prepared to deal with such aspects of the past. Furthermore, they fear the consequences of touching upon past injustices and thus prefer to stay "silent." Levstik points out that these silences ironically reflect those in society at large, which have been and are being reproduced by history teachers. To avoid conflictive or contentious issues of the past, educators accommodate cultural diversity by celebrating "song and dance" differences over discussing race, cultural conflict, social inequities, and oppression. By doing so, they inadvertently reinforce stereotypes and distort images of the past and of current social realities, which in turn could potentially render history meaningless, inaccurate, and irrelevant for minority students, leading them to lack appreciation for their own historical agency and that of others.

6. General Research on Educators Teaching the "History of Quebec and Canada" Course

Despite the dearth of research on Quebec national history teachers, a general understanding of their pedagogical practices can be attained. Details of their everyday work experiences and environment as well as of their attitudes toward the History of Quebec and Canada program are readily available. Matters, however, change when it comes to looking at how Francophone and Anglophone educators comparatively view national history and teach it to their students. This lack becomes all the more evident with respect to inter-group attitudes and in-class mutual treatment between groups. By piecing all available information together, the groundwork can nevertheless be laid for conducting research on these and other related issues. The following overview briefly contextualizes my particular interest in studying Quebec history teachers' historical consciousness. The weight of this summary becomes especially

relevant when considering the province's sociological parallelism and ambiguous ethnic dominance, along with its common but non-consensual history curriculum for both competing groups.[1]

As a preliminary, it is clear that national history teachers from the two language communities normally face similar practical challenges when teaching. Some of the most important obstacles include limited resources, insufficient training for transferring the historical method, and time constraints for effectively transmitting course content when preparing students for the mandatory end-of-year exam (MEQ 1996). Reflecting a widespread lack of inter-group dialogue at the school level, three fundamental details regarding my research interests, however, do emerge. First, while Anglophone teachers often find that their group's social realities and historical experiences are neglected in the history program, some of them discredit it and mostly teach personal perspectives instead (MEQ 1996; MEQ 1998b; Zanazanian et al. 2005). Second, Francophone educators may possibly transfer a "melancholic" or "nostalgic" narrative of their group's past to students, thus mirroring negative or "victimized" memories of former times (Létourneau and Moisan 2004). And third, school principals from both language groups feel that their history classes do not necessarily offer their students the best chances of appreciating their own and the other community's realities and experiences (McAndrew et al. 2006). When put together, these three aspects reinforce the idea that Quebec's history classrooms are indeed parallel and that they actually do require some substantial and consistent form of mutual comprehension. To better grasp the implications of these three features, it would suffice to quickly elaborate on each of them.

The first aspect surfaces from the findings of the 1998 History Task Force (HTF), mandated by the MEQ to comment, encourage and improve the teaching and learning of history among Quebec's English-speaking student population. By investigating

---

[1] The new History and Citizenship Education program replaced the History of Quebec and Canada one in Secondary Four in September 2008. Since the data in this dissertation was gathered beforehand, my review thus focuses on the studies conducted prior to this change. This, however, should not be seen as a setback for my work because teachers' awareness of the past as well as their pedagogical practices would not have drastically evolved in such a short period of time.

how Anglophone and Francophone history educators teach Quebec/Canadian history in English language high schools, they underscore an important discrepancy between MEQ prescriptions and what some Anglophone history educators actually do teach. One outcome shows that ninety percent of sampled teachers follow MEQ directives to the letter, while the remaining ten do not for many reasons, some of them being: "Slanted Quebec viewpoint … Inaccurate facts," "Not enough teaching time to cover the material… Not comfortable with all the topics," "I augment info where I feel Canadian accomplishments have been ignored or marginalized (Boer War/WWI/WWII/Peace Keeping)" or "There is too much emphasis on Quebec nationalism" (MEQ 1998b, p26-27).

This ten percent is of particular interest because it suggests that some Anglophone teachers feel uncomfortable with transmitting the program's collective identity framework, especially since it does not adequately cater to their group's social realities and historical experiences. This contention is further corroborated by educators' general opinion that the mandatory June exam basically amounts to an imposition of the Franco-Québécois historical vision of the past. Coupled with time constraints and in some cases with students who have learning disabilities or poor reading and writing skills, they find that the exam impedes them from properly bringing Anglophone perspectives to classroom discussions (MEQ 1996; Zanazanian et al. 2005).

The second aspect emerges from Létourneau and Moisan's (2004) study on the complexities of what Franco-Québécois students know of their group's historical experiences. They find that the dominant storyline of the past that these students recite tends to be "nostalgic" and "melancholic," and is most probably garnered from both students' social environment and history teachers. For our purposes here, if true, this latter idea would highlight the centrality of educators' agency in developing students' historical representations of the past. To the authors' dismay, however, the framework of such a negative historical vision diverges from fairly recent historiographies that portray the Franco-Québécois as the main actors in their

historical evolution. As an explanation for disregarding these empowering pasts, Létourneau and Moisan believe that teachers resort to a "socially accepted and legitimized storyline" when they lack the "adequate factual knowledge, interpretive skills or intellectual courage to support an unconventional or eccentric version of Quebec's historical experience" (p114). Other cited reasons are teachers' eagerness to appease administrative and student pressures, to maintain social norms, and to avoid controversy. Consequently, similar to the findings of Levstik's aforementioned study, Létourneau and Moisan's suggestions regarding educators' classroom agency point to teachers' general preference for playing "safe," rather than being at the centre of contentious debate.

By and large, the conclusions of this study led me to make the following assumption: if indeed students do acquire aspects of a melancholic narrative from both their history teachers and social environment, it would not necessarily be wrong to suggest that these educators have, in turn, acquired parts of this narrative from their own history teachers and social environment when they were students. It is within this logic, then, that it would be interesting to study Francophone history teachers' historical consciousness of the "significant Other," especially if some of them have interiorized and tend to impart a general "victimized" storyline of Quebec's past.

Finally, the third aspect arises from McAndrew et al.'s (2006) study on Francophone and Anglophone school principals' perceptions of inter-group relations in the sphere of education since the 1998 linguistic division of Quebec school boards. One of its objectives was to apprehend the role of curricula on mutual knowledge and comprehension between both groups. Of interest here are the particular findings on curricular transmission in the history classroom. Overall, it revealed that both groups communicate little if at all across the linguistic divide. Principals from each side believe that their schools' history classes offer a somewhat average opportunity to better understand their own and the other community as well as an average, as opposed to a just, vision of their own and the other language group. For our purposes, a slightly larger number of Francophone school directors think that their schools'

history classes offer students less of an opportunity to better understand Quebec Anglophones, while a slightly larger number of Anglophone ones find the opposite, that their classes offer a better opportunity to understand Quebec Francophones. Furthermore, slightly more Anglophone principals believe that Francophone schools do not transmit a just vision of their group's past, with not a single one thinking that a "very just" vision is conveyed.

7. General Research on History Teachers in Northern Ireland

A look at the research conducted on Northern Irish history teachers adds to my understanding as well as to my imperative to study Quebec national history educators' historical consciousness of common past events. Both societies share key points for comparative analysis, particularly since they each are characterized by ambiguous ethnic dominance with regard to the sociological status of their constituent communities. Initial group contact, the ensuing evolution of inter-group relations as well as the nature of group control over the state's varying institutions all point to community competition over demographics, politics and the economy, as well as over certain elements of group identity such as language or religion (McAndrew 2002). While both societies hold some form of political autonomy within large state systems, Northern Ireland epitomizes a high degree of institutional, political and even violent division, whereas Quebec's institutional separation between Francophones and Anglophones points to somewhat peaceful daily inter-group contact, characterized by a mix of political tension and avoidance (McAndrew 2000).

In this sense, Northern Ireland's context of extreme division provides fascinating insight into the role of history teachers and history education in a society where clearly defined group differences have led to a recent violent and bloody past. As political developments seem to be resolving the main differences between Catholics and Protestants, and violence as a means to an end seems to have subsided, a majority of government officials, historians and educationalists see the history classroom as one key element contributing to social reconciliation. Based on the Schools History

Project (SHP) method of instruction, developed in the UK in the 1970s, traditional modes of teaching historical content in the curriculum have been replaced by an inquiry-based approach to history, where students learn the ins and outs of the historical method so as to basically develop their own perspectives on the past, rather than accept at face value what community leaders and family members hand them. Northern Irish history teaching is thus a prime example of a developed society attempting to teach a unifying history across a deep national divide. With this in mind, some key studies on Northern Irish history teachers permit a better comprehension of Quebec history educators' pedagogical practices when dealing with controversial aspects of a common past between two competing communities.

Similar to Levstik's (2000) findings, research in Northern Ireland demonstrates that during in-class treatments of their state's contentious past, history teachers tend to "play safe." Smith (2005) explains this as a result of the society's deep division. Given the choice, teachers tend to sidestep or resist teaching a common history, even if they are offered prime conditions to do so. As demonstrated in another study, despite recognizing the importance of dealing with controversial issues and of improving inter-group relations, educators seem to be more concerned with knowing how to go about achieving these intentions. Only a minority of them seem to display their ethno-political views in class, while the rest prefer to stay neutral. In such cases, teachers deal with sensitive topics by referring to already available documents rather than by initiating classroom discussions (Conway 2004).

Some factors explaining these attitudes include fear of community repercussions and uneasiness in dealing with the emotional responses that such issues may provoke among students (similar to the anxiety that Levstik found among her respondents). Moreover, the lack of proper teacher education to deal with these matters, of other forms of necessary support as well as of insufficient curricular resources all contribute to "playing safe" (McCully et al. 2003a).

In his turn, Barton (2007) argues that Northern Ireland history teachers steer away from "trouble" mostly because of personal insecurities vis-à-vis both government educational policies and their students. These anxieties are reflected in two respective discrepancies. The first relates to differences between classroom practices and program prescriptions, where teacher views of historical instruction essentially diverge from those of educational policymakers. Accordingly, among other consequences, rather than promoting social reconciliation, teachers prefer to transmit what they both know and feel comfortable in teaching. The second discrepancy stems from the opposition between teachers' intentions and students' expectations. While teachers undervalue their personal abilities to expand students' horizons at a stage when the latter are both developing their historical understanding and forming their own ideas about things, students are not getting the different perspectives of the past that they anticipate from their teachers. Barton feels that by avoiding contentious issues in the classroom, educators are thus unwittingly doing service to external influences by not challenging views that they are qualified and expected to address.

To complement Barton's views, it is important to note that recent studies on Northern Irish students' relationship with school history demonstrate that they tend to appreciate both their history classes and their teachers' pedagogical efforts. As a defining influence on the development of their identity and political views, students use what they learn in class selectively to justify and at times to even complexify group allegiances. Multiple perspectives, put forth by educators, moreover enable them to construct personal narratives of the past, particularly in light of the politicized histories they are bombarded with outside school (Barton et al. 2003; McCully et al. 2003b; Barton 2005; Barton and McCully 2005; Barton and McCully, forthcoming).

A final study elaborating on Northern Irish history teachers' avoidance of controversial issues is that of Allison Kitson (2007). In light of "playing safe" tendencies, she inquires into the extent to which they promote a genuine inquiry-based approach to history among students. Apart from finding educators' overall classroom agency and teaching priorities similar to those of their peers in other

Western states, Kitson's research reveals how her respondents do not necessarily attribute social reconciliation to the workings of history education, and how they instead prefer to focus on other, less contentious aspects of their work. Comparable to other Northern Irish studies, she finds that most teachers avoid dealing with sensitive issues and challenging generally accepted visions of the past because they basically fear inadvertently reinforcing already-ingrained perceptions by evoking emotional reactions among students. Teachers seem to be further convinced that common beliefs about the past are too entrenched in their classrooms to effectively be challenged, and depending on the location of their schools, they fear that local community pressures may be too strong to overtly employ strategies of reconciliation. "Playing safe," however, usually tends to happen mostly in neighbourhoods where inter-group conflict is more present in peoples' daily lives. Overall, while some teachers make history relevant to current issues in Northern Ireland, others do not depending on their willingness to challenge misconceptions, touch upon contentious issues, and connect the recent past to the present.

8. The Methodological Approach Used for Discerning Teacher Expressions of Historical Consciousness

Before ending this chapter, a few words need to be said about the overall methodology employed in this dissertation. Of central importance here are both the rationale behind my means for ascertaining research participant constructions of social reality and the strategies I actually employed for discerning such interpretations. Put together, both my reasoning and methods permitted me to determine how educators' historical consciousness enables them to appreciate common past events and to structure their realities of Francophone-Anglophone relations in Quebec.

Fundamentally amounting to the intellectualization of time for knowing and guiding oneself, I believe access to expressions of historical consciousness emerges when moral values for apprehending and configuring temporal change are "confronted."

Put differently, the workings of historical consciousness become clear when its negotiation processes among individuals are elicited in actual situations that require referral to a priori notions of the past for justifying and mobilizing social agency. In this sense, manifestations of historical consciousness arise in social relationships that require the perpetual assessing and organizing of one's moral obligations toward the past when constructing social reality for purposes of living life.

By linking this logic to ethnicity delineations and group interactions in my research, I proceeded with the overriding presupposition that any thematic context that incites Francophone and Anglophone educators to interpret and discuss the "Other" or their community's interactions with the "Other" in the flow of time ultimately amounts to such social circumstances of moral mobilization. On this view, to attain a deeper understanding of how my respondents minutely employ their historical consciousness to apprehend the other group, I decided to challenge the interiorized values they use for conceiving them when remembering and intellectualizing about Quebec's past.

As this reasoning proved to be theoretically sound, I resorted to a qualitative approach for collecting such expressions among research participants. The prospect of deeply examining manifestations of historical consciousness among a restricted sample of respondents seemed more appealing than attempting to acquire a synopsis of its workings among a larger segment of the history teacher population, as a quantitative approach would have warranted. Above all, my qualitative focus permitted me to empirically analyse and penetrate into respondents' thought processes, offering much needed fodder for prodding and probing my knowledge of the workings of historical consciousness.

By and large, several methodological strategies exist for accessing expressions of historical consciousness for qualitative study. Researchers can measure the concept's different aspects through employing semi-directive and open-ended interview questions, eliciting discourses from a series of pictures, problem solving, group discussions, autobiographical memory, participant observations, and the writing of

historical texts (Kölbl and Straub 2001; Lee 2004; Létourneau and Moisan 2004; Seixas and Clark 2004; Billmann-Mahecha and Hansen 2005; Wineburg et al. 2007). Following recent trends that support studying the narrative formulations of historical consciousness, researchers can further discern the major themes, intrigues, forms and logic that underlie such configurations among individuals (Wertsch 2004; Rüsen 2005; Straub 2005b).

In similar fashion, I foresaw my respondents' manifestations of historical consciousness as narrative and cultural texts. By employing interview and problem solving tactics, I believed access to their analytical reflections and justifications when historicizing past events would be empirically realized.

To these ends, the first study's strategy sought to grasp respondent constructions of social reality through the use of semi-directive interview questions. While the effects of historical consciousness on such constructions were not looked at as an integral whole, relevant aspects regarding mutual group perceptions and in-class treatments were highlighted, thereby setting the tone for my second in-depth inquiry. As a popular method for a preliminary, comprehensive examination of the field, the recourse to interviewing thus permitted grasping both respondent knowledge and reasoning processes. Furthermore, structured along pre-established themes for guidance, the flexibility of semi-directive questioning also made room for respondents' answers and ideas to potentially contribute to the development of new themes or aspects for review and analysis. In all, this scheme helped survey the meanings that national history teachers from both communities employ to apprehend the realities of inter-group relations. Moreover, it specifically provided a general overview of educator reactions, motives, calculations and reasoning for dealing with the "significant Other" in the Secondary Four history classroom (Miles and Huberman 1994; Van der Maren 1996; Boutin 1997; Mason 2002).

The research methodology employed for the follow-up study was more complex than in the prior, exploratory one. Keeping in mind the second investigation's more

descriptive and detailed character, three main strategies for gathering and analysing data were adopted. When put together, they permitted me to comment on the direct influence of historical consciousness on human identity and agency, as opposed to solely discussing some of its various aspects. To these ends, my analytical scheme also allowed me to test my repertory of different, parallel tendencies of historical consciousness for the very first time.

On the whole, the methods used in this inquiry were borrowed and adapted from the works of both Seixas and Clark (2004) and Létourneau and Moisan (2004). The first strategy comprised the idea of problem solving, which offered concrete information on the reasoning behind respondents' specific thinking processes when constructing social reality. For eliciting their historical consciousness, I asked them to solve a historical issue that had become contentious and problematic in the present (Seixas and Clark 2004). This exercise aimed to discern how they interacted with the past for resolving such controversies. Seeing that respondents would resort to significations of the past for negotiating and justifying their "moral" choices, I was thus able to analyse how they historicized the past in a disputatious present. Furthermore, I was also able to see how they theorized and intellectualized the usefulness of "history" for making sense of the past and thereby for living life. All this information was gathered through asking respondents to think and justify their reasoning out loud.

The second tactic consisted of asking an open-ended question that required a long narrative-type response related to a certain historic theme. I basically wanted respondents to recount the history of the "Other" from its very beginnings until the current day as best they could remember (Létourneau and Moisan 2004). Not only did I seek the type of narrative they would orally recite, but also the logic behind their thoughts. By focusing on the latter, I particularly wanted to discern how they would mobilize pre-given narrative elements for recounting Anglo-Québécois history and the extent to which they would historicize both the evolution of the past and their own thought processes. Since the analysis of narrative structuring can be very revealing of attitudes and beliefs that ethno-cultural groups hold of each other over

time, I was able to understand how respondents knew and signified the past when constructing social reality for purposes of living life.

Finally, similar to the exploratory study, the third strategy simply involved asking a series of semi-directive questions. The aim was to complement information already gathered through the other two techniques. This was done by focusing on both respondents' knowledge of inter-group power structures and their reactions to pre-given visions of their group. Since the two issues are highly political and controversial and therefore ethical, they also offered insight into respondent mobilizations of historical consciousness for assessing social reality.

References

Angvil, Magne and Bodo Von Borries, eds. 1997. *Youth and History. A Comparative European Survey on Historical Consciousness and Political Attitudes among Adolescents*. Hamburg: Edition Körber-Stiftung. 2 volumes.

Assman, Aleida 2001. History and Memory. In *International Encyclopaedia of the Social and Behavioural Sciences*, eds. Neil J. Smelser and Paul B. Baltes, Volume 10, 6822-6829.

Barton, Keith C. and Linda Levstik. 2004. *Teaching History for the Common Good*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Barton, Keith C. 2005. Best Not to Forget Them: Adolescents' Judgements of Historical Significance in Northern Ireland. *Theory and Research in Social Education*. 33: 9-44.

Barton, Keith C. 2007. Teachers, Students, and History Education in Northern Ireland: A Commentary on the Research Studies. In *Recent Research into Teaching History in Northern Ireland: Informing Curriculum Change*, 37-42. University of Ulster, UNESCO Centre.

Barton, Keith C. et al. 2003. History Education and National Identity in Northern Ireland, *International Journal of Historical Learning, Teaching and Research*. 3, 1: 31-43.

Barton, Keith C. and Alan McCully. 2005. History, Identity, and the School Curriculum in Northern Ireland: An Empirical Study of Secondary Students' Ideas and Perspectives. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*. 37, no. 1: 85-116.

Barton Keith C. and Alan McCully. Forthcoming. Secondary Students' Perspectives on School and Community History in Northern Ireland. *Teachers' College Record*.

Becker, Carl. 1932. Everyman his Own Historian. *The American Historical Review*. 37, no.2: 221-236.

Berger, Peter L. and Thomas Luckmann. 1967. *The Social Construction of Reality. A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge*. New York: Anchor Books.

Billmann-Mahecha, Elfriede and Monika Hansen. 2005. Empirical Psychological Approaches to the Historical Consciousness of Children. In *Narration, Identity, and Historical Consciousness*. Jürgen Straub, ed., 163-186. New York: Berghahn Books.

Black, Jeremy and Donald D. MacRaild. 2000. *Studying History*. 2nd ed. London: Macmillan Press Ltd.

Bogdan, Robert and Sari Knopp Biklen. 1992. *Qualitative Research for Education: An Introduction to Theory and Method*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Boutin, Gérald. 1997. *L'entretien de recherche qualitatif*. Quebec City: Presses de l'Université du Québec.

Breton, Raymond. 2005. *Ethnic Relations in Canada. Institutional Dynamics*. With an introduction by Jeffrey G. Reitz. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Brighouse, Harry. 2003. Should We Teach Patriotic History? In *Citizenship and Education in Liberal-Democratic Societies. Teaching for Cosmopolitan values and Collective Identities*, eds. Kevin McDonough and Walter Feinberg, 157-176. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Buckley, Anthony. 1989. 'We're Trying to Find our Identity': Uses of History among Ulster Protestants. In *History and Ethnicity*, eds. Elizabeth Tonkin, Maryon McDonald, and Malcolm Chapman, 183-197. London and New York: Routledge.

Bulletin d'histoire politique (BHP). 2007. *Débat sur le programme d'enseignement de l'histoire au Québec*. 15, no. 2, Winter.

Cardin, Jean-François. 2004. Le nouveau programme d'histoire au secondaire : le choix d'éduquer à la citoyenneté. *Formation et profession. Bulletin du CRIFPE*. 10 no. 2, December: 44-48.

Carretero, Mario and James F. Voss. 1994. *Cognitive and Instructional Processes in History and the Social Sciences*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Charland, Jean-Pierre. 2003. *Les élèves, l'histoire et la citoyenneté : Enquête auprès d'élèves des régions métropolitaine de Montréal et de Toronto*. Québec: Les Presses de l'Université Laval.

Chartier, Roger. 1988. *Cultural History: Between Practices and Representations*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Conway, Margaret. 2004. Identifying the Past: An Exploration of Teaching and Learning Sensitive Issues in History at Secondary School Level. *Educate*. 4, no. 2: 22-26.

Eriksen, Thomas Hylland. 1993. *Ethnicity and Nationalism: Anthropological Perspectives*. Boulder, CO: Pluto Press.

Éthier, Marc-André. 2007. Apprendre à exercer sa citoyenneté à l'aide de l'histoire. *Bulletin d'histoire politique*. 15, no. 2, Winter : 53-58.

Éthier, Marc-André et al. 2007. Enseignement de questions controversées en histoire : tensions entre politique de la reconnaissance et politique du passé. *Éducation et francophonie*. 23, no. 1, Spring: 65-85.

Fullinwider, Robert K. 1996. Patriotic History. In *Public Education in a Multicultural Society: Policy, Theory, Critique*, ed. R.K. Fullinwider, 203-227. Cambridge and New York City: Cambridge University Press.

Gadamer, Hans-Georg. 1987. The Problem of Historical Consciousness. In *Interpretive Social Science. A Second Look*, eds. P. Rabinow and W. M. Sullivan, 82-140. Berkeley, Los Angeles : University of California Press.

Gergen, Kenneth J. 2005. Narrative, Moral Identity and Historical Consciousness: A Social Constructionist Account. In *Narration, Identity, and Historical Consciousness*, ed. Jürgen Straub, 99-119. New York: Berghahn Books.

Hutchinson, John and Anthony D. Smith, eds. 1996. *Ethnicity*. New York, Toronto: Oxford University Press.

Kitson, Alison. 2007. History Teaching and Reconciliation in Northern Ireland. Dans *Teaching the Violent Past: Reconciliation and History Education*, ed. E. Cole, 123-154. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Kölbl, Carlos and Jürgen Straub. 2001. Historical Consciousness in Youth. Theoretical and Exemplary Empirical Analysis. Dans *Forum: Qualitative Social Research. Sozialforschung*. 2, no. 3. On-line journal: www.qualitative-research.net.

Lagueux, Maurice. 2001. *L'actualité de la philosophie de l'histoire*. Québec: Les Presses de l'Université Laval

Laville, Christian. 2004. Historical Consciousness and Historical Education: What to Expect from the First for the Second. In *Theorizing Historical Consciousness*, ed. Peter Seixas, 165-182. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Lee, Peter. 2004. Understanding History. In *Theorizing Historical Consciousness*, ed. Peter Seixas, 129-164. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Leeuw-Roord, Joke van der, ed. 1998. *The State of History Education in Europe. Challenges and Implications of the "Youth and Hitsory" Project*. Hamburg: Körber-Stiftung.

Lemon, M.C. 2003. *Philosophy of History. A Guide for Students*. London and New York: Routledge.

Létourneau, Jocelyn. 2004. *A History for the Future. Rewriting Memory and Identity in Quebec.* Translated by Phyllis Aronoff and Howard Scott. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Létourneau, Jocelyn and Sabrina Moisan. 2004. Young People's Assimilation of a Collective Historical Memory: A Case Study of Quebeckers of French-Canadian Heritage. In *Theorizing Historical Consciousness*, ed. Peter Seixas, 109-128. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Lévesque, Stéphane. 2004. History and Social Studies in Québec: An Historical Perspective. In *Challenges and Prospects for Canadian Social Studies*, eds. Alan Sears and Ian Wright, 55-72. Vancouver: Pacific Educational Press.

Levine, Marc V. 1990. *The Reconquest of Montreal. Language Policy and Social Change in a Bilingual City*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Levstik, Linda S. 2000. Articulating the Silences. Teachers' and Adolescents' Conceptions of Historical Significance. In *Knowing, Teaching, and Learning History. National and International Perspectives*, eds. Peter N. Stearns et al., 284-305. New York and London: New York University Press.

Lukacs, John. 1985. *Historical Consciousness or the Remembered Past*. New York: Schocken Books.

MacDonald, Sharon, ed. 2000. *Approaches to European Historical Consciousness: Reflections and Provocations*. Hamburg: Koerber Stiftung.

Marcus, John T. 1980. *Sub Specie Historiae. Essays in the Manifestation of Historical and Moral Consciousness*. London and Toronto: Associated University Press.

Mason, Jennifer. 2002. *Qualitative Researching*. 2nd ed. London: SAGE Publications.

McAndrew, Marie. 2000. Conclusion: comparabilité des expériences décrites et perspectives de collaboration. In *Relations ethniques et éducation dans les sociétés divisées (Québec, Irlande du nord, Catalogne et Belgique)*, eds. Marie McAndrew and France Gagnon, 225-239. Montreal: L'Harmattan Inc.

McAndrew, Marie. 2002. Ethnic Relations and Education in Divided Societies: Belgium, Catalonia, Northern Ireland, Quebec. *Kolor, Journal on Moving Communities*. 1: 5-19.

McAndrew, Marie. 2003. Should National Minorities/Majorities Share Common Institutions or Control Their Own Schools? A Comparison of Policies and Debates in Quebec, Northern Ireland and Catalonia. In *The Social Construction of Diversity: Recasting the Master Narrative of Industrial Nations*, eds. Danielle Juteau and Christiane Harzig, 369-424. New York: Berghahn Press.

McAndrew, Marie and Rudi Janssens. 2004. The Role of Schooling in the Maintenance and Transformation of Ethnic Boundaries between Linguistic Communities: Contrasting Quebec and Belgium. *Canadian Ethnic Studies/Études ethniques au Canada*, special issue, ed. Guy Bourgeault et al., *Ethnic Relations and Education in Divided Societies: Comparing Belgium and Canada*. 36, no. 3: 61-83.

McAndrew et al. 2006. L'éducation et les relations entre les francophones et les anglophones au Québec : les perceptions des directeurs d'école. *Brusselse Thema: Politiek, Taal, Onderwijs en Samenleving in Beweging*, special issue, eds. De Groof, R. et al. 14: 335-359.

McAndrew, Marie. 2010. *Les majorités* fragiles *peuvent-elles s'ouvrir au pluralisme? Les enjeux éducatifs au Québec et en Europe*. Montréal: Les Presses de L'Université de Montréal.

McCully, Alan et al. 2003a. *Teaching History in Societies Emerging from Conflict*. Report of an International Seminar Held in the UNESCO Centre, University of Ulster, Coleraine, Northern Ireland, September 9-13, 2002. University of Ulster: UNESCO Centre, August.

McCully, Alan et al. 2003b. *Speak Your Piece. Exploring Controversial Issues in Northern Ireland, a Development Project for Teachers and Youth Workers*. Final Report, School of Education, University of Ulster at Coleraine.

Miles, Mathew B. and A. Michael Huberman. 1994. *An Expanded Sourcebook: Qualitative Data Analysis*. 2nd ed. London: SAGE Publications.

Ministère de l'Éducation du Québec. 1996. *Se souvenir et devenir. Rapport du groupe de travail sur l'enseignement de l'histoire.* Quebec City: MEQ.

Ministère de l'Éducation du Québec. 1998a. *A School for the Future: Policy Statement on Educational Integration and Intercultural Education*. Quebec City: MEQ.

Ministère de l'Éducation du Québec. 1998b. *Overview of the Teaching of Elementary Social Studies and Secondary History within the Anglophone Community of the Province of Quebec. A Report by the History Task Force*. Quebec City: MEQ, October.

Ministère de l'Éducation, du Loisir et du Sport. 2003. *Programme de formation de l'école québécoise. Domaine de l'univers social. Géographie. Histoire et Éducation à la citoyenneté*. Quebec City: MELS.

Ministère des Communautés culturelles et de l'Immigration. 1990. *Au Québec pour bâtir ensemble. Énoncé de politique en matière d'immigration et d'intégration*. Quebec City: MICC.

Nash, Manning. 1989. *The Cauldron of Ethnicity in the Modern World*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.

Nash, Gary et al. 1997. *History on Trial: Culture Wars and the Teaching of the Past*. New York: A.A. Knopf.

Nietzsche, Friedrich. 1997 (1874). On the Uses and Disadvantages of History for Life. In *Untimely Meditations*, ed. Daniel Breazeale. Translated by R.J. Hollingdale, 57-124. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Peel, J. D. Y. 1989. The Cultural Work of Yoruba Ethnogenesis. In *History and Ethnicity*, eds. Elizabeth Tonkin, Maryon McDonald, and Malcolm Chapman, 198-215. London and New York: Routledge.

Ricoeur, Paul. 1984. *Time and Narrative*. Volume 1. Translated by K. McLaughlin and D. Pellauer. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Ricoeur, Paul. 2004. *Memory, History, Forgetting*. Translated by K. Blamey and D. Pellauer. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Rosenzweig, Roy and David Thelen. 1998. *Presence of the Past: Popular Uses of History in American Life*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Roy, Simon et al. 1992. *Évolution des programmes d'histoire de 1861 à nous jours*. Ste-Foy: Université Laval, Laboratoire de recherche en administration et politiques scolaire.

Rüsen, Jörn. 2005. *History: Narration, Interpretation, Orientation*. New York: Berghahn Books.

Sandwell, Ruth W., ed. 2006. *To the Past: History Education, Public Memory, and Citizenship Education in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Schermerhorn, Richard. 1978. *Comparative Ethnic Relations: A Framework for Theory and Research*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Schieder, Theodor. 1978. The Role of Historical Consciousness in Political Action. In *History and Theory. Studies in the Philosophy of History*. 17, no. 4: 1-18. *Beiheft 17 Historical Consciousness and Political Action*. Wesleyan University Press.

Seixas, Peter, ed. 2004a. *Theorizing Historical Consciousness*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Seixas, Peter. 2004b. Introduction to *Theorizing Historical Consciousness*, ed. Peter Seixas, 3-20. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Seixas, Peter and Penney Clark. 2004. Murals as Monuments: Students' Ideas about Depictions of Civilization in British Columbia. *American Journal of Education*. 110, February: 146-171.

Seixas, Peter. 2005. Historical Consciousness: The Progress of Knowledge in a Postprogressive Age. In *Narration, Identity, and Historical Consciousness*. Jürgen Straub, ed., 141-160. New York : Berghahn Books.

Simon, Roger I. 2004. The Pedagogical Insistence of Public Memory. In *Theorizing Historical Consciousness*, ed. Peter Seixas, 202-215. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Smith, Margaret. 2005. Historical Memory, Ethnonationalism and Peacebuilding in a Divided Society: The Teaching of History and Group Identity in Northern Ireland. Based on her book*: Reckoning with the Past: Teaching History in Northern Ireland*. Lanham, Maryland, USA: Lexington Books, 8-11.

Stearns, Peter N. et al. 2000. *Knowing, Teaching, and Learning History. National and International Perspectives*. New York and London: New York University Press.

Straub, Jürgen. 2005a. Telling Stories, Making History: Toward a Narrative Psychology of the Historical Construction of Meaning. In *Narration, Identity, and Historical Consciousness*, ed. Jürgen Straub, 44-98. New York: Berghahn Books.

Straub, Jürgen, ed. 2005b. *Narration, Identity, and Historical Consciousness*. New York: Berghahn Books.

Tutiaux-Guillon, Nicole and Didier Nourrisson. 2003. *Identités, mémoires, conscience historique*. Saint-Étienne: Publications de l'Université de Saint-Étienne.

Van der Maren, Jean-Marie. 1996. *Méthodes de recherche pour l'éducation*. Montréal: Les Presses de l'Université de Montréal.

Van Hover, Stephanie et Elizabeth Yeager. 2005. *'I want to use my subject matter to…' The Role of Purpose in One Secondary U.S. History Teacher's Instructional Decision-Making*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association. Montréal, Canada. April 11-15.

Vickers, Edward. 2005. History, Nationalism, and the Politics of Memory. In *History Education and National Identity in East Asia*, eds. Edward Vickers and Alisa Jones, 1-30. New York and London: Routledge.

Weber, Max. 1968. *Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology*. Guenther Roth and Claus Wittich, eds. Translated by Ephraim Fischoff et al. New York: Bedminster Press.

Wertsch, James. 2004. Specific Narratives and Schematic Narrative Templates. In *Theorizing Historical Consciousness*, ed. Peter Seixas, 49-62. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Wineburg, Sam. 2001. *Historical Thinking and Other Unnatural Acts. Charting the Future of Teaching the Past*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Wineburg, Sam et al. 2007. Common Belief and the Cultural Curriculum: An Intergenerational Study of Historical Consciousness. *American Educational Research Journal*. 44, no.1: 40-76.

Wrzosek, Wojciech. 2000. Histoire, valeurs, éducation. De la formation spontanée de la conscience historique. In *L'histoire et ses fonctions. Une pensée et des pratiques au présent*, eds. Henri Moniot and Maciej Serwanski, 113-126. Paris: L'Harmattan.

Zanazanian, Paul et al. 2005. *Teaching the History of Québec and Canada Course: Perspectives of Anglophone and Francophone Teachers: A Report based on a Qualitative Study Conducted in Montréal in 2003/2004*, (unpublished) for GREAPE (Groupe de recherche sur l'ethnicité et l'adaptation au pluralisme en éducation).

CHAPTER THREE

Historical Consciousness and Ethnicity: How Signifying the Past Influences the
Fluctuations in Ethnic Boundaries

Article One

Abstract

Theorists tend to limit "history's" role in the dynamics of ethnicity to that generally played by collective memory. By introducing the notion of historical consciousness to the field, new possibilities may, however, emerge for discerning how history, as one cultural mode of remembering among many others, impacts both ethnicity delineations and fluctuations in boundary maintenance. By encapsulating the many forms of commemoration as well as the different dimensions of historical thinking, the contribution of historical consciousness to the processes of ethnicity lies in the manner in which group members historicize the past or rather see emerging from it meaningful moral life patterns for orientation in time. By likewise signifying past events for negotiating their ethnicity and agency toward the "significant Other," social actors gate-keep group boundaries. And, depending on their capacity and willingness to recognize the "significant Other's" moral and historical agency in the flow of time, they can transform group delineations and render ethnic boundaries more porous.

Les théoriciens tendent généralement à restreindre le rôle de « l'histoire » dans la dynamique de l'ethnicité à celui joué par la mémoire collective. Cependant, l'introduction du concept de conscience historique dans le domaine peut faire émerger une meilleure compréhension du rôle de l'histoire, en tant que mode culturel de souvenir parmi d'autres, dans le maintien ou la fluctuation des marqueurs de l'ethnicité et des frontières intergroupes. Associant les formes diverses de la commémoration, ainsi que les différentes dimensions de la pensée historique, la conscience historique contribue à la dynamique de l'ethnicité en influençant la façon dont les membres d'un groupe historicisent le passé ou encore voient émerger de ce passé des formes significatives de l'agir moral pour l'orientation de leurs actions futures. À cet égard, en dotant les événements du passé de sens pour négocier leur ethnicité et agentivité envers l'« Autre signifiant », les acteurs sociaux contrôlent les frontières ethniques. Mais selon leur capacité et leur volonté de reconnaître

l'agentivité morale et historique de l' « Autre signifiant » à travers le temps, ils peuvent transformer la définition du groupe et rendre ses frontières plus perméables.

1. **Introduction**

When theorists touch upon the role of "history" in the dynamics of ethnicity, they usually tend to place its potential within the confines of what is generally understood as collective memory. Seemingly neglecting moments of historical thinking as a modern cultural mode of recollecting past experiences, "history's" potency is thus restrained to discerning the processes involved in the formation and rigidity of group boundaries rather than to fully comprehending how the capacity to historicize past events correlates with their overall maintenance and porosity. While ethnic boundaries are always permeable, they usually tend to be more so during certain periods more than others, notably when the general interests underlying intra- and inter-group power relations overwhelmingly converge (Weber 1968; Barth 1969; Jenkins 1997; Juteau 1999). This convergence paves the way for either potential assimilation into the more dominant culture or for a restructuring of the power system so that dichotomies and boundaries between two opposing "ethnic" groups persist into the unforeseeable future, albeit in different forms and possibly even in content (Weber 1968; Barth 1969; Jenkins 1997; Juteau 1999). Of importance here is how essentialized visions of past inter-group relations are mobilized for political or other social gains. For it is arguably these manipulated, pre-given narrative configurations of the past that are mistakenly held as solely consummating "history's" role in individual negotiations of ethnicity rather than equally considering the importance of the contributions of historical thinking.

A look at recent conceptualizations of historical consciousness allows one to better appreciate the relationship between history and ethnicity, especially since they hold notions of historical thinking on a par with those of collective memory. Fundamentally referring to how past events are signified for purposes of self-identification and temporal orientation in moral relationships with the "significant Other" (Rüsen 2005), historical consciousness offers the possibility to better understand how the capacity to historicize past events underlies a socio-historical

actor's autonomy in his or her negotiations of ethnicity, thereby better elucidating the fluctuations in ethnic boundary maintenance.

In the last two decades, theorists interested in ethnicity have sporadically touched upon notions of historical consciousness, usually referring to some of its aspects under the guise of "history" or instead by using the term without necessarily having exploited the entirety of its potential. Either way, those concerned with historical anthropology have linked it to ethnicity from afar by heralding ethnographies of the historical imagination or of the different cultural uses of "history" in its various forms, structures and functions as a new impulse and direction for the scope of their burgeoning field of study. Some have called for exploring both the historicity and socio-historical context of the making and transforming of different cultural groups' particular worlds (Comaroff and Comaroff 1992), while others have sought to recast the study of ethno-history into that of historical consciousness as a culturally distinct and socially specific phenomenon (Dening 1991). Underlying these approaches has been a universal understanding of historical consciousness, common to Western and non-Western societies alike in their constructions of social reality. While the promotion of such an anthropological understanding of "history" has been extremely pertinent for complementing the works of those who have demonstrated how group power elites manipulate history for purposes of group legitimacy, mobilization and perpetuity (Weber 1968; Tonkin et al. 1989; Nash 1989; O'Brien and Roseberry 1991; Eriksen 1993), it still does not fully consider the implications of historicizing on the fluctuations of ethnic boundary maintenance.

As a contribution, this article aspires to elaborate on this correlation. By proposing a repertory of tendencies of historical consciousness to clarify how awareness of past inter-group relations informs individual ethnicity negotiations, it suggests that the significations given to past events and the fluctuations in ethnic boundary maintenance mutually affect each other. An initial section calling for a universal understanding of history will be followed by a conceptualization of both historical consciousness and the repertory of its main tendencies. An ensuing discussion on the

allusions made to historical consciousness in constructivist perspectives of ethnicity will then lead to connecting the repertory of tendencies to the different fluctuations in ethnic boundaries. This will then open the way for a final analysis of the role that the capacity to historicize plays in these processes.

2. Understanding "History" by Bridging Disciplinary History with Collective Memory

Since time immemorial, individuals have referred to significant past experiences to moor their bearings for the purpose of surviving in the world. In the West, such speculation about the meanings of one's place or existence in temporal reality, inherent in general strategies of remembering, is today immersed in the specific patterns of consciousness and thought that a given culture constantly sets and refines. As these ways of doing "history" are fundamentally as numerous as those able-bodied individuals capable of and interested in such activities, they are moreover influenced by various group elites' interests and whims that gate-keep what is deemed permissible to think and to act upon in a given society (Halbwachs 1925; Weber 1968; Schermerhorn 1978; Nora 1984; Ricoeur 1984; 2004; Lowenthal 1985; Chartier 1988; Connerton 1989; Peel 1989; Eriksen 1993; Hutchinson and Smith 1996). Consequently, while our significations of the past are essentially subjective, the differing political imperatives of group power holders as well as philosophers' and historians' century-old debates over "history" have nonetheless come to influence both our perceptions of the past and the interpretive filters we use for discerning it. In other words, as notions of historical thinking have seeped into our collective consciousness, so have a certain number of narrative configurations of the past infiltrated and guided our thought patterns. It would thus not be wrong to posit that such a symbiosis informs the vast array of possibilities that we hold for imbuing temporal reality with significance (Ricoeur 1984; 2004; Chartier 1988; Assmann 2001; Rüsen 2005). As this may be true for the average layperson, the same can be said of group elites, who themselves are likewise socialized with similar cultural mores. This further suggests that those who have vested professional or political

interests in producing knowledge(s) of the past mutually influence one another when remembering it.

Following this logic, it would be hard to deny that both collective memory and disciplinary history, as two main Western modes of remembering that stretch beyond the time-span of human life, build on and nourish one another while also influencing how various elites and laypersons apprehend both temporal change and their own temporality (Ricoeur 1984; 2004; Chartier 1988; Assmann 2001; Rüsen 2005). For as the first primarily offers narrative frameworks within which the patterns of historical thought can be developed, the other permits criticizing, deconstructing and reformulating the contents of the past, that in turn are reified for guiding human agency.

Having slowly developed since the nineteenth century as a professionalized mode of Western thought and consciousness, disciplinary history basically comprises a form of investigation with its own established research methodology that seeks, finds and signifies the past (Black and MacRaild 2000; Lemon 2003). Among others dimensions, its thinking patterns include the ability to decipher what is historically significant, to properly use evidence from the past, and to understand such notions as continuity and change, cause and consequence, progress and decline, and presentism or hindsight (Lowenthal 2000; Seixas and Peck 2004; Seixas 2005). Guided by a community of academic historians who among themselves ideally vie for high methodical engagements, disciplinary history rigorously aims to produce plausible interpretations of past events by ultimately weaving all of its available traces into coherent and cogent narrative emplotments (Ricoeur 1984; Mink 1987; White 1987; Stearns et al. 2000). Although fundamentally an artistic mode of expression, such a configuration of past events differs from fiction in that it is limited by the records and traces of the past and is furthermore "commanded by an intention and a principle of truth" (Seixas 2000, p28). While the domain of disciplinary history primarily concerns academics, many of its aspects do engage other power elites as well as the general public. More specifically, this refers to the production of contents of the past

as well as of notions of historical thinking, which are mostly transmitted through books, history textbooks, schools, universities and museums (Stearns et al. 2000; Seixas 2004).

For its part, collective memory generally relates to how a group, society or nation remembers and narrates itself (Halbwachs 1925; Connerton 1989; Wertsch 2002). As a potent tool for various power elites (including historians) and even for certain grassroots movements, it involves a process through which particular visions of a group's past are endorsed, reiterated and even revisited and reconstructed for purposes of offering a sense of unity or community and even change to a given group so as to maintain it in perpetuity (Halbwachs 1925; Connerton 1989). Consequently, while certain moments of the past (real or imagined) are remembered, others are forgotten or occluded (Halbwachs 1925; Nora 1984; Wineburg 2001), thus rendering the production of historical narratives that try to best encapsulate it highly controversial, especially during times of social tension. Similar to the production of disciplinary history, narratives that configure such pasts and their concomitant symbols are furthermore transmitted to group members through different apparatuses of socialization, such as schools, universities, museums, community centres and the family, as well as through public monuments, national holidays and various other state symbols, like the national flag or anthem (Nora 1984; Lowenthal 1985; Connerton 1989). Overall, collective memory permits individuals to establish both who they are and what their relationships with society, the "Other" as well as with life in general consist of. In this logic, the "past" risks becoming sacred, offering group members a pre-determined future (Létourneau 1986; 1996; Charland 2003). Ironically, though aspects of historical thinking may contribute to questioning and even replacing such rigid memories of the past, the new narrative configurations that emerge nevertheless hold the potential to also become static, especially when power elites or grassroots movements control both the framework and outcome of relevant social debates.

Within this mind frame, reducing our understanding of history to its lowest terms elucidates how collective memory and disciplinary history are intimately related, where both amount to parallel yet interdependent manners of remembering. As "the memory of things said and done," history ultimately consists of the "ideal" sequencing of a series of events that have unfolded "objectively" in the past (Becker 1932, p223). With regard to an "anthropologically universal function of orientating human life by culture," this ideal sequencing, held and affirmed in our memory, renders history as "meaningful and sense-bearing time." "As a process of reflecting the time order of human life," it thus is "grounded on experience and moved by outlooks on the future" (Rüsen 2005, p2).

In this logic, my working definition of history, as it pertains to man's quest for living life, basically resembles current conceptualizations of historical consciousness, as will be discussed in the next section. This stance not only reflects but also contributes to disciplinary history's new drive for recasting its main objectives from seeking historical "truth" into investigating how people generally remember the past (Assman 2001; Laville 2004; Rüsen 2005). In other words, academic historians no longer search "for the true and verifiable" or "for realities in the past with an eye to understanding and explaining it and to interpreting its impact on the present." Instead, they are more interested in focusing "on the perceptions held in the present day, accurate or not," thereby making way for histories of "the collective imagination" by vying to "understand meanings" rather than merely "seeking causes" (Laville 2004, p172). Herein arguably lies the one main connection between both disciplinary history and collective memory that underlies my understanding of history: their common interest in the general expressions of human configurations of both temporal change and one's own temporality. As such, this provides the necessary step towards better investigating and theorizing the role of historical consciousness in issues pertaining to ethnicity, and more particularly to the fluctuations in ethnic boundary maintenance.

3. Conceptualizing Historical Consciousness: Towards a Repertory of Tendencies

As a relatively new concept in the humanities and social sciences, historical consciousness holds the potential for inquiring into "history's" role in informing human identity and agency. To these ends, it fundamentally refers to an individual's capacity to mobilize notions of the past for fulfilling moral obligations or for making the necessary moral choices in a social relationship for purposes of living life (Rüsen 2005). By epitomizing personal interaction with temporality through which both lived and eternal time are signified, it imputes coherency to the multifarious and bountiful past. As it helps individuals understand, appropriate and construct social reality, it also involves the structuring of a scheme for remembering events strategically or purposefully for knowing and guiding oneself. Thus, offering individuals temporary assurances or self-confidence for surviving in the world, historical consciousness consists of a stream of knowingness that links individual existence with future horizons, incorporating what Straub (2005) calls the triad of past, present and future. As such, consciousness in the present of the usefulness and meaningfulness of things past affords security for tomorrow.[2]

This approach to historical consciousness assumes that humans are basically moral and historical beings and that they use the past to answer pressing current-day questions about their relationships, identity, immortality, and agency, using it critically, creatively, and actively, in seeing change and continuity in their lives (Rosenzweig and Thelen 1998). In this mind frame, the purposes or motivations of historical consciousness may, among others, be ethical, practical or political, depending on the time, space and context of the moral situation and the values incurred in the social relationship at hand. In an ethical vein, both through empathy with the human condition in the past and an awareness of being-in-time, historical

---

[2] Variety in viewing this temporal trinity lies on the different emphases authors place on its temporal stream of consciousness, ultimately questioning whether the weight of the past (Nietzsche 1874; Rüsen 2005), the necessity of today (Becker 1932; Straub 2005) or the calling of tomorrow (Marcus 1980; Létourneau 2004) command historical consciousness.

consciousness imparts a temporal coherency that ultimately provides clues as to the true nature of one's moral existence (Marcus 1980). As a practical guide, it helps perform the simplest daily acts, adapting memories of prior thoughts and deeds to personal needs, wants and tastes (Becker 1932). And at a political level, it permits going beyond mere retrospective contemplation of historical events, affording to draw conclusions from the past and to pertinently apply them to goals set for the future (Scheider 1978).

While signifying past events is fundamentally negotiated at an individual level, its form, content and limits nonetheless bathe in the collective consciousness of the group(s) as well as of the wider culture(s) to which the socio-historical actor belongs. Accordingly, historical consciousness is located within the confines of what is deemed possible for human recollection, thought and action, circumscribed by the limits of culture or of human ingenuity itself. More particularly, it is influenced by both the patterns of historical thinking and the different narrative configurations of the past that the various elites transmit through such outlets of socialization as the media, university, family, community centre or officially-sanctioned state history (national history programs in schools, national holidays, etc.) (Becker 1932; Seixas 2004; Straub 2005). As such, historical consciousness consists of a dynamic and flexible process that adjusts to the situational imperatives of an individual's biological age, generation and cultural moment.

Both the value and contentiousness of historical consciousness for research arguably resides in its underlying capacity to "historicize" or to place past events into socio-historical context. At a first glance, this process implies seizing the different dimensions of historical thinking (historical significance, evidence, change and continuity, cause and consequence, historical perspective and moral judgment) that enable one to differentiate and distance current social and political realities, values, morals and mentalities from those of the past. For certain authors, this leads to ultimately possessing historical consciousness in and of itself, especially if the individual comes to recognize the historicity of one's own thought processes and

thereby accepts the idea of one's insertion in the historical process or in the flow of time as a moral or historical actor (Lukacs 1985; Gadamer 1987). However, when viewing historical consciousness as a mode of human orientation in time, where dimensions of historical thinking intermingle with collective memory and other forms of human commemoration, an important precision needs to be made. While historicizing would still pertain to placing the past into socio-historical context, a more profound understanding would permit a better appreciation of the many ways in which individuals apprehend and mobilize the temporal experience of their moral values for living life.

According to my reading of Rüsen (2005), to historicize would thus refer to a more specific manner of "doing history," suggesting an individual's capacity to see meaningful (moral) life patterns in the course of time. In other words, it consists of establishing a rapport with temporal change when interpreting past events, where the individual would see emerging significant life forms that offer a sense of responsibility and conscience for living life that transcend the boundaries of one's own temporality. In this sense, historicizing has more "praxis" connotations than merely being a sum total of theoretical or disciplinary understandings of history, thereby implicating a tendency not towards doing history for history, but rather towards making necessary moral choices to orient one's actions in social relationships. Since different forms of historicizing can thus take place, an individual's capacity to recognize one's own historicity and thus the historicity of the present in the flow of time consequentially amounts to only one tendency among others of historical consciousness (Rüsen 2005; Straub 2005).

Rüsen's (2005, p28-34) fourfold typology of historical consciousness serves as a good starting point for discerning the different ways in which humans historicize the past, or mobilize significant moral life patterns in time, for knowing and orienting themselves.[3] I will first look at the main characteristics of this typology, and then

---

[3] To my knowledge, the last attempt at offering a typology of historical consciousness in its entirety is that of Nietzsche's (1874). While it concedes that signifying the past impels or orients individuals toward the future, its central disdain toward an excess of historical knowledge, fearing that it could

propose some changes that support my recommendation of a repertory of ideal tendencies in its place. As shall be seen, this will become even more pertinent for relating my understanding of historical consciousness to the different fluctuations in ethnic boundary maintenance inherent in constructivist views of ethnicity.

Regarding the patterns of historical significance for individuals, the first two types that Rüsen proposes, the "traditional" and the "exemplary," amount to two different forms of mobilizing and orienting human agency and identity in a manner that resembles collective memory. Furthermore, they insinuate a way of apprehending the past as imposed from above, or as interiorizing what has been gained through processes of socialization. Accordingly, as "a continuity of obligatory cultural and life patterns over time," the first type refers to historical consciousness as partly functioning to keep traditions alive, where selected events of the past ultimately aim to preserve a group's cultural norms and values in time. This is done through reminding individuals of their origins and through the repetition of obligations (i.e. through narratives or symbols that confirm and reaffirm an individual's connection to his or her peers) (Rüsen 2005, p30). By incarnating one's group, the individual thus honours and maintains preconfigured narratives of the past by using history to reinforce them rather than to question their veracity.

In the same vein, the second type, as a form of "timeless rules of social life and timeless validity of values," ultimately refers to using the experiences of the past as guidelines for conduct, orienting individuals toward either what course of action to take or what to refrain from doing (Rüsen 2005, p29). Of importance here is the regularity of life patterns or of moral principles that transcend time and that serve as the basis for historical arguments that explain temporal change. History thus contains a message or becomes a lesson for the present and serves to legitimize the validity of one's roles and values in time.

---

doom humans, differentiates it from Rüsen's. The latter rather embraces "history" because of its potential for offering permanence through change. It is for this reason, ultimately reflecting current appreciations of history and of historical thought that have evolved from those of the nineteenth century, that Rüsen's typology will be considered over Nietzsche's.

Moving onto Rüsen's third "critical" type, as a refusal of the prior types' continuity and timeless guidelines, it consists basically of criticizing the dominant historical narratives that have been held as "true" or "real" by authoritative sources. In a way, such an apprehension points to transgressing a priori held notions of the past as handed down through collective memory. No longer deemed convincing, the individual does not recognize the validity of preconfigured narratives in connecting both past and future together; a binding obligation no longer exists, their validities are no longer pertinent. The individual transgresses elements of preconfigured narratives with historical arguments that lessen the weight of one's moral obligations to the past. He or she further offers elements of a counter-narrative to establish the plausibility of this refusal based on historical reasoning, explaining either why existing preconfigured narratives were used for understanding the past or, by focusing on certain aspects of the past that have changed, to describe their temporal evolution. Of importance here is a rupture in the flow of time where history serves to question life patterns and values systems in the present.

Finally, the "genetic" type fundamentally consists of recognizing the complexity of understanding human life. By noticing both the temporality of human thought processes and the variability of time, the individual realizes that one's obligations to the moral weight of the past vary according to different temporal contexts and thus can constantly be adjusted. He or she adapts elements of preconfigured narratives to current ethical considerations, all the while knowing that these could change tomorrow, thereby reflecting recognition of the constant evolution of both the variability of the moral context and of the pertinence of elements of preconfigured narratives for living life. Consequently, these elements are always perceived on a modern basis or by following new means of apprehending social reality. As such, it is the notion of change that gives history its sense, "where [historical] patterns change in order to paradoxically maintain their very permanence" (Rüsen 2005, p33). In contrast to the other types, new narratives of the past are envisaged in a dynamic manner of perpetual transformation according to time, space and context, permitting

the individual to construct social reality in all its complexity. Accordingly, he or she manifests a sincere openness to different viewpoints so as to better understand his or her own vision of things and to integrate them into a more complete perspective of temporal change. In this mind frame, it is fundamentally the recognition of one's own historicity that encourages humans to accept and respect the moral and historical agency of others. History here serves ultimately to transform unfamiliar life forms into those of one's own.

Although Rüsen admits that these types of historical consciousness are hard to concretize because they may appear simultaneously in mixed forms among individuals and may vary in context, he nonetheless embeds his typology in a theory of ontogenetic development, starting with the traditional and ending with the genetic. The different types of historical consciousness ultimately come to constitute the different stages in their growth of complexity, each being the pre-condition for the following, more complex one. In this development there is growth in complexity in terms of imbuing the past with historical significance, of its concomitant intellectual processes and skills, as well as of its pertinence in orienting individual identity and agency (Rüsen 2005).

Putting aside the ingenuity in constructing such a typology, the notion of ontogenetic development does, however, have its limits. Firstly, the underlying idea of offering rigid categories for determining the progression of individual historical consciousness is counter-productive because it does not recognize the fluidity of human agency when making sense of the past for living life. As an active moral and historical actor in his or her own right, the individual's historical consciousness may vary, contradict itself and even regress according to the social context in which he or she is located and thus cannot be seen as forming distinctive stages.

Secondly, as has been eloquently pointed out by Lee (2004), Rüsen fails to offer a comprehensive correlation between the acquisition of substantive ideas of the past (the "real" content or "practical" concepts of historical knowledge) and the

apprehension of second-order notions of history. In other words, Rüsen's typology solely allows for the registering of individuals' rapports with historical content knowledge when signifying the past for temporal orientation while neglecting how their understandings of the functioning or the structuring of disciplinary history intimately pertain to their mobilization of such knowledge. The discernment of individual apprehensions of such dimensions of historical thinking as evidence, change or hindsight when making claims about the past, is thus ignored. This neglect becomes all the more important given that the different dimensions of historical thinking do not necessarily evolve at the same rate in each person, thereby leading to confusion when associating the development of what one knows about the past with that of how one goes about knowing it.

Thirdly, Rüsen's notion of ontogenetic development also suggests that some types of historical consciousness are inherently better than other ones. This ultimately leads to questioning whether a "better" type of consciousness fundamentally does exist and if it does, whether, for example, recognizing the historicity of one's own thought processes and thus of others' is fundamentally "better" than blindly accepting preconfigured narratives for living life. Importing such a value judgment further suggests the potential manipulation of historical consciousness toward political or ideological ends, especially when power elites or grassroots movements use it to garner particular identities or visions of the past, as can be seen in the case of transmitting a pan-European identity through school history in some European countries (Macdonald 2000; Laville 2004).

If the underlying notion of progression, the discrepancies between historical thinking and historical content knowledge as well as the ideological implications inherent in Rüsen's ontogeny were resolved, addressed or recast in another light, his typology would arguably be more useful for conducting research, especially with regard to the fluctuations in ethnic boundary maintenance. In light of these concerns, it would thus be plausible to suggest making some adjustments. For example, by replacing his notion of ontogenetic development with that of a general repertory and by viewing

his rigid "types" as tendencies instead, a dynamic framework emerges, ultimately forming a new starting point for studying the role of historical consciousness in orienting human identity and agency.

Transforming Rüsen's typology into a repertory of four main "ideal" markers or tendencies of historical consciousness thus serves as an adequate heuristic tool for analysing social actors' mobilization of historical content knowledge when negotiating their ethnicity. Likewise, the traditional, exemplary, critical and genetic types should be seen as parallel tendencies that co-exist in a general repository of interiorized propensities that act as possible filters or lens an individual may inter-changeably use to signify the past. As dynamic phenomena, these different tendencies should furthermore be seen as interacting together according to time, space, context, values, and the historical situation under scrutiny. Not only does this suggest that individuals possess parallel manifestations of consciousness regarding different aspects of the past simultaneously, but it also permits the adding of different markers or tendencies to the general repertory along the way. Adopting such a repertory also opens the door for eventually developing new strategies, or in the very least new spaces for dialogue, for better understanding the ways in which different dimensions of historical thinking influence general human tendencies of signifying the past for purposes of living life. And finally, its fluidity also suggests and respects both the equality between the many forms of human conscience and the freedom of thought and expression that underlie modern democratic states.

Within the framework of such a repertory, analyzing historical consciousness enables the answering of such questions as why, how and when individuals remember certain historic events over others, acquire and maintain values for making moral judgments, employ historical thinking when imagining and narrating the past, negotiate their identity in light of past and recurring power struggles, and interiorize or reject the narratives of power-holders (intellectuals, media, politicians, business elite, grassroots movements) and state institutions (officially-sanctioned national identity narratives, historical visions of the state). And finally, for my purposes here, in terms

of inter-ethnic relations, the study of historical consciousness through such a repertory would also help to better grasp in-group attitudes toward significant out-groups, past, present and future, ultimately permitting the apprehension of the processes involved in the negotiation of one's ethnicity, or more specifically in both boundary formation and the fluctuations in its maintenance.

4. Understandings of Ethnicity that Deal with Historical Consciousness

The dominant perspective in ethnic studies today is the constructivist one, the core of which consists of three major interrelated dimensions that conceptualize ethnicity as a form of social organization that fundamentally emerges at the conjunction of group interaction in a given society. Of central importance, the first dimension refers to the salient features that structure the framework of a group's "cultural content" or "self-ascriptions," such as religion, language, physical traits, cultural values, norms, practices, traditions as well as shared historical memories. As these markers fundamentally facilitate self-knowledge and peer recognition, they also offer group members a sense of dignity and prestige by circumscribing their privileged access to group resources. Accordingly, cultural markers mould and inform ethnicity through the processes of socialization, establishing it both as a form of status group and a mechanism of monopolistic social closure (Weber 1968; Jenkins 1997; Juteau 1999; Malesevic 2004).

Equally important is the second dimension of group boundaries, which ultimately distinguish and validate cultural differences between various ethnic groups and which serve to maintain them according to their agency or capacity for socio-political mobilization. As social interaction across intergroup boundaries structures mutual group perceptions, it also offers the necessary prescriptions and proscriptions for behaviour during moments of intergroup contact. In this sense, group self-ascriptions as well as imputed out-group categories, consisting both of claimed and imposed cultural markers, become important for reciprocal signifying among in- and out-groups (Barth 1969; Jenkins 1997; Juteau 1999; Malesevic 2004; Spencer 2006).

Finally, the third dimension refers to the notion of unequal power relations. Parallel to merely describing cultural differences at the conjunction of group interaction, the emergence of ethnicity also implies a clash of interests and an ensuing power struggle, the political undertones of which render its analysis sociologically pertinent (Malesevic 2004). Among others, this involves considering the allocation of scarce resources within a given society, the concomitant economic, political and juristic concerns as well as issues of honour, values and overall livelihood, all of which variously provoke a flurry of competitive or even cooperative activities. In this sense, sentiments or subjective feelings of group commonality (i.e. the different cultural markers, categories, ascriptions and classification systems) are fundamentally manipulated and mobilized by various power elites and even grassroots movements for purposes of maintaining group formation and of rallying members against perceived societal inequalities or for whatever other motives that may be of interest (Weber 1968; Jenkins 1997; Juteau 1999; Alba 2000; Malesevic 2004).

When put together, these three dimensions fundamentally posit the interplay of both internal and external sides of ethnic boundaries, the first referring to the cultural content of the in-group and the second to the locus of the power struggle with the "significant Other" (Jenkins 1997; Juteau 1996; 1999). Notably, despite content change within group boundaries and group interactions outside of them, such a formation and mobilization of ethnicity is maintained as long as the dichotomies between significant in- and out-groups persist in time (Barth 1969). In other words, boundaries differentiating two groups continue to do so as long as the power structure regulating their interaction evolves in a binary manner. This, however, does not mean that the boundaries regulating their differences are rigid; instead they fluctuate, becoming more porous than usual to outsiders during certain periods over others (Juteau 1996; 1999).

Since the core of ethnicity fundamentally consists of a social communal relationship (Weber 1968) or of ethnic communalization (Juteau 1996; 1999), increased boundary

permeability occurs when societal inequalities or other antagonisms between two mutually significant groups are perceived to be practically non-existent, especially when intra-group power elites or grassroots movements reach a general consensus to that effect. In this logic, since ethnicity arises once a common feeling for a common situation leads to mutual orientations of behaviour, be they purely emotive, traditional or even partly motivated by rational common interests (Weber 1968, p40-42), its mobilization or communalization arguably ceases to occur when there no longer exists a drive among power elites or grassroots movements to manipulate subjective feelings of group belonging. This then paves the way for either assimilation into the more dominant culture or for a restructuring of the power system (by concerned group members who again mobilize cultural markers for their own interests, be it for power or prestige) so that dichotomies and boundaries persist into the unforeseeable future, albeit in different forms and possibly even different content.

In this mind frame, ethnicity is a dynamic phenomenon, depending on the time, space and context of both the inter- and intra-group relationships at hand, be they highly competitive and imbued with notions of domination and subordination or not (Juteau 1996; 1999). In this dual sense, as power structures evolve, so do cultural markers (historical, economic and social) as well as access to group membership that are both mobilized out and across the external side of the boundary (Barth 1969; Jenkins 1997; Juteau 1999; Malesevic 2004).

References to historical consciousness in models of ethnicity, which variously adhere or even contribute to constructivist perspectives, overwhelmingly allude to notions of collective memory when discussing issues pertaining to boundary formation and its rigid maintenance. By neglecting to also equally consider the influences of historical thinking in these processes, they thus achieve an incomplete picture of how the complexities of "history" both relate to the persistence of inter-group dichotomies and play a leading role in the mobilization of ethnic sentiments (Juteau 1996; 1999). Likewise, they fail to adequately grasp the relationship between "history" and moments of increased ethnic boundary permeability.

Interestingly enough, despite its subtle and scant presence in the literature, references to historical consciousness greatly mirror the first two types of Rüsen's typology, reminiscent of how an ethno-cultural group's collective memory creates and maintains group identity. At the most basic level, a foremost reference involves the fundamental promotion of both the subjective belief in common, real or putative ancestry and the ensuing shared historical memories of group experiences that permit members to know and narrate themselves as well as to acknowledge and narrate their peers. Regarding sustained contact between groups, such memories specifically refer to whether relations, at the time of contact between migrant and indigenous groups, involved the colonization of indigenous ones or rather the assimilation of migrant ones, and whether these processes occurred voluntarily or through force (Weber 1968; Schermerhorn 1978; Hutchinson and Smith 1996).

Concomitant to the first, a second reference to historical consciousness is the manipulation of these shared historical memories for political ends of mobilizing group sentiments and group formation. Carried out by various group power elites and or grassroots movements, it can garner a solid base, grounding members in a strong sense of common ethnicity or ethnic coherency, albeit in an illusionary manner through imagined membership or presumed identity (Weber 1968; Peel 1989; Hutchinson and Smith 1996). If these shared memories are to be effective in the political present, they need to nonetheless resonate with group members' actual experiences. By establishing a symbiosis between the imperatives of the present and the experiences of the past, the visions of the common past that a group's various political communities put forth need to be meaningful to group members in order for them to be properly mobilized (Peel 1989). Similarly, in order for ethnic groups to interact with each other across the external side of the boundary, these shared historical memories also need to form a sort of mutualism with those of the significant out-group. The historical narratives of both the dominant and subordinate groups thus need to resonate (even in their opposition) with each other if they are to fundamentally interact at all (Eriksen 1993). In both instances it becomes clear that

while narrative visions of the past demand plausibility and correlation for in- and out-groups respectively so that ethnicity becomes politically functional, the manipulation of shared historical memories (or the use of historical consciousness) in boundary maintenance is in and of itself a historical phenomenon that varies depending on time, space and context (Schermerhorn 1978).

A third reference to historical consciousness is its role in giving group members a sense of cohesion between the past, present and future (Weber 1968; Buckley 1989; Davis 1989; Nash 1989; Eriksen 1993). By keeping shared historical memories of group origins and other important experiences of the collective past alive, history offers ethnicity "'streams' of tradition" within which group members "are to differing degrees located and of which they differentially partake" as historical actors (Barth in Jenkins 1997, p52). In this sense, "tradition" (as a form and use of historical consciousness) can be seen as a cultural construct giving an authoritative direction to a group based on its survival, pastness, and continuity into the future (Nash 1989). By affording cultural beliefs and practices a legitimacy and pertinence for group members, this forward orientation of tradition binds personal life trajectories to that of the group, giving them a sense of unity and connection throughout generations by permitting them to "identify with heroic times, great deeds, and a genealogy to the beginning of things human, cultural and spiritual" (Nash 1989, p14).

Arguably, each of these aforementioned references neatly fit into Buckley's (1989) typology of how historical memories form a strong sense of ethnicity. The first is its use as "rhetorical commentary," by which the past is used descriptively to buttress a group's claim to prestige and power in opposition to another group. This is done by either amalgamating past grievances awaiting redress together or by asserting the superiority of one's group over the other. The second is using history as a "charter" for action, offering rules or guidelines for agency in the present. Less of a historical description, it serves as a practical model to be imitated. And the third is a focus on allegiance, by which commemorations of historical events in processions of rituals, set forth as an example, can provide a focus for ethnic loyalty. Strikingly, this

typology resembles Rüsen's traditional and exemplary types in that historical visions of the past are used to not only narrate who group members are, but also to serve as a repository for remembrance and action through repetitive reminders of key identity markers and through promoting codes or rules of conduct or action.

Finally, a look at Juteau's (1996; 1999) constructivist model of ethnicity, which goes a step further than those proposed by other authors when dealing with the role of history, will permit us to see how notions of historical thinking may play a leading role of equal importance as those of collective memory for better grasping the relationship between historical consciousness and the fluctuations in boundary maintenance. To this end, she basically emphasizes the centrality of the manipulation and mobilization of "historically produced attributes or memories" in the symbiosis between both the internal and external sides of ethnic boundaries. Of importance here are the imposition and resistance to "essentialized" or "stereotypical" visions of the past, where historical memories become an asset as well as a weapon for pushing the various political, economic, societal, ideological or cultural interests of both intra- and inter-group power elites and even grassroots movements.

According to Juteau, in the power structure regulating group interaction, the stronger or more dominant group will usually attempt to deter members of the weaker one from determining their historical agency according to idiosyncratic historical specificities, preferring that they instead interiorize a simplistic framework of their past experiences that the stronger one usually imposes. Some members of the weaker group may yield to such "essentialized" definitions, eventually adopting a static sense of self (i.e. rigid boundaries and a simple and homogenous history). Others, however, will not, and may instead mobilize their own interpretations of their group's historical memories (and other cultural markers) to counter such attempts, which in turn also entails a process of essentialization, where reduced aspects of a reclaimed past are used as ammunition for group action or even resistance. Underlying such a process of communalization is the weight of a group's shared historical experiences that may corroborate the current realities of its social status and agency. As such, the more

negative the shared memories of these experiences are, the more essentialized visions of historical memories are prone to being mobilized for purposes of attaining various objectives. Even if power elites and grassroots movements may compete amongst themselves to promote their own besieged historical outlook among group members in this process, the intensity of mobilizing essentialized historical visions nevertheless evolves according to the time, space and context of a group's social relationship with the "significant Other."

As this mobilization again relates to Rüsen's traditional and exemplary types when signifying past events for self-identification and orientation in time, Juteau's promotion of an "inquisitive mind," as a preponderant means of deconstruction, instead points to a social actor's capacity of "liberating" himself or herself from imposed visions or narratives of past inter-group relations. By likewise being open to questioning the rigidity of essentialized and reclaimed group histories, she suggests that individuals can better understand the processes involved in the construction of ethnic group identity when negotiating their ethnicity (Juteau 1996, p57).

Accordingly, Rüsen's critical and genetic types immediately spring to mind. For if group members were to individually and effectively question past inter-group relations and consider their various possibilities for narration (especially by recognizing the value of multiple viewpoints of the past), they would most probably be able, at the very least, to unmask what has been interiorized as true or self-evident. Furthermore, they would most likely be able to deconstruct and better apprehend the issues of the underlying power struggle inherent in ethnic communalization that rigidly mobilizes a group's historical and cultural specificities. Depending on both their outlook on current inter-group relations and adherence to various power holder interpretations of the past, social actors could thus either accept, simply criticize or outright reject the general historical visions that narrate their group and its relations with the "significant Other." As a consequence, they could either promote already established narratives or eventually even recite new ones that reconfigure inter-group relations both in their complexity and according to modern ethic considerations.

5. Conclusion: Toward Theorizing the Relationship between Historical Consciousness and the Fluctuations in Ethnic Boundaries

In bringing my repertoire of historical consciousness together with these constructivist accounts, a particular understanding of ethnicity emerges, which permits me to correlate the different tendencies of signifying past inter-group relations with the fluctuations in ethnic boundary maintenance. As was seen, when socio-historical actors negotiate their ethnicity, they are fundamentally faced with making moral decisions in a social relationship with the "significant Other." By thus reasserting their values in the construction of inter-group reality, they resort to their historical consciousness of past events so as to structure both a scheme for connecting their personal identity to that of their larger "ethnic" in-group and for guiding their actions towards the out-group.

By following the logic of Rüsen's fourfold typology, these expressions of historical consciousness thus predispose individuals to reaffirm, criticize or re-adapt already available historical visions that ultimately configure who they are and what their group's relationship with the "significant Other" consists of. While these tendencies variously comprise notions of collective memory and historical thinking as cultural modes of remembering, the historical visions that individuals engage with are nevertheless manipulated and essentialized by different group power elites and even grassroots movements. Having been interiorized through similar processes of socialization, these actors appropriate the same filters for making sense of the past, as have other group members, in order to advance their own personal or other interests, such as improving their group's social status or access to scarce resources.

In this sense, as individuals refer to their historical consciousness when negotiating ethnicity, they are basically mediating between two processes: the many ways in which different group power elites and grassroots movements both manipulate patterns of historical thought with pre-configured narratives of past events and

mobilize essentialized historical group attributes. It is thus through these in-group complexities in engaging the "significant Other" at the conjunction of group interaction that inter-group boundaries are arguably either rigidly maintained or become more porous than usual.

Based on my understanding of Rüsen's genetic type, two important points emerge that need to be carefully emphasized. Firstly, a social actor's recognition of the historicity and thus variability of human thought processes can fundamentally "liberate" him or her from what group power elites and grassroots movements deem permissible to think and act upon. So, as individual expressions of historical consciousness in ethnicity negotiations are ultimately dependent on the state of the current power structure between both intra- and inter-group trendsetters, the social actor's ethical, practical and political motivations for accepting the "significant Other's" moral and historical agency may fundamentally counter those of his or her peers or even of his or her power and grassroots elites. This, in turn, leads to the second point. In light of the mechanics of boundary persistence, even if individuals tend to recognize the historicity and variability of man's thought processes, it should not immediately be taken for granted that the "significant Other" will be cast in a positive light or that their historical experiences and social realities will be taken into consideration when constructing inter-group reality. In all then, not only does the capacity to recognize man's moral and historical agency imply "autonomy" from various in-group influences, but it also suggests that a social actor may choose to perceive the power structure regulating group interaction as he or she pleases, be it equitable and conducive to in-group regeneration or rather unequal and antagonistic so as to indefinitely maintain inter-group dichotomies.

Regarding these two points, if one were to concede that the underlying motivations to recognize man's moral and historical agency could ultimately counter the different historical visions of past inter-group relations that various power elites and grassroots movements try to impose on group members, the fluctuations in ethnic boundary maintenance can become clearer. While this moves beyond grasping the role of

history in these processes as mere static notions of collective memory, it also points to the necessity of further elaborating on the genetic tendency's contributions. For while traditional and exemplary inclinations toward signifying past events in a moral situation with the "significant Other" ultimately suggest the preservation of exclusionary "ethnic" visions of in-group identity and inter-group agency, and while critical ones rather question the pertinence of such claims, genetic tendencies instead seem to be more complex. This is so because of the latter's many motivations for readapting the past to the changing circumstances of the present, which notably open up new possibilities for facing inter-group challenges dynamically without forgetting stories of old. For while individuals would see themselves as well as members of the "significant Other" as moral and historical actors who are in a perpetual state of transformation, and would thereby appreciate multiple viewpoints of the past when assessing and negotiating upon current inter-group relations, individuals' ethical, practical and political motivations may, however, discourage them from doing so.

Accordingly, at least four different moments that relate individual expressions of historical consciousness to ethnic boundary fluctuations can be suggested as a starting point for further debate and theorization. When power relations between two groups are overwhelmingly portrayed by intra-group power elites and grassroots movements as having transformed for the better, group members may be motivated to recognize the "significant Other's" historicity and to readapt pre-given historical visions to these changing realities of inter-group dynamics, thereby rendering their boundaries more porous and open to the "significant Other." Under the same circumstances, they may instead decide to nevertheless continue to maintain inter-group dichotomies and thus rigidly preserve inter-group boundaries. Conversely, when inter-group power relations are depicted as staying constant or as not having greatly improved, group members may accordingly decide to not recognize the historicity of the "significant Other" and to rather reaffirm the historical visions that various power elites and grassroots movements diffuse to again rigidly maintain boundaries (similar to the first two tendencies of my repertory). Or finally, group members may instead decide to recognize the "significant Other's" historicity irrespective of various in-group

interests of maintaining dichotomies, thus rendering their boundaries more permeable to the "significant Other."

With these moments in mind, it is however important to note that such an understanding of the capacity to recognize the historicity and variability of man's thought processes in individual negotiations of ethnicity should be seen as an iterative work-in-progress, for such historicizing will always consist of a sort of internal battlefield between group members. For while its instances may be salutary for some group members, depending on the time, space and context of the social relationship at hand with the "significant Other," it may also at times be seen as constituting a danger to the group's preservation for others. Thus, as ethnicity persists according to the evolution of intra- and inter-group dichotomies, so do the parallel tendencies of historical consciousness, which sometimes demand the self-conscious use of the capacity to recognize man's moral and historical agency in a manner that may be deemed unthinkable.

References

Alba, Richard D. 2000. Ethnicity. In *Encyclopaedia of Sociology*, eds. Edgar F. Borgatta and Rhonda J. V. Montgomery. 2nd ed. Volume 2, 840-852. New York: Macmillan Reference USA.

Assman, Aleida. 2001. History and Memory. In *International Encyclopaedia of the Social and Behavioural Sciences*, eds. Neil J. Smelser and Paul B. Baltes, Volume 10, 6822-6829.

Barth, Frederik. 1996. Ethnic groups and boundaries (1969). In *Theories of Ethnicity: A Classical Reader*, ed. Werner Sollor, 294-324. New York: New York University Press.

Becker, Carl. 1932. Everyman his Own Historian. *The American Historical Review*. 37, no. 2: 221-236.

Black, Jeremy and Donald D. MacRaild. 2000. *Studying History*. 2nd ed. London: Macmillan Press Ltd.

Buckley, Anthony. 1989. 'We're Trying to Find our Identity': Uses of History among Ulster Protestants. In *History and Ethnicity*, eds. Elizabeth Tonkin, Maryon McDonald, and Malcolm Chapman, 183-197. London and New York: Routledge.

Charland, Jean-Pierre. 2003. *Les élèves, l'histoire et la citoyenneté : Enquête auprès d'élèves des régions métropolitaine de Montréal et de Toronto*. Québec: Les Presses de l'Université Laval.

Chartier, Roger. 1988. *Cultural History: Between Practices and Representations*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Comaroff, John and Jean Comaroff. 1992. *Ethnography and the Historical Imagination*. Boulder, San Francisco and Oxford: Westview Press.

Connerton, Paul. 1989. *How Societies Remember*. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press.

Davis, John. 1989. The Social Relations of the Production of History. In *Ethnicity and History*, eds. Tonkin, Elizabeth et al., 104-120. London and New York: Routledge.

Dening, Greg. 1991. A Poetic of Histories. Transformations that Present the Past. In *Clio in Oceania. Toward a Historical Anthropology*, ed. Aletta Biersack, 347-380. Washington and London: Smithsonian Institution Press.

Eriksen, Thomas Hylland. 1993. *Ethnicity and Nationalism: Anthropological Perspectives*. Boulder, CO: Pluto Press.

Gadamer, Hans-Georg. 1987. The Problem of Historical Consciousness. In *Interpretive Social Science. A Second Look*, eds. P. Rabinow and W. M. Sullivan, 82-140. Berkeley, Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Halbwachs, Maurice. 1992 (1925). *On Collective Memory*. Edited and translated with an introduction by Lewis A. Coser. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Hutchinson, John and Anthony D. Smith, eds. 1996. *Ethnicity*. New York, Toronto: Oxford University Press.

Jenkins, Richard. 1997. *Rethinking Ethnicity: Arguments and Explorations*. Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE Publications.

Juteau, Danielle. 1996. Theorising Ethnicity and Ethnic Communalisations at the Margins: From Quebec to the World System. In *Nations and Nationalism*. 2, no.1: 45-66.

Juteau, Danielle. 1999. *L'ethnicité et ses frontières*. Montréal: Presses de l'Université de Montréal.

Laville, Christian. 2004. Historical Consciousness and Historical Education: What to Expect from the First for the Second. In *Theorizing Historical Consciousness*, ed. Peter Seixas, 165-182. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Lee, Peter. 2004. Understanding History. In *Theorizing Historical Consciousness*, ed. Peter Seixas, 129-164. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Lemon, M.C. 2003. *Philosophy of History. A Guide for Students*. London and New York: Routledge.

Létourneau, Jocelyn. 1986. Historiens, sociogrammes et histoire : l'interaction complexe entre mémoire collective, mémoire individuelle, passé construit et passé vécu. In *Étude de la construction de la mémoire collective des Québécois au XXe siècle. Approches multidisciplinaires*, ed. Jacques Mathieu, 99-108. Québec: Cahiers du CELAT.

Létourneau, Jocelyn. 1996. L'historiographie comme miroir, écho et récit de « Nous Autres ». In *L'histoire en partage : usages et mises en discours du passé*, eds. Bogumil Jewsiewicki and Jocelyn Létourneau, 25-44. Paris: L'Harmattan.

Létourneau, Jocelyn. 2004. *A History for the Future. Rewriting Memory and Identity in Quebec.* Translated by Phyllis Aronoff and Howard Scott. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Lowenthal, David. 1985. *The Past is a Foreign Country*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.

Lowenthal, David. 2000. Dilemmas and Delights of Learning History. In *Knowing, Teaching and Learning History. National and International Perspectives*, eds. Peter N. Stearns et al., 63-82. New York: New York University Press.

Lukacs, John. 1985. *Historical Consciousness or the Remembered Past*. New York: Schocken Books.

Macdonald, Sharon, ed. 2000. *Approaches to European Historical Consciousness: Reflections and Provocations*. Hamburg: Koerber Stiftung.

Malesevic, Sinisa. 2004. *The Sociology of Ethnicity*. Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE Publications.

Marcus, John T. 1980. *Sub Specie Historiae. Essays in the Manifestation of Historical and Moral Consciousness*. London and Toronto: Associated University Press.

Mink, Louis. 1987. *Historical Understanding*. Ithaca & London: Cornell University Press.

Nash, Manning. 1989. *The Cauldron of Ethnicity in the Modern World*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.

Nietzsche, Friedrich. 1997 (1874). On the Uses and Disadvantages of History for Life. In *Untimely Meditations*, ed. Daniel Breazeale. Translated by R.J. Hollingdale, 57-124. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nora, Pierre. 1984. *Les lieux de mémoire*. Paris: Gallimard.

O'Brien, Jay and William Roseberry. 1991. *Golden Ages, Dark Ages. Imagining the Past in Anthropology and History*. Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: University of California Press.

Peel, J. D. Y. 1989. The Cultural Work of Yoruba Ethnogenesis. In *History and Ethnicity*, eds. Elizabeth Tonkin, Maryon McDonald, and Malcolm Chapman, 198-215. London and New York: Routledge.

Ricoeur, Paul. 1984. *Time and Narrative*. Volume 1. Translated by K. McLaughlin and D. Pellauer. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Ricoeur, Paul. 2004. *Memory, History, Forgetting*. Translated by K. Blamey and D. Pellauer. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Rosenzweig, Roy and David Thelen. 1998. *Presence of the Past: Popular Uses of History in American Life*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Rüsen, Jörn. 2005. *History: Narration, Interpretation, Orientation*. New York: Berghahn Books.

Schermerhorn, Richard. 1978. *Comparative Ethnic Relations: A Framework for Theory and Research*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Schieder, Theodor. 1978. The Role of Historical Consciousness in Political Action. In *History and Theory. Studies in the Philosophy of History*. 17, no. 4: 1-18. *Beiheft 17 Historical Consciousness and Political Action*. Wesleyan University Press.

Seixas, Peter and Carla Peck. 2004. Teaching Historical Thinking. In *Challenges and Prospects for Canadian Social Studies*, eds. Alan Sears and Ian Wright, 109-117. Vancouver: Pacific Educational Press.

Seixas, Peter. 2000. Schweigen! Die Kinder! Or, Does Postmodern History Have a Place in the Schools. *Knowing, Teaching and Learning History. National and International Perspectives*, eds. Peter N. Stearns, Peter Seixas and Sam Wineburg, 19-37. New York: New York University Press.

Seixas, Peter. 2004. Introduction to *Theorizing Historical Consciousness*, ed. Peter Seixas, 3-20. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Seixas, Peter. 2005. Historical Consciousness: A Scheme of Progress in Knowledge for a Post-Progressive Age. In *Narrative, Identity and Historical Consciousness: On the Psychological Construction of Time and History*, ed. Jürgen Straub, 141-160. London, Cambridge: Berghahn Books.

Spencer, Stephen. 2006. *Race and Ethnicity. Culture, Identity and Representation*. New York: Routledge.

Stearns, Peter N. et al. 2000. *Knowing, Teaching, and Learning History. National and International Perspectives*. New York and London: New York University Press.

Straub, Jürgen. 2005. Telling Stories, Making History: Toward a Narrative Psychology of the Historical Construction of Meaning. In *Narration, Identity, and Historical Consciousness*, ed. Jürgen Straub, 44-98. New York: Berghahn Books.

Tonkin, Elizabeth et al., eds. 1989. *Ethnicity and History*. London and New York: Routledge.

Weber, Max. 1968. *Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology*. Guenther Roth and Claus Wittich, eds. Translated by Ephraim Fischoff et al. New York: Bedminster Press.

Wertsch, James. 2002. *Voices of Collective Remembering*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.

White, Hayden. 1987. *The Content of the Form: Narrative Discourse and Historical Representation*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.

Wineburg, Sam. 2001. *Historical Thinking and Other Unnatural Acts. Charting the Future of Teaching the Past*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

CHAPTER FOUR

Historical Consciousness and the "French - English" Divide among Quebec History Teachers

Article Two

Abstract

Teacher historical consciousness influences pedagogical practices in the national history classroom. Its study within the context of societies with ambiguous ethnic dominance like Quebec fosters a better understanding of how teachers signify past inter-group relations for knowing and orienting themselves toward the "Other." Quebec's blurred majority/minority demarcations between Francophones and Anglophones as well as its common but non-consensual history program for its parallel school system provides innovative and productive ground for such research. This article discusses a study conducted on inter-group attitudes and mutual in-class treatments between Francophone and Anglophone history teachers when teaching the Secondary Four, History of Quebec and Canada course in Montreal. Whereas most Francophone respondents displayed an indifference to the social realities and historical experiences of Quebec Anglophones, all Anglophone ones demonstrated a sense of empathy toward the former. As this discrepancy reflects each group's sociological status, it also implies a dissimilarity in how research participants historicize the "French – English conflict" in Quebec's past. In this context, the non-recognition of Anglo-Quebecois moral and historical agency possibly explains the prevalent indifference among Francophone respondents.

La conscience historique des enseignants influence leurs pratiques pédagogiques lorsqu'ils enseignent l'histoire nationale. Dans une société à dominance ethnique ambiguë comme le Québec, l'étude de cette conscience permet de comprendre le sens que donnent les enseignants aux relations intergroupes du passé pour mieux se reconnaître et se positionner par rapport à l'Autre. La démarcation majoritaire/minoritaire floue entre francophones et anglophones ainsi que le curriculum d'histoire commun, mais non-consensuel, offre un terrain fertile pour la recherche. Cet article présente les résultats d'une étude sur les attitudes intergroupes des enseignants d'histoire nationale francophones et anglophones en quatrième secondaire à Montréal. Si la plupart des répondants francophones manifestent de l'indifférence face aux réalités sociales et aux expériences historiques des Anglo-

québécois, tous les répondants anglophones manifestent de l'empathie envers les premiers. Reflet du statut sociologique distinct de chaque groupe, cette divergence implique une dissemblance dans la manière dont les répondants historicisent le conflit français-anglais. Dans cette optique, le fait de ne pas reconnaître l'historicité des Anglo-québécois pourrait expliquer l'indifférence des répondants francophones.

1. Introduction

Up until the 1960s, two different historical narratives were transmitted to French and English speaking students in Quebec, both greatly reflecting the collective memories of each group. In general, Francophones were taught *la survivance* or the preservation of their French heritage and Catholic religion with its accompanying morals and values, while Anglophones about the redemptory magnificence and virtues of the British Empire (Trudel and Jain 1970; Roy et al. 1992; Lévesque 2004). This politically sanctioned duality changed with the Quiet Revolution, as did the province's socio-political landscape, necessitating reform in how history was taught in schools. As French Canadians in Quebec started to gradually identify themselves as *les Québécois*, circumscribed by the province's geographical and henceforth "national" boundaries, they became responsible for socializing all Quebec citizens and not just members of their own group. Soon enough, decades-old imperatives of preserving and regenerating their heritage were confronted by the exigency of incorporating Quebec's linguistic, religious and ethnic diversity into the official historical narrative transmitted in schools. For the first time, a common ministry of education was created and a uniform curriculum for all students was advocated.[4] Rather than transmitting a shared vision of Quebec's past that integrated both Francophone and Anglophone viewpoints, as well as those of other minority groups, these initiatives preserved a historical narrative that mostly configured the collective identity of the Francophone majority. Despite this outcome, continuous attempts were made to diversify the national memory prescribed in Quebec's history programs, but to no avail, particularly regarding Anglophone realities (Lévesque 2004; Cardin 2004; Young 2006; Éthier et al. 2007).

---

[4] One central outcome of the Parent Commission, mandated in 1961 to study the state of education in Quebec and to offer solutions to its inherent problems, was the creation of the Quebec Ministry of Education (*Ministère de l'Éducation du Québec* or MEQ) in 1964. Its name changed to that of *Ministère de l'Éducation, du Loisir et du Sport* (MELS) when the Liberal Party of Quebec came into power in 2003. In this article I refer to "MEQ" when it existed as such and to "MELS" as of 2003.

One main impediment to achieving a shared historical vision of the past is Quebec's sociological context of ambiguous ethnic dominance, where the majority/minority statuses of both Francophones and Anglophones are blurred and where both groups are more concerned with their respective linguistic and cultural reproduction than with inter-group reconciliation. The province's school system serves as one venue for this competition. Separated initially along ethno-religious and ethno-linguistic lines since 1998, Quebec schools still largely represent a central institution for maintaining (instead of transforming) each group's ethno-cultural boundaries (McAndrew 2003). Consequently, despite the promotion of critical thinking skills through the historical method to bridge Francophone and Anglophone perspectives, the risk of transmitting two competing memories in the province's parallel history classrooms persists. To this day, government imperatives to address this issue by making the national history curriculum more inclusive provoke emotional debates as to the limits of adequately balancing the promotion of the Franco-Québécois historical narrative with those of Quebec's various cultural communities.

The province's most recent "History War" over the MELS' new History and Citizenship Education program in the spring of 2006 demonstrates how controversial diversifying the national history curriculum's collective identity framework can be. Instigated by certain interest groups, a largely sensationalized outcry in the media against its perceived dilution of the "French - English conflict," lack of referral to the Quebecois nation and increased inclusion of Quebec minority perspectives managed to sway government policy to alter -at least cosmetically- the proposed program. Fearing the relativity of the Franco-Québécois historical experience and thus of inadequately integrating Quebec's ethno-cultural diversity, main events and figures that had heretofore delineated Quebec's collective identity and that were only implicit in the new program were reemphasized in a revised version (Laville 2006; Létourneau 2006; Young 2006; BHP 2007; Bouvier 2008). Ultimately, Quebec's national history program proves to be what Seixas and Clark (2004) describe as sacred memorial sites, which in this case, while concentrating, ordering and securing

the Franco-Québécois collective narrative, its reconfiguration to include a more positive role for Quebec Anglophones suggests its imminent desecration.

In this context, Quebec's non-consensual history curriculum for its parallel school system risks an unfavourable integration of the province's Anglophone minority, especially if their historical experiences and social realities are continually perceived to be neglected. In such circumstances, understanding history teachers' pedagogical practices when socializing students in the national history classroom seems pertinent. Undeniably, their historical consciousness of the other group greatly determines the vision of Quebec's/Canada's past they transmit to their students and potentially influences the values and perspectives that the latter interiorize throughout their personal and social development. With these issues in mind, this article looks at the perceptions and attitudes that Francophone and Anglophone history teachers hold of the other's group when teaching national history. In doing so, it discusses the significant findings of an exploratory study conducted on their pedagogical practices when dealing with non-consensual historical issues common to both groups in the Secondary Four, History of Quebec and Canada course. As a strategy, this permits the scrutinizing of educators' views of national history, how they teach it to their students and how they treat the other linguistic group in class. It further permits the questioning of their limits both in recognizing the other group's historicity and in anticipating them for common future life. And finally, it also elucidates the workings of historical consciousness in contexts of ambiguous ethnic dominance, the impact of these expressions on the maintenance and fluctuation of group boundaries, and their overall influence on competing memories in schooling in modern multicultural and plural societies, such as Quebec.

2. Opaque Boundaries: Quebec Francophones and Anglophones

In societies with ambiguous ethnic dominance, none of the major competing ethno-cultural groups holds a perfect demographic, linguistic, cultural, economic or socio-political hegemony over the state's resources and institutions. The complex

relationship between Francophones and Anglophones in Quebec and Canada typifies this, particularly since the two groups have been at odds with each other since the British conquest of 1760, and since Confederation have shared mutual challenges and an unequal power struggle in defining a common civic project. Ultimately today, each group's sociological status is ambiguous because each can claim to be part of either a majority or a minority depending on the identity referent they adhere to, be it Quebec or Canada (Levine 1990; Juteau 2000; McAndrew 2003). Prior to the Quiet Revolution, Quebec Francophones and Anglophones lived in what some have called a "consociational" relationship in which their respective elites and institutions sought consensus and social harmony by securing their group's socio-political interests through mutual bargaining, and in which the English-speaking minority benefited the most economically (Levine 1990; Stevenson 1999). This symbiosis was altered in the 1960s when a relatively peaceful period of gradual socio-political change for French Canadians and consequentially for Quebec Anglophones occurred. French Canadian neo-nationalism urged modernizing the Francophone community in order to meet the demands of the age. Its new secular-minded and intellectual elite set upon creating a modern democratic welfare state and in the process asserted control over the province's institutions by gaining political and eventually economic power from their own outdated leaders and the dominant English Canadian minority (Rudin 1985; Levine 1990; McRoberts 1993; Stevenson, 1999).

At the time of these changes, Quebec's Anglophone population was not as homogeneous as it had been before the latter half of the nineteenth century. Whereas many who could claim British and Protestant descent had gradually been leaving the province mostly for Toronto, which was to gradually become Canada's main economic hub after World War Two, the remaining community continued attracting and integrating most newcomers to the province. In their turn, immigrants preferred adopting English as their primary means of communication, first because it held promises of socioeconomic mobility in North America, and second because French Canadians remained relatively closed to their integration. Primarily concerned with *la survivance* in light of British domination, this latter community tended to instead

count on their high fertility to perpetuate their group (Levine 1990; McRoberts 1993; Caldwell 1994; Stevenson 1999). However, as their birthrate dropped with Quebec's modernization, both the limited success of the Quiet Revolution in securing their overall upward socioeconomic mobility and the integration of immigrants into the Anglophone community proved to be worrisome. The Franco-Québécois leadership thus set out to preserve and replenish Montreal's - and by extension Quebec's - French character. Seeking to guarantee their group's linguistic and cultural maintenance and development, they introduced a law to encourage more equal opportunities for Francophones in the workforce, the upper echelons of which were still largely dominated by Anglophones. Other than making the knowledge of French an important asset for upward economic mobility, the adoption of the Charter of the French Language in 1977 (also commonly known as Bill 101) further made French language schooling the norm for an overwhelming majority of French-speaking and immigrant students.[5] As part of regenerating Quebec's Francophone character, French schools henceforth became the principle institution for integrating newcomers to the province.

From another angle, Quebec also actively engaged in the selection and integration of immigrants, a constitutional jurisdiction shared between the Federal government and the Canadian provinces. This involvement required determining a model for regulating ethno-cultural diversity in order to respect the province's growing pluralism. Accordingly, Quebec's 1975 Charter of Rights and Freedoms guaranteed the right of the province's ethno-cultural minorities to maintain and develop their own cultural dynamism parallel to that of the Francophone majority's. This was again emphasized in the government's 1981 policy statement, *Autant de façons d'être québécois* (MICC 1981). It would, however, not be until the 1990 *Énoncé de politique en matière d'immigration et d'intégration* that the dichotomy opposing the

---

[5] Bill 101 made French language instruction the norm for all Quebec students unless they, their parents, or their siblings had been or were enrolled in English schools before 1977. Today, those who are exempt from the law are Native and handicapped children, those who are only living temporarily in the province, and those who had either one of their parents attend an English primary school before the adoption of the bill.

majority's "*Nous collectif*" and Quebec's cultural communities would be questioned (MICC 1990). In contrast to prior policies, a more inclusive vision of Quebec's ethno-cultural diversity was emphasized. Through instituting a moral contract between all citizens, this new policy established both Quebec as a democratic and pluralist society, and French as its language of public use. Consequently, Francophone institutions became the main, but not exclusive, space for integrating newcomers.

Concurrent to these developments, Quebec Anglophones' status became increasingly relegated to that of a minority. Their group's heterogeneity eventually proved to be an obstacle for organized political manoeuvring when it came to defending Anglophone linguistic rights in the post Quiet Revolution era. This raised questions as to whether Anglophones in Quebec really constituted a genuine community, or rather a varied group that fundamentally used English as their general means of communication (Caldwell 1994; Levine 1990; Stevenson 1999). Currently, insofar as Montreal is concerned, Anglophones form a privileged minority because of the maintenance of high institutional completeness, a continued powerful cultural pull over newcomers to the province and a slight overall economic advantage over Francophones (Levine 1990; McAndrew 2002; 2003).

Today, Franco-Québécois imperatives of cultural renewal as a French-speaking society in North America coincide with Anglophone concerns for survival as an English-speaking community in Quebec. Self-interests for cultural and linguistic dynamism still largely limit both groups' capacity to communicate at an institutional level, and thus impede them from developing concrete initiatives for inter-group comprehension. In terms of education, this is exemplified by Quebec's parallel school system, consensually segregated along linguistic lines. Overall, Anglophones are arguably adapting to their increasingly ominous minority status, dealing with all the perceived losses that accompany such a change. And Francophones are still adapting to their "newfound" majority status, where, as responsible for hosting and integrating newcomers to the province, they are at the receiving end of other groups'

mobilization aims and grievances without necessarily having had their own cultural and linguistic ones fully addressed since the Sixties. In all, a precarious equilibrium has been found where Francophones and Anglophones, although pluralistic and overall relatively open to ethno-cultural diversity, exhibit some characteristics of a "besieged mentality" when dealing with the other group (McAndrew and Janssens 2004).

3. History Teaching in Quebec

Based on the recommendations of the Parent Commission of 1963, the MEQ devised a province-wide program that sought to bridge the two "patriotic" histories transmitted in its schools. By incorporating the historical method, students would learn to do history for themselves and consequently think critically and autonomously. They would be taught to use primary and secondary sources in order to both achieve plausible understandings of the past and appreciate its multiple interpretations, thereby overcoming group differences (Roy et al. 1992; Lévesque 2004; Cardin 2004; 2007). At a socio-political level, these changes to the curriculum seem to have instigated an ongoing tension between proponents interested in mainly promoting the transmission of an adequate collective narrative framework that best captures Quebec's past (i.e. the Franco-Québécois collective identity) and those mainly preoccupied with producing critically engaged citizens that are fundamentally open to minority viewpoints (Lévesque 2004; Cardin 2004; 2007; Young 2006; Éthier et al. 2007).

Accordingly, the 1970 History of Canada course, which focused more on social, political, and constitutional historical events of the twentieth century than previous programs had, elicited criticism among Franco-Québécois nationalists for its deficiency in fostering a national attachment to Quebec. This provoked opposing calls for a more modern, enlightened history that was open to the world and not as nationalist in tone (Lévesque 2004). The ensuing 1982 History of Quebec and Canada course seemed like a compromise. While primarily endorsing a narrative framework

within which students could locate themselves and their society, it also promoted inter-group empathy through notions of both historical thinking (mainly of change and continuity) and citizenship as means of understanding social diversity (MEQ 1983). These initiatives, however, generally failed. Due to the mandatory end-of-year June exam, which students had to pass in order to obtain their diploma, or to unfamiliarity with disciplinary history and its accompanying method, teachers ended up largely transmitting Franco-Québécois "patriotic" content instead (MEQ 1996).

By the 1990s, the failures of both constitutional negotiations and a referendum on Quebec sovereignty triggered calls for a new history program by two opposing camps, one that advocated a common historical vision and identity with the rest of Canada, and the other demanding more of a Quebec-centred nationalist curriculum (Lévesque 2004). The ensuing Lacoursière Report, commissioned by the MEQ in 1995 to study the state of history teaching in Quebec and to suggest strategies to improve it, recommended making school history more open to the province's minorities (First Nations, Anglophones, ethno-cultural groups) and other traditionally excluded groups (women, the working class). It further advocated adjoining a citizenship education aspect to the curriculum as a means of providing students with adequate reading, interpreting and analytical skills needed not only to empathize with ethnic and cultural diversity, but also to be prepared for democratic participation as actively-engaged citizens (MEQ 1996). Public criticism again emanated from two opposing camps. One accused the report of condoning an improper transmission of the French Canadian historical memory due to political correctness, the other for not touching upon past discriminations that cultural minorities in the province suffered at the hands of the majority (Guérin 1996; Cardin 2004; Young 2006).

Based on the Report's recommendations, the resulting History and Citizenship Education program greatly reflected the MEQ's 1998 *Policy Statement on Educational Integration and Intercultural Education*, that stipulated the need to "integrate into the study of history - not just to tack on as separate material - the role played by Anglophones and Aboriginal peoples, and by groups of other ethnic

origins, in the building of Quebec society and development of the collective identity and memory of Quebecers" (MEQ 1998a, 26). Today, this new program attempts to render its collective identity narrative reference framework more accessible to social diversity within a socio-constructivist mind frame. By offering the many dimensions of historical thinking a more prominent role in questioning and interpreting social realities, it aims to encourage the acquisition of responsible civic consciousness (MELS 2003). More specifically, it aspires to permit students of various backgrounds to deliberate, debate, construct and appreciate various perspectives of the past without contradicting their and others' own agency in the story of the nation (Lévesque 2004; Cardin 2004; 2007; Éthier 2007; Éthier et al. 2007).

Once again, this new program was the source of public debate. At its heart lay great dissatisfaction with the MELS' alleged intentions of not transferring an adequate historical narrative that would promote national sentiments toward Quebec. Overall, program detractors felt that by bringing history and citizenship education together, the virtuous qualities of each would be confounded while the transmission of historical content would erroneously be downplayed to the benefit of historical skills. This meant that by fundamentally focusing more on skills instead of on factual knowledge in the name of citizenship as opposed to that of history, the Franco-Québécois historical experience would become threateningly unimportant, while Quebec's ethno-cultural diversity would be led astray by not properly being integrated into the mores of the majority group (BHP 2007; Bouvier 2008). In all, this vociferous concern against diluting the "French – English conflict" points to certain interest groups' need to secure the history program's symbolic sanctity of guaranteeing the protection and maintenance of the Franco-Québécois collective identity in light of the predominance of English in North America. Consequently, it further betrays the Quebec history curriculum's contentiousness in rendering the boundaries of the *Nous collectif* more porous to outsiders, especially to Anglophones.

4. Defining Historical Consciousness

As a relatively new concept in the social sciences, historical consciousness permits inquiry into history's role in informing human identity and agency. It fundamentally refers to an individual's capacity to mobilize notions of the past for making the necessary moral choices in a social relationship for purposes of living life (Rüsen 2005). By epitomizing personal interaction with temporality through which both lived and eternal time are signified, it imputes coherency to the multifarious and bountiful past, enabling individuals to construct social reality and to purposefully remember events for knowing and guiding themselves. Forming a stream of knowingness that links individual existence with future horizons, its underlying motivations may thus be ethical, practical or political, depending on the context of the social relationship at hand (Becker 1932; Scheider 1978; Marcus 1980). Furthermore, while negotiated at an individual level, its form and content nonetheless bathe in the collective consciousness of one's group(s) and wider culture(s). Accordingly, historical consciousness is located within the confines of what is deemed possible for human recollection, thought and action, circumscribed by the limits of culture or of human ingenuity itself. More particularly, it is influenced by both the patterns of historical thinking and the different narrative configurations of the past that are transmitted through the various processes and outlets of group socialization (Becker 1932; Seixas 2004; Straub 2005). As such, historical consciousness consists of a dynamic and flexible process that adjusts to the situational imperatives of an individual's biological age, generation or cultural moment.

The value of historical consciousness for theoretical analysis lies in its intimate connection to an individual's capacity to historicize the past. For some authors, this ability to fundamentally recognize the historicity of one's own thought processes and thus of one's own insertion in the course of time as a moral or historical actor basically translates into possessing historical consciousness in and of itself (Lukacs 1985; Gadamer 1987). For others it forms but one of its types, albeit the preferred, most advanced one (Rüsen 2005; Straub 2005). Interested in seeing historical

consciousness as a mode of human orientation in time, I hold "historicizing" to consist of an individual's capacity to see meaningful forms of living life in the course of time. This implies negotiating between the many parallel and emerging significant life patterns that offer a sense of responsibility and conscience for transcending temporality so as to better know oneself and orient one's actions in the social relationship at hand (Rüsen 2005). In terms of intergroup relations, it is arguably this view of historicizing that permits to discern how historical consciousness influences openness to the Other's social realities and historical experiences. By recognizing and embracing one's own moral and historical agency, an individual would likewise be more receptive to the Other's historicity, unless he or she refuses to do so for ethical, practical or political reasons.

5. The Study

Generally speaking, research on the relationship between Quebec Francophones and Anglophones in the sphere of education is lacking. Despite some work on various educational realities specific to the Anglophone community (decreasing school clientele, French immersion programs) (Locher and Locher 1983; Lapkin and Swain 1990; Chambers 1992; 2001; Lamarre 2005; 2007; 2008; Béland 2006) as well as on others confronting Francophone schools (language and culture promotion, immigrant integration, and loss of ethnic homogeneity) (McAndrew and Ledoux 1995; Pagé et al. 1998; McAndrew et al. 1999; McAndrew et Eid 2003), practically none has focused on the role of schooling on the maintenance or transformation of ethno-cultural boundaries between both language groups and on the impact of school segregation on the preservation of separate group identities. Moreover, little is known on inter-group perceptions in terms of both explicit and hidden curricula.[6] With respect to the national history program, such issues remain to be looked at in depth,

---

[6] This context emerges from the GREAPE's (*Groupe de recherche sur l'ethnicité et l'adaptation au pluralisme en éducation*) research program, *Frontières ethniques, structures scolaires et initiatives de rapprochement dans les sociétés divisées: le cas québécois dans une perspective comparative*, which was funded by both the SSHRC (Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council) and the FQRSC (*Fonds québécois de recherche sur la société et la culture*) between 2001 and 2004. The study discussed in this article forms part of one of its projects, *La ségrégation scolaire et ses conséquences.*

especially when comparing how Francophones and Anglophones view their national history and teach it to high school students.

While no direct work on the latter has been conducted, two comparative studies on English and French language national history textbooks do exist. The first, undertaken by Trudel and Jain (1970) for the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism (1963 - 1969), compared Canadian history textbooks throughout the country, highlighting them as a medium for transferring both groups' cultural traditions and values. Inspired by this work, the second study, a 1983 M.Ed. thesis from McGill University, looked at Secondary Four history textbooks used in Quebec high schools and found similar results (Adams 1983). Two other reports offer additional pertinent information, mostly on the different obstacles both groups face when teaching national history. The first is the aforementioned Lacoursière Report (1996), and the second is that of the MEQ-mandated History Task Force (MEQ 1998b), which underscored a discrepancy between what was prescribed by the 1982 history program and what actually was taught in class by Anglophone history teachers - with about ten percent not following program directives on claims of bias. As a result, it suggested encouraging and improving history teaching for the Anglophone community.

The exploratory study discussed in this article is basically an offshoot of a larger one conducted on Francophone and Anglophone school principals' perceptions of inter-group relations in the sphere of education since the linguistic division of Quebec school boards in 1998.[7] One of its objectives was to apprehend the role of curricula on mutual knowledge and comprehension between both groups (McAndrew et al. 2006). Of interest here are its particular findings on curriculum transmission in the history classroom. Overall, it revealed that both groups communicate little if at all

---

[7] Conducted in 2001-2002, this study's research sample consisted of two hundred primary and secondary school principles from fourteen different school boards - five from the island of Montreal (three Francophone and two Anglophone) and nine from two outlying regions with a significant Anglophone population, Estrie and Outaouais (seven Francophone and two Anglophone) (McAndrew et al. 2006).

across the linguistic divide, with each believing that their schools' history classes offer a somewhat average *opportunity to better understand* both their own and the other's community as well as an average, as opposed to a just, *vision* of their own and the other language group. For our purposes, a slightly larger number of Francophone school principals think that their schools' history classes offer students less of an opportunity to better understand Quebec Anglophones, while a slightly larger number of Anglophone ones find the opposite, that their classes offer a better opportunity to understand Quebec Francophones. Furthermore, slightly more Anglophone principals believe that Francophone schools do not transmit a just vision of their group's past, with not a single one thinking that a very just vision is conveyed at all.

These findings motivated two researchers and the present author to delve into history teachers' understandings and treatments of the other language group whilst teaching national history. To this end, we conducted a qualitative study in Montreal in 2003-2004 on the maintenance or transformation of each group's boundaries when teaching the 1982 History of Quebec and Canada course. We wanted to see whether teachers preserve past memories of inter-group "conflicts," forging alienation between them and the out-group, or whether they interpret the past in its socio-cultural and temporal context, anticipating improved inter-group relations in the future. In other words, did our respondents promote mutual empathy - understanding the other's social realities and historical experiences - and integrated co-existence among their students, or did they reinforce group boundaries as a better means of maintaining exclusionary co-existence? To grasp potential discrepancies and teacher articulations on pedagogical agency, we investigated how non-consensual historical issues, sore spots common to both groups' memories of the Canadian past, were dealt with. Accordingly, we devised a semi-structured interview guide, which inquired into their teacher education and professional experiences and into their perceptions of history as school subject, of the history course itself, and of pedagogy in general. Respondents' personal involvement with Quebec/Canadian history, the role and awareness of their agency in the classroom and their concrete teaching practices were also looked into. For purposes of data reliability and interpretative validity, recurrent thematic questions

were asked throughout the interview process thereby reassuring consistency among each respondent's answers.

Our research sample consisted of nineteen teachers, eight who taught the course in French in French schools or FRFR (five from public schools and three from private schools), eight in English in English schools or ENGENG (six from public schools and two from private schools), and finally three in French in English schools or FRENG (one from a public school and two from private schools).[8] Our data, from hour-long interviews held at respondents' schools, were transcribed verbatim by hand and an open-ended coding strategy was employed, affording us more leeway and creativity in its treatment.[9] It is important, however, to remember that this study reflects what respondents say they believe and do. Classroom observations would be needed to correlate the latter with what they actually do in practice. Furthermore, as an exploratory study, it is only suggestive of our respondents' attitudes. While our results cannot be generalized to the wider population of Quebec history teachers, it can nonetheless offer room to think, interpret and raise questions, setting the stage for further research on history teachers' historical consciousness and identity/ethnicity delineations.

---

[8] A few points need to be made here. Firstly, our FRENG history teachers form part of the province's French immersion programs in English schools, which since the 1960s have offered certain classes in French with the aim of making English-speaking students more proficient in both its spoken and written form. Secondly, the employed procedure for recruiting our respondents was twofold. Most of them emerged from a thorough history-teacher database that we compiled, whereas the remaining ones were contacted through a list of history teachers from a prior study. Although we maintained a numeric symmetry between our FRFR and ENGENG (with a smaller group of FRENG, commensurate with their lower numbers in the wider history teacher population), our sample was nonetheless restricted to participants on a voluntary basis, ineluctably making their numbers from private and public schools disproportionate. Furthermore, regarding our respondents from public schools, our FRFR came from two of Montreal's three Francophone school boards, while our ENGENG and FRENG from one of Montreal's two Anglophone ones. And finally, although an exact figure for the total number of Secondary Four history teachers on the island of Montreal is hard to come by, it would be reasonable to assume that on average, approximately 220 of them teach the course annually in Montreal's 147 high schools (one or two per school, per annum). This would put our research sample of nineteen teachers at about 8.6 percent of the total Secondary Four history teacher population.

[9] Our method for categorizing and coding our variables was mostly based on a conventional approach where similar themes emanating from the transcripts were grouped together and coded and exhaustively reread, recoded and verified until we were satisfied with our categories, codes and variables (Lessard-Hébert et al. 1995; Van der Maren 1996; Boutin 1997).

Altogether, nine variables emerged from the data: "Teacher education and work experience," "Influence of teacher education, experiences and identity on professionalism," "Teacher purpose when teaching the History of Quebec and Canada course," "Teaching practices in light of the MEQ program," "Classroom treatment of controversial issues," "Teacher theoretical knowledge and agency," "Role of history education in inter-group relations," "Diversity and perspectives in MEQ program and didactic materials," and "Integration of history and citizenship education." While each of them offered invaluable insight for analyzing our data, four directly touched upon our respondents' attitudes toward the course, their students and the other linguistic group. Out of these, "Influence of teacher education, experiences and identity on professionalism," "Classroom treatment of controversial issues," and "Diversity and perspectives in MEQ program and didactic materials" complemented the most revealing variable, "Teacher purpose when teaching the History of Quebec and Canada course." This latter one grouped the three following questions from our interview guide: "Why is it important to teach the history of Quebec and Canada to your students?" "What should students learn from the History of Quebec and Canada course? Are there any particular events, figures or other historical phenomena they should learn about?" And finally, "You named/didn't name the following events: the Conquest; the Patriots' Rebellion; Act of Confederation; Conscription Crisis; the October Crisis; Bill 101. Why do you think these events have/do not have to be learnt by your students?"

5.1 Respondents who teach in French in French Schools

Our FRFR teach the course differently according to their student clientele, available resources, time constraints and the mandatory end-of-year exam. Some highlight the existence and importance of different perspectives of the past; others promote critical thinking skills or enhance notions of citizenship. In terms of national identification, some see Quebec as forming a society within Canada and within the larger world, while two immigrant teachers remain neutral on such "sensitive" issues as Quebec - Canada relations. Common to the majority, though, is a Quebec-first approach to

their teaching, viewing the province as multicultural, pluralist and ultimately Francophone. Accordingly, they see the course as preparing students for life in a French-speaking society, with hardly any reference to Canada, which at most serves as a backdrop to understanding Francophone Quebec realities. One seemingly adopted strategy for integrating their multicultural student clientele is by explaining to them why Quebec is unique. Common ground promoting this vision is sought by transmitting the notion of how everyone is different and has the right to be different because everyone has an inalienable right to their own past. They defend and justify why French is important for Quebec by connecting their group's struggle for survival with those possibly lived by newcomers in the old country. Arguably, without obliging their students, the course is a medium for teachers to talk about and justify the Quebec "cause":[10]

> "It's very important to know today that Quebec has demands and a place that it forged for itself throughout its history. The occurrence of these [historical] events have made, formed and moulded the Québécois. As for immigrants, it is important to know that they often go to the Canadian embassy in their countries, where it is often forgotten to tell them that French is spoken in Quebec. They arrive here, fall off their chairs and have to understand why French is spoken in Quebec and why Quebec is not like the rest of Canada. It is through these events that they have to be explained, as others should already know, why they [the demands] are like this. This also explains the conflicts between the English Canadians and the Québécois."

> "It is precisely within the scope of the Canada/Quebec course that we see what the claims of French Canadians, the Québécois are, their demands, among others, of separation or the rebellions for the autonomy of a people, the independence of a people; political, social, cultural and religious autonomy. The fact that they [the students] are multiethnic, they understand this. This is what is easy."

Finally, the respondents seldom mention the "English" nor make any reference to Anglophone realities in Quebec society. They hardly talk about the "French - English conflict" or of trying to understand the English side. When they do, they are quick to assert the maintenance of their identity and mention the difficulties their group

---

[10] The following quotes are some of the punchiest ones, believed to be quite revealing. I have translated all the French ones into English, and in so doing, I have done my best to truly express what was meant in the original. In two instances, I have inserted parts of the original French within the translation so as to offer an exact meaning.

endured in the past. They simply seem to teach based on their memories of Quebec's past:

> "Yes the massacres, the English, it takes someone to blame [quelque chose sur qui bûcher]."

> "I believe that what my students have understood is that the Québécois people never wanted to be submissive, never… Some small events demonstrate where they [the English] tried to pass a fast one by us, among others, Lord Durham …"

On the whole, there is an overall lack of empathy towards Quebec Anglophones on the part of the FRFR. Their main preoccupation is integrating their multicultural student clientele instead of making any conciliatory gestures to the former. As such, they display a resounding sense of "indifference," which at times betrays a sense of distrust or resentment. Although not clear whether they conflate the Anglo-Québécois with the rest of English Canada, the latter exists for them somewhere along the fringes of Quebec and at most represents some sort of thorn in their side. They are primarily concerned with Quebec as a French-speaking society that has evolved into a multicultural and pluralist province and look to the future in those terms. With this in mind, however, it is important to remember that a minority of our FRFR accepts the English factor in Quebec history and seems to have reconciled itself with changing times.

5.2 Respondents who teach in English in English Schools

Like their Francophone counterparts, the majority of our ENGENG want their students to understand the society they live in; the main differences, however, are that they all see Quebec as an integral part of Canada, they all talk more freely about French - English relations, and they refer to Canada more often:

> "I teach them what greater democracy is there in the world than Canada, why? Because in any other country, would they allow a political party that wants to break up the country to sit in the central government like the Bloc Québécois? What greater democracy is there in the world? In any other country those people would be dead. We let them sit, we let them vote, we let them have their voice, we listen to them, we argue with them, we debate, we don't go out and shoot each other."

Most of these respondents teach their students about the "French - English conflict" so that they respect the Franco-Québécois viewpoint of Canada's past and that they specifically understand that the language laws, the sovereignty movement and other grievances exist because French Canadians were not treated fairly in the past. As such, they promote inter-group empathy:

> "When we get to the end of the history course, I don't know if any of my students have become Quebec nationalists but they've been taught why there are Quebec nationalists, that it has a historical precedent. Nobody woke up one morning and said: 'Oh, I think I'll take Quebec out of Canada.' There are reasons, there were difficulties. French people in Quebec did have legitimate grievances that go back in time."

> "They [students] need to understand some of the animosity that exists in our province. It's there, they see it, they feel it, whether they've experienced it or not, it's all over. I think they really need to understand why it is the way it is, what makes Quebec so unique in Canada. They need to know the background; they need to understand why we have this English - French conflict; how it got there."

A smaller group of the ENGENG discussed omissions in the program. Two "Allophone" respondents sense a lack of adequate attention to minority groups and First Nations, whereas another, originally from Ontario and who teaches in a low-income, multicultural English public school, is upset that the program neglects positive English contributions to Quebec's development:[11]

> "There's missing a bunch of stuff too. Why Conscription Crisis but why not WW1? What about the Canadian contribution to WW1? The emphasis on the two wars is all conscription, it's not about Canada fighting in the war and losing over 100 000 men; it's the fact that the French Canadians were ticked off. This is where you start to see the difference of what's left out and what's put in. There's all this English bad stuff, who's the bad guy here? The English people! What about the good things the English people did?"

All our ENGENG seem sympathetic to Quebec's past under British domination and to ongoing Franco-Québécois power struggles with English Canada. They go to great lengths to explain the latter's point of view to their students. Even the most ardent "Anglo" Canadian of them all sees himself standing up for French Canadian rights in

---

[11] This respondent's view could possibly be more representative of Anglophone history teachers' attitudes towards the Francophone minority outside the province of Quebec. In order to validate this assumption, a similar study like ours would need to be conducted in English Canada.

front of his students, who at times demonstrate disdain towards them. In light of all this, however, they portray a sense of confusion, abandonment and frustration because of their perceived treatment on behalf of the MEQ course program, the mandatory end-of-year exam and the prescribed textbook. They understand Quebec's past and are sorry for it, are mindful of it, and teach it to their students, but at the same time feel neglected by the provincial government.

5.3 Respondents who teach in French in English Schools

One of our FRENG definitely bridges the gap between both language groups. He promotes a positive view of Canada and believes in peaceful co-existence and mutual comprehension:

> "They [the students] have to learn to not blame what has occurred in the past. We cannot say that France lost, that England won; it's simply an evolution of society. It seems that in today's society we have to find a culprit and there isn't one. It's simply that society has evolved."

The other two FRENG are more concerned with explaining to their students why and how Quebec society is different from the rest of Canada, parallel to how each of them should develop and maintain their own identities. Arguably, they defend the Franco-Québécois viewpoint and the French status of Quebec in an English-speaking school according to the logic that every person has an inalienable right to express and fulfill his or her own identity:

> "Students need to know the main framework of our history so as to have reference points. Again today, we interrogate on Quebec's place in Canada and if we do not know that there once was a New France, that there already was a society in Quebec, we would have a hard time in understanding why Quebec doesn't want to be like the other provinces. Thus, there are certain historical elements that they have to always be reminded [remettre d'actualité] of, that have to not be forgotten."

> "It explains our reality today, a reality in contemporary politics of the distinct people of Quebec. All the history of Quebec and Canada explains this reality that our children do not know and a reality to which they object. We need to explain the Conquest, the rebellions, the negotiations on both sides, the British and the French Canadian, so as to explain to people the actual phenomenon that we are living in Quebec."

These last two share many similarities with most of the FRFR: they adopt a Quebec-first framework for teaching the course and are mindful of any mistreatments that French Canadians may have lived. While respectful of the Anglophone milieu in which they work, they are aware of the differences between them and the English and don't seem to be concerned with merging any gaps. They greatly differ from the first who is overtly federalist, who wants his students to become good Canadians and who sees the past as the past and the present as having evolved into something better. He teaches his students the Franco-Québécois viewpoint by placing both group's past realities in socio-historical context, thereby deflating the strong identity markers that differentiate them.

6. Analysis

The most significant finding of our study suggests an opposing trend among our respondents from both language groups. While the majority of our Francophone ones display a sense of indifference to the social realities and historical experiences of Quebec Anglophones, all our Anglophone respondents do the opposite. They demonstrate a resounding sense of empathy to Franco-Québécois experiences and even transmit them to their students. While this divergence arguably reflects the adjustments that both groups are making to their ambiguous majority/minority statuses, the FRFR indifference, as opposed to ENGENG empathy, can be quite disconcerting. As part of the dominant demographic majority in Quebec, the former adhere to MEQ imperatives when socializing their multicultural classrooms for life in a French-speaking society (as seen in the 1998 policy) but are seemingly negligent when it comes to configuring Anglophones into an integrated positive identity narrative. If such attitudes are widespread among the larger Francophone national history teacher population, this could become problematic for inter-group reconciliation and harmony. For if Anglophones find their social and historical experiences and contributions diminished or dismissed, thereby feeling ostracized, it could impede their full integration into Quebec society.

At an institutional level, these diverging attitudes possibly reflect the lack of deep contact between English and French language schools, which results in teachers having no direct information about the realities of the other group (McAndrew et al. 2006). Since French schools host newcomers to the province, the integration of immigrants constitutes teachers' primary concerns as opposed to addressing Anglophone issues in the history classroom. In their turn, reflective of an increasing minority group, Anglophone teachers are vulnerable to respecting and teaching the history of the majority even if they perceive the national history program as omitting positive Anglophone contributions to Quebec society. Possibly, most of these ENGENG form part of the Anglophone population that preferred to stay in Quebec at the time when Bill 101 was introduced. Logically, it can thus be assumed that they are not necessarily frightened by the prospect of living and integrating into a more dominant Francophone society, and therefore are more sensitive and sympathetic to Franco-Québécois grievances. A further factor possibly explaining Anglophone openness is the high visibility of both Francophone teachers in French immersion programs, such as the FRENG, and *ayants droit* crossovers into their schools.[12] Despite their low percentage of Quebec's total school-age population, the presence of Francophone crossovers in the English sector is felt more than that of Anglophone ones in French schools due to the small number and high concentration of English schools on the island of Montreal. In contrast, the significant percentage of Anglophone crossovers is not always felt by Francophone teachers because their presence is diluted in their Francophone and Allophone schoolmates' numeric superiority (McAndrew and Eid 2003).

7. Concluding Remarks: Quebec History Teachers' Historical Consciousness

Our study points to the existence of different competing memories across a parallel school system with a non-consensual history program. It also raises certain

---

[12] *Ayant droit* crossovers are those students who have the legal right to either attend their own or the other school sector under the provisions of Bill 101 (i.e. both Francophones and Anglophones - of British heritage or other – whose ascendants attended English language schools before 1977).

suggestions about the role of Quebec teachers' historical consciousness when determining inter-group attitudes and treatments in Montreal's national history classrooms. If the indifference to Anglophone social realities and historical experiences is common to the larger Francophone history teacher population, this would suggest that their capacity to historicize the past, as members of the ambiguous majority in a society with ambiguous ethnic dominance, does not necessarily encourage them to integrally consider the place of the ambiguous minority in anticipation of common future life - an ambiguous minority with whom their group is in competition over language use and culture in the province, and whom they may perceive as exerting an unequal official majority status in Canada. Reversely, the Anglophone respondents' sensitivity to Franco-Québécois social realities and historical experiences suggests that their capacity to historicize the past, as members of the ambiguous minority, permits them to consider the place of the ambiguous majority in future common life - possibly because they feel they can no longer compete with the Francophone dominant majority on an equal footing, hence reflective of their minority status in Quebec, or simply because they feel comfortable due to their majority status in Canada. Overall, this divergence between both groups suggests the possibility of Francophone teachers to generally not recognize the historicity of Quebec Anglophones, while the latter tend to see the Franco-Québécois as moral and historical actors in their own right.

Since the Quiet Revolution, one major source of contention dividing Quebec's polity has been the national question or Quebec's place in or out of Canada. Arguably, at the core of this issue is the memory of the "French - English conflict," which to this day elicits controversy in delineating an official historical narrative acceptable to all interest groups in the province. The "French - English conflict" has also been central to the varied works and dissenting views on Franco-Québécois collective identity (Maclure 2003; Létourneau 2004). And according to a recent study, its demoralizing effects could possibly still haunt the historical memory that Francophone history teachers transmit to students, despite positive in-group representations in Quebec historiography during the last twenty five years (Létourneau and Moisan 2004). If

this conflict lies at the heart of the FRFR's indifference, can we assume its pervasiveness, interiorized either consciously or unconsciously as an essential component of Franco-Québécois collective memory, defines their vision of Quebec, past, present and future? In contrast, could the small number of the Francophone respondents who display some openness to Quebec Anglophones be adamant in keeping this conflict at bay? Could they fundamentally be concerned with getting rid of what can be best articulated in the words of Jocelyn Létourneau (2004) as a "victimized," "melancholic," "miserable," and "nostalgic" ethos among the Franco-Québécois? Accordingly, do these negative memories of Canada's British imperialist past impede the configuration of various positive, "self-empowering" interpretations of Quebec's history that could potentially offer new, inclusive historical identity narratives to all Quebec citizens (Létourneau 2004)? With these questions in mind, I would venture to suggest that in order to better understand the FRFR indifference, it would be pertinent to directly study how they historicize the "French - English conflict" or French Canadian power struggles with the English in Quebec's past and to thereby particularly discern the extent to which they recognize Anglo-Quebecois historicity. Likewise, we would be able to grasp whether they see the past as having evolved into something different, arguably even better for their group, thereby opening up new prospects for change, or whether they see it as essentially remaining the same, thereby keeping them chained to a static past. This would permit a better understanding of the influences of their historical consciousness on their tendencies to include Quebec Anglophones in a newer, civic collective identity.

References

Adams, Stephen G. 1983. *A Textual Analysis of Challenge and Survival and Canada - Quebec.* Master's thesis. McGill University.

Becker, Carl. 1932. Everyman his Own Historian. *The American Historical Review.* 37, no. 2: 221-236.

Béland, Paul. 2006. *La fréquentation du réseau scolaire Anglophone : une étude exploratoire des statistiques de 2000 à 2004.* Quebec City: Conseil supérieur de la langue française.

Boutin, Gérald. 1997. *L'entretien de recherche qualitatif.* Quebec City: Presses de l'Université du Québec.

Bouvier, Félix. 2008. *Bilan du débat relative au programme Histoire et Éducation à la citoyenneté du deuxième cycle de l'ordre d'enseignement secondaire qui a eu cours au Québec 2006-2007.* Commission de consultation sur les pratiques d'accommodement reliées aux différences culturelles, January.

Bulletin d'histoire politique (BHP). 2007. *Débat sur le programme d'enseignement de l'histoire au Québec.* 15, no. 2, Winter.

Caldwell, Gary. 1994. *La question du Québec anglais.* Quebec City: Institut de recherche sur la culture.

Cardin, Jean-François. 2004. Le nouveau programme d'histoire au secondaire : le choix d'éduquer à la citoyenneté. *Formation et profession. Bulletin du CRIFPE.* 10, no. 2, December: 44-48.

Cardin, Jean-François. 2007. « L'œuvre de destruction de l'identité nationale se poursuit » : quelques commentaires d'un didacticien dans la foulée des réactions au projet d'histoire nationale au secondaire. *Bulletin d'histoire politique*. 15, no. 2, Winter: 67-84.

Chambers, Greta. 1992. *Taskforce on English Education*. Quebec City: Report to the Minister of Education of Quebec.

Chambers, Greta. 2001. *Français langue seconde dans les écoles anglophones du Québec*. Report for the Estates-General on the Situation and Future of the French Language in Quebec.

Éthier, Marc-André. 2007. Apprendre à exercer sa citoyenneté à l'aide de l'histoire. *Bulletin d'histoire politique*. 15, no. 2, Winter: 53-58.

Éthier, Marc-André et al. 2007. Enseignement des questions controversées en histoire: tensions entre politique de la reconnaissance et politique du passé. *Éducation et francophonie*. 23, no.1, Spring: 65-85.

Gadamer, Hans-Georg. 1987. The Problem of Historical Consciousness. In *Interpretive Social Science. A Second Look*, eds. P. Rabinow and W. M. Sullivan, 82-140. Berkeley, Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Guérin, Marc-Aimé. 1996. *La faillite de l'enseignement de l'histoire au Québec*. Montreal: Guérin.

Juteau, Danielle. 2000. Du dualisme canadien au pluralisme québécois. In *Relations ethniques et éducation dans les sociétés divisées (Québec, Irlande du nord, Catalogne et Belgique)*, eds. Marie McAndrew and France Gagnon, 13-26. Montreal: L'Harmattan Inc.

Lamarre, Patricia. 2005. L'enseignement du français dans le réseau scolaire anglophone : à la recherche du bilinguisme. In *Le français au Québec : Les nouveaux défis*, eds. A. Stefanescu and P. Georgeault, 553-568. Quebec City: Conseil supérieur de la langue française.

Lamarre, Patricia. 2007. Anglo-Quebec Today: Looking at Community and Schooling Issues. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*. 185: 109-132.

Lamarre, Patricia. 2008. English Education in Quebec: Issues and Challenges. In *The Vitality of the English-Speaking Communities of Quebec: From Community Decline to Revival*, 63-86. Montreal: CEETUM, Université de Montréal.

Lapkin, Sharon and Merrill Swain. 1990. French Immersion Research Agenda for the 90's. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*. 46, no. 4: 638-674.

Laville, Christian. 2006. La crise du programme d'histoire au Québec: Quelles leçons en tirer? *Canadian Issues/Thèmes canadiens*. Fall: 80-85.

Lessard-Hébert, Michelle et al. 1995 *La recherche qualitative : Fondements et pratiques*. Montreal: Éditions Nouvelles.

Létourneau, Jocelyn and Sabrina Moisan. 2004. Young People's Assimilation of a Collective Historical Memory: A Case Study of Quebeckers of French-Canadian Heritage. In *Theorizing Historical Consciousness*, ed. Peter Seixas, 109-128. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Létourneau, Jocelyn. 2004. *A History for the Future. Rewriting Memory and Identity in Quebec.* Translated by Phyllis Aronoff and Howard Scott. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Létourneau, Jocelyn. 2006. Faut-il craindre une autre histoire du Québec? *Canadian issues/Thèmes canadiens*. Fall: 87-90.

Lévesque, Stéphane. 2004. History and Social Studies in Québec: An Historical Perspective. In *Challenges and Prospects for Canadian Social Studies*, eds. Alan Sears and Ian Wright, 55-72. Vancouver: Pacific Educational Press.

Levine, Marc V. 1990. *The Reconquest of Montreal. Language Policy and Social Change in a Bilingual City*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Locher, U. and P.G. Locher. 1983. *Le fait français vécu par les élèves étudiant en anglais en 4ième et 5ième secondaire et en 1ère et 2ième collégial*. Volume 3. Quebec City: Conseil de la langue française.

Lukacs, John. 1985. *Historical Consciousness or the Remembered Past*. New York: Schocken Books.

Maclure, Jocelyn. 2003. *Quebec Identity. The Challenge of Pluralism.* Translated by Peter Feldstein. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Marcus, John T. 1980. *Sub Specie Historiae: Essays in the Manifestation of Historical and Moral Consciousness*. London and Toronto: Associated University Press.

McAndrew, Marie and Michel Ledoux. 1995. La concentration ethnique dans les écoles de langue française de l'île de Montréal : un portrait statistique. *Cahiers québécois de démographie*. 24, no. 2: 343-370.

McAndrew, Marie et al. 1999. Densité ethnique de l'école et intégration sociale des élèves néo-québécois. *Canadian Ethnic Studies/Études ethniques au Canada*. 31, no. 1: 5-25.

McAndrew, Marie. 2002. Ethnic Relations and Education in Divided Societies: Belgium, Catalonia, Northern Ireland, Quebec. *Kolor, Journal on Moving Communities*. 1: 5-19.

McAndrew, Marie. 2003. Should National Minorities/Majorities Share Common Institutions or Control Their Own Schools? A Comparison of Policies and Debates in Quebec, Northern Ireland and Catalonia. In *The Social Construction of Diversity: Recasting the Master Narrative of Industrial Nations*, eds. Danielle Juteau and Christiane Harzig, 369-424. New York: Berghahn Press.

McAndrew, Marie and Paul Eid. 2003. La traversée des frontières scolaires par les francophones et les anglophones au Québec : 2002 - 2003. *Cahiers québécois de démographie*. 32, no. 2, Fall: 223-253.

McAndrew, Marie and Rudi Janssens. 2004. The Role of Schooling in the Maintenance and Transformation of Ethnic Boundaries between Linguistic Communities: Contrasting Quebec and Belgium. *Canadian Ethnic Studies/Études ethniques au Canada*, special issue, eds. Guy Bourgeault et al., *Ethnic Relations and Education in Divided Societies: Comparing Belgium and Canada*. 36, no. 3: 61-83.

McAndrew et al. 2006. L'éducation et les relations entre les francophones et les anglophones au Québec : les perceptions des directeurs d'école. *Brusselse Thema: Politiek, Taal, Onderwijs en Samenleving in Beweging*, special issue, eds. De Groof, R. et al. 14: 335-359.

McRoberts, Kenneth. 1993. *Quebec: Social Change and Political Crisis*. Don Mills, Ontario: Oxford University Press.

Ministère de l'Éducation du Québec. 1983. *History of Quebec and Canada Program; Secondary IV; General and Vocational Education*. Quebec City: MEQ.

Ministère de l'Éducation du Québec. 1996. *Se souvenir et devenir. Rapport du groupe de travail sur l'enseignement de l'histoire.* Quebec City: MEQ.

Ministère de l'Éducation du Québec. 1998a. *A School for the Future: Policy Statement on Educational Integration and Intercultural Education*. Quebec City: MEQ.

Ministère de l'Éducation du Québec. 1998b. *Overview of the Teaching of Elementary Social Studies and Secondary History within the Anglophone Community of the Province of Quebec. A Report by the History Task Force*. Quebec City: MEQ, October.

Ministère de l'Éducation, du Loisir et du Sport. 2003. *Programme de formation de l'école québécoise. Domaine de l'univers social. Géographie. Histoire et Éducation à la citoyenneté*. Quebec City: MELS.

Ministère des Communautés culturelles et de l'Immigration. 1981. *Autant de façons d'être Québécois : plan d'action du gouvernement du Québec à l'intention des communautés culturelles*. Quebec City: MICC

Ministère des Communautés culturelles et de l'Immigration. 1990. *Au Québec pour bâtir ensemble. Énoncé de politique en matière d'immigration et d'intégration*. Quebec City: MICC.

Pagé, Michel et al. 1998. Intégration sociale des élèves montréalais d'origine immigrante : rapport à la société d'accueil et rapport au groupe culturel d'origine. *Revue québécoise de psychologie*. 19, no. 1: 116-149.

Roy, Simon et al. 1992. *Évolution des programmes d'histoire de 1861 à nous jours*. Ste-Foy: Université Laval, Laboratoire de recherche en administration et politiques scolaire.

Rudin, Ronald. 1985. *The Forgotten Quebecers. A History of English-Speaking Quebec, 1759-1980*. Quebec City: Institut québécois de recherché sur la société.

Rüsen, Jörn. 2005. *History: Narration, Interpretation, Orientation*. New York: Berghahn Books.

Schieder, Theodor. 1978. The Role of Historical Consciousness in Political Action. In *History and Theory: Studies in the Philosophy of History*. 17, no. 4: 1-18. *Beiheft 17 Historical Consciousness and Political Action*. Wesleyan University Press.

Seixas, Peter. 2004. Introduction to *Theorizing Historical Consciousness*, ed. Peter Seixas, 3-20. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Seixas, Peter and Penney Clark. 2004. Murals as Monuments: Students' Ideas about Depictions of Civilization in British Columbia. *American Journal of Education*, 110, February: 146-171.

Stevenson, Garth. 1999. *Community Besieged. The Anglophone Minority and the Politics of Quebec*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Straub, Jürgen. 2005. Telling Stories, Making History: Toward a Narrative Psychology of the Historical Construction of Meaning. In *Narration, Identity, and Historical Consciousness*, ed. Jürgen Straub, 44-98. New York: Berghahn Books.

Trudel, Marcel and Geneviève Jain. 1970. *Canadian History Textbooks: A Comparative Study*. Ottawa: Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism.

Van der Maren, Jean-Marie. 1996. *Méthodes de recherche pour l'éducation*. Montreal: Les Presses de l'Université de Montréal.

Young, Brian. 2006. Teaching about Racism and Anti-Semitism in the Context of Quebec's History Programs. *Canadian Issues/Thèmes canadiens*. Fall: 91-96.

CHAPTER FIVE

Vers une compréhension de la conscience historique des francophones à l'égard des Anglo-québécois : une étude qualitative auprès des enseignants d'histoire nationale

Article Three

Résumé

La conscience historique des enseignants influence la socialisation des élèves dans le cours d'histoire nationale. En effet, dans le contexte québécois de dualité entre Francophones et Anglophones, une analyse critique des tendances à historiciser le passé commun permet de comprendre jusqu'à quel point les enseignants voient l'autre groupe comme faisant partie de l'identité collective commune. Le présent article s'inscrit dans cette optique en décrivant les résultats d'une étude qualitative sur la conscience historique des enseignants francophones d'histoire à l'égard de la minorité anglophone du Québec. À l'aide d'un répertoire de tendances, influencé par la typologie de la conscience historique de Jörn Rüsen (2005), les historicisations du passé commun des répondants selon les trois moments de la négociation de l'ethnicité ont été examinées pour voir dans quelle mesure ils reconnaissent l'agentivité morale et historique des Anglo-québécois. En général, leurs manières de penser l'utilité de l'histoire pour vivre sa vie et historiciser des contextes thématiques différents du passé commun n'amènent pas les répondants à reconnaître l'agentivité morale et historique des Anglo-québécois, ce qui suggère que ces derniers ne sont pas considérés comme faisant partie d'une identité collective nationale. Toutefois, malgré une méconnaissance de l'histoire de l'Autre, beaucoup des répondants sont ouverts à mieux connaître les réalités sociales et les expériences historiques des Anglo-québécois et à transmettre ces informations à leurs élèves.

Teacher historical consciousness influences how students are socialized in the national history classroom. In the context of Quebec's duality between Francophones and Anglophones, a critical analysis of these tendencies of historicizing common past events permits understanding of the extent to which teachers view the other group as forming part of a common collective identity. This article looks at the findings of a qualitative study conducted on Francophone national history teachers' historical consciousness of Quebec's Anglophone minority. By testing a repertory of tendencies, influenced by Jörn Rüsen's fourfold typology of historical consciousness, it investigates how respondents historicize common past events that pertain to the

negotiation of their ethnicity in order to see whether such historicizing encourages them to recognize the moral and historical agency of the Anglo-Québécois. In general, respondent theories on the value of "history" for living life and their historicizing of different thematic contexts of the common past do not lead them to recognize the moral and historical agency of the Anglo-Québécois, thereby suggesting that the latter are not considered as forming part of a common national identity. However, despite not knowing the Other's history, many respondents are open to learning about Anglo-Québécois social realities and historical experiences and even to transmitting such information to their students.

1. Introduction

Les prédispositions éthiques ou politiques des enseignants d'histoire nationale peuvent influencer la manière dont ils promeuvent des valeurs morales ou autres normes afin d'améliorer la vie commune future entre différents groupes ethnoculturels (Stearns et al 2000; Wineburg 2001; Barton et Levstik 2004; Van Hover et Yeager 2005; Kitson 2007). Ainsi, se trouve l'enjeu de l'équilibre, pour les enseignants, entre la transmission d'un cadre de référence identitaire assurant la cohésion de la société et l'enseignement de la méthode historique qui fait la promotion d'une pensée critique permettant l'actualisation des valeurs démocratiques. Une telle préoccupation est en effet importante dans les sociétés occidentales où un groupe ethnoculturel dominant contrôle les ressources, les symboles et les institutions de l'État. Elle l'est d'autant plus dans les sociétés où deux ou plusieurs groupes distincts et politiquement actifs coexistent depuis longtemps en partageant le pouvoir de manière inégale. S'insérant dans la rivalité pour la survie sociopolitique et culturelle qui oppose les deux communautés, cet équilibre peut ainsi basculer en faveur de la reproduction du propre groupe auquel appartiennent les enseignants plutôt qu'en faveur d'une socialisation commune (McCully et al. 2003; Barton et McCully 2003, 2004; Kitson 2007).

L'étude de la conscience historique des enseignants d'histoire nationale peut sûrement éclairer la dynamique de cette tension, surtout si elle est conceptualisée à travers un prisme constructiviste de l'ethnicité, et ce dans le contexte québécois de dualité entre Francophones de descendance canadienne-française et Anglophones d'héritage britannique (ou autres assimilés par ces derniers). En combinant les différents aspects de la mémoire collective et de la pensée historique (Seixas 2004; Rüsen 2005), la conscience historique détermine les perceptions des rapports de pouvoir intergroupes, permettant aux enseignants des deux communautés de construire à la fois la réalité de leurs expériences « ethniques » et la manière dont ils se comportent envers l'Autre. Étant donné que les deux groupes québécois gèrent et fréquentent des institutions et des réseaux sociétaux parallèles, notamment en ce qui

concerne l'éducation, et entrent en concurrence afin de se maintenir et de se développer de manière autonome (McAndrew 2000, 2002, 2003), l'influence de la conscience historique sur les prédispositions des enseignants à connaître et à traiter l'Autre dans la classe d'histoire devient important.

Un regard sur la conscience historique des enseignants d'histoire nationale francophones dans ce contexte nous permettra de mieux nous interroger sur son rôle dans leurs négociations de l'ethnicité et du rapport à la minorité Anglophone. Ceci est particulièrement révélateur parce que ces enseignants font partie d'une communauté dont la mémoire historique des relations intergroupes peut générer des visions antagonistes de l'Autre. En effet, leur groupe a été de l'avant dans l'émergence d'un État-providence francophone au Québec dans les années 1960 qui a fait basculer les rapports de force, souvent inégaux, entre Francophones et Anglophones en faveur de la majorité canadienne-française.

Cet article discute des résultats d'une étude qualitative qui touche plus spécifiquement à la manière dont les enseignants francophones tendent à historiciser la présence des Anglophones dans le passé au Québec, pour ensuite examiner jusqu'à quel point ils reconnaissent l'agentivité morale et historique de ces derniers.[13] En d'autres termes, en étudiant comment ces répondants donnent sens aux événements communs du passé, nous cherchons à voir comment ils se positionnent envers l'Autre, s'ils sont sensibles aux réalités sociales et expériences historiques des Anglo-québécois, et même s'ils sont prédisposés à transmettre celles-ci à leurs élèves. Ceci nous permet, en somme, de mieux cerner leur degré d'ouverture à considérer la minorité anglophone comme faisant partie d'une identité collective commune pour le Québec.

Pour répondre à notre problématique, nous avons élaboré un répertoire de tendances lié à la conscience historique, inspiré de la typologie de Jörn Rüsen (2005), que nous avons appliqué au domaine de rapports ethniques. Dans un premier temps, nous

---

[13] Dans ce travail, l'agentivité réfère à la capacité de l'individu d'agir comme acteur social dans la vie.

présenterons notre conceptualisation de la conscience historique à travers le prisme constructiviste de l'ethnicité, ainsi que notre répertoire de tendances. Dans un second temps, nous exposerons les objectifs et le déroulement de notre recherche, pour ensuite présenter les résultats et la conclusion.

2. La conscience historique, la capacité d'historiciser et l'ethnicité

Le concept de conscience historique permet de cerner l'influence qu'exerce l'histoire sur l'identité et l'agentivité humaine. Il réfère à la capacité de chacun à mobiliser les notions du passé afin de faire des choix moraux nécessaires pour s'orienter dans une relation sociale (Rüsen 2005). Certes, la conscience historique est un processus d'interaction de l'individu avec la temporalité qui rend le passé, fondamentalement complexe et fluide, cohérent. Elle permet de comprendre et de construire la réalité sociale et aide à répondre aux questions que nous nous posons sur nous-mêmes ou sur notre rôle dans la société. Elle constitue la structuration stratégique ou délibérée d'un système de souvenirs qui nous oriente dans le temps. Et elle lie l'existence de l'individu à des horizons futurs et possibles (Létourneau 2004; Charland 2003), formant, ainsi, ce que Straub (2005) nomme la triade « passé, présent et futur ».

Notre conceptualisation de la conscience historique suppose que l'individu est fondamentalement un être moral et historique qui, en s'insérant dans le temps et en utilisant des principes moraux pour donner du sens à son existence, contribue activement à la réalisation de « l'histoire ». Dans cette optique, les buts et les motivations de la conscience historique peuvent être d'ordre éthique, pratique ou politique, selon la situation morale et les valeurs en jeu dans la relation sociale en question (Becker 1932; Scheider 1978; Marcus 1980; Rosenzweig et Thelen 1998). Néanmoins, même si la conscience historique est formée à un niveau individuel, sa forme, son contenu, et ses limites s'insèrent dans la conscience collective du groupe auquel appartient l'acteur social. Ainsi, la conscience historique individuelle est circonscrite aux limites du souvenir, de la pensée et de l'action humaine, et à celles de la culture ou de l'ingéniosité humaine (Becker 1932; Seixas 2004; Rüsen 2005;

Straub 2005). La conscience historique est donc un processus souple et dynamique qui s'ajuste aux impératifs sociaux de l'âge de la personne, de sa génération et du contexte culturel.

Pour établir l'importance de la conscience historique dans la recherche en sciences sociales, il est nécessaire de bien nuancer l'un de ses aspects centraux, à savoir la capacité « d'historiciser » ou de placer les événements du passé dans un contexte sociohistorique. De prime abord, cette notion implique une aptitude à saisir les dimensions différentes de la pensée historique pour bien comprendre ce qui est survenu dans le passé et avoir, ainsi, une version plausible des événements passés (Stearns et al. 2000; Seixas et Peck 2004).[14] Pour certains auteurs, si l'individu est capable « d'historiciser » le passé, dans la mesure où il distingue les réalités, les valeurs, les mœurs et les mentalités sociales et politiques actuelles de celles d'hier, il serait apte à posséder la conscience historique. Il pourrait donc reconnaître « l'historicité » de ses propres pensées et accepter l'idée qu'il s'insère lui aussi dans le processus historique ou dans le cours du temps en tant qu'acteur moral ou historique (Lukacs 1985; Gadamer 1987).

Cependant, c'est plutôt à la conception de la conscience historique comme mode d'orientation humaine qu'il faudrait apporter des précisions. Même si « historiciser » fait toujours référence à l'idée de placer le passé dans un contexte sociohistorique, il est nécessaire de mieux apprécier les différentes façons dont l'individu saisit l'expérience temporelle de ses valeurs morales et les mobilise selon les différents contextes de sa vie. D'après notre lecture de Rüsen (2005), « historiciser » devrait donc se rapporter à une manière plus spécifique de « faire de l'histoire » ou d'« avoir une expérience du temps », où l'acte d'historisation évoquerait plutôt la capacité de voir une forme significative de l'agir dans le temps. Ici, pour l'acteur social, faire de l'histoire, c'est établir un rapport avec le changement temporel quand il interprète les événements du passé. Il reconnaîtrait donc, ainsi, des formes de vie morales qui lui

---

[14] Dans ces dimensions, on trouve, entre autres, la pertinence historique, les faits découlant des sources primaires, la continuité et le changement, le progrès et le déclin, la cause et la conséquence, la perspective historique et le jugement moral.

accordent un sens de responsabilité et de conscience afin de transcender les limites de sa propre temporalité, ce qui, par la suite, orienterait ses actions selon le contexte des relations sociales dans lesquelles il se trouve. En somme, cette vision n'exclut pas l'idée que l'individu reconnaisse sa propre historicité et donc l'historicité du présent. Elle considère plutôt que c'est une tendance parmi tant d'autres dans le registre de la conscience historique (Rüsen 2005; Straub 2005).

En l'associant à une approche constructiviste de l'ethnicité, ce concept d'historicisation permet de mieux comprendre comment, au sein d'un groupe ethnique spécifique, le rapport avec le passé, et surtout la mémoire historique des relations intergroupes, influence l'ouverture des individus face à l'Autre. Entrent ici en jeu les attributs culturels et historiques des groupes qui sont souvent essentialisés par différents élites et mouvements populaires pour servir leurs intérêts sociopolitiques. Dans un contexte de rapports de pouvoir avec l'Autre, ces marqueurs sont manipulés et mobilisés simultanément à l'intérieur et face aux frontières ethniques. De plus, leur renforcement, pour faire gagner des appuis populaires pour une mobilisation sociopolitique contre les « menaces » de l'Autre, sert aussi à délimiter les différences culturelles avec l'exogroupe afin de maintenir les frontières du groupe aussi strictement que possible (Weber 1968; Barth 1996; Jenkins 1997; Juteau 1996; 1999; Malesevic 2004).

C'est dans cette optique que nous supposons qu'un acteur sociohistorique fait des choix moraux pour négocier son identité ethnique et ses relations avec l'Autre. En exerçant sa conscience historique dans la construction des réalités intergroupes, l'individu « ethnique » évalue ses valeurs morales afin de relier son identité personnelle à celle de son groupe et orienter ses actions envers l'exogroupe. Pour ce faire, on peut penser qu'il doit historiciser les nombreuses façons dont les élites et mouvements populaires de l'endogroupe présentent les différents aspects du passé intergroupe (les marqueurs culturels et historiques essentialisés). Il doit donc accepter, rejeter ou adapter le poids moral de ces récits préétablis -des configurations préalablement intériorisées des différentes façons d'agir- selon ses besoins et ses

capacités, pour ensuite les mobiliser ou non. En conséquence, nous croyons que l'acteur social aurait plus tendance à démontrer une ouverture et une acceptation des réalités sociales et des expériences historiques de l'Autre lorsqu'il est en mesure de comprendre sa propre historicité dans le cours du temps. C'est donc lorsqu'il reconnaît son agentivité morale et historique que l'acteur social est en mesure d'accepter l'historicité de l'Autre, à moins qu'il refuse de le faire pour des raisons éthiques, pratiques ou politiques.

3. Un répertoire des quatre tendances de la conscience historique

Pour faire suite à cette conceptualisation, nous allons maintenant préciser les différentes formes d'historicisation temporelle avec lesquelles l'humain peut s'orienter. Nous proposons un répertoire des quatre tendances générales, égales les unes aux autres, pouvant se manifester simultanément chez un acteur moral et historique. La source d'inspiration de ce répertoire est la typologie ontogénétique de la conscience historique que Rüsen (2005) a élaboré pour prendre en compte la croissance de la complexité de nos capacités cognitives à doter le passé de sens historique. Le premier stade précèderait ainsi le deuxième, et ainsi de suite jusqu'au quatrième, qui conduirait au stade idéal auquel nous devrions tous aspirer en tant qu'humains modernes. Même si nous adhérons à la conceptualisation de ces quatre catégories différentes en empruntant leurs définitions, nous n'adhérons pas à l'idée du développement ontogénétique en raison de deux problèmes fondamentaux.

Premièrement, l'idée du développement de la complexité cognitive par stades successifs crée une dissociation entre les concepts de conscience historique et de pensée historique. Elle montre l'absence de corrélation entre l'acquisition du contenu « réel » du passé et la compréhension du fonctionnement disciplinaire de l'histoire. Elle ne permet que de cerner la manière dont une personne mobilise le contenu du passé pour construire ses réalités actuelles, mais pas nécessairement les dimensions de la pensée historique qui l'ont amenée à historiciser de cette façon. De plus, même si ces dimensions sont connues, rien n'empêche que chacune d'elles se manifeste à

des rythmes de développements différents chez la personne (Lee 2004). Pour éviter une telle dissociation, nous nous contenterons d'un répertoire qui correspond à des connaissances « réelles » du passé, surtout que nous nous intéressons à établir des liens entre la conscience historique et les négociations de l'ethnicité. Sans pour autant nier l'importance de la pensée historique dans ce processus, nous pensons que notre répertoire crée et encourage aussi d'éventuels dialogues entre les deux niveaux de connaissances historiques. Ceci n'apportera que de nouvelles pistes pour préciser le rôle complexe de la pensée historique dans le fonctionnement de la conscience historique.

Deuxièmement, nous rejetons la conception implicite de la typologie rüsenienne voulant qu'une forme de conscience soit meilleure qu'une autre. Comme implication fondamentale, cela risquerait de favoriser la soumission à une manière spécifique de se souvenir des événements passés et de décrire notre identité, surtout si son contenu et ses contours sont contrôlés par un régime autoritaire. En effet, la conscience historique peut être manipulée à des fins politiques ou idéologiques, notamment par certains élites et mouvements populaires, pour renforcer des identités ou des visions du passé particulières (Macdonald 2000; Laville 2004). Ce que nous proposons, donc, c'est un répertoire de tendances qui suggère non seulement l'égalité de la conscience, mais aussi une liberté de l'esprit pour tous.

Examinons, à présent, la pertinence de ces tendances pour les rapports interethniques. Nous parlons ici surtout de l'utilité de « l'histoire » et des éléments des récits préétablis pour donner un sens au passé pour l'orientation d'une personne dans une relation sociale avec l'Autre. Suivant la théorie de Rüsen (2005, p28-34), la première tendance, dite *traditionnelle,* serait d'accepter sans réserve les éléments des récits préétablis parce qu'ils font un lien entre le passé et le présent. Ils nous rappellent nos origines et nos obligations envers nos ancêtres et affirment la validité et l'importance de nos valeurs et de nos systèmes de valeurs à travers le temps. Donc, en incarnant son groupe, la personne honore et véhicule ces éléments à travers le temps et emploie l'histoire pour les confirmer et renforcer leur « véracité ».

La deuxième tendance, dite *exemplaire*, serait une sorte de justification de l'utilité des récits préétablis pour donner un sens aux expériences passées. Son moteur réside dans les principes moraux généraux qui justifient ces éléments et qui nous guident. Ce qui compte ici, ce sont les règles, les façons de faire et les régularités de la vie qui transcendent le temps et qui nous servent d'argumentations historiques. Dans cette tendance, la conscience historique donne un sens aux expériences passées sous forme de cas abstraits qui formulent les règles du changement temporel et de la conduite humaine dont la validité n'est pas limitée à un événement spécifique. L'histoire contient ainsi un message, devient une leçon pour le présent et sert à légitimer nos rôles et nos principes à travers le temps.

À l'opposé de ces deux premières tendances, se trouve la troisième, dite *critique*. Elle consiste en un refus total des éléments des récits préétablis qui ne sont plus convaincants. L'individu ne voit plus de lien valable et obligé entre le passé et le présent. Il transgresse ces récits en se basant sur une argumentation historique qui explique pourquoi il les oppose et qui le débarrasse de la responsabilité de les préserver tels qu'ils sont présentés. Même si cette tendance consiste principalement en une négation et une déconstruction, elle se caractérise aussi par l'apport des éléments d'un contre-récit qui offre une nouvelle interprétation des significations préétablies du passé. L'important ici est de considérer la rupture dans la continuité du temps où l'histoire sert à rendre problématiques les patterns de vie et donc les systèmes de valeurs actuels.

Enfin, la quatrième tendance, dite *génétique*, va au-delà de la seule critique des éléments des récits préétablis en reconnaissant pleinement la complexité de la compréhension de la vie dans le cours du temps. En constatant la temporalité des pensées humaines et la variabilité du temps, l'individu réalise que ses obligations morales envers le passé varient selon le temps et s'adaptent constamment aux contextes différents. Il accommode les éléments des récits préétablis selon les considérations éthiques d'aujourd'hui tout en sachant que celles-ci pourront changer

demain. Dans cette optique, il respecte ses obligations morales (sens de la responsabilité et de la conscience) envers le passé en cherchant constamment à mieux le comprendre et à mieux appréhender les relations sociales dans lesquelles il se trouve. Contrairement aux autres tendances, en aspirant toujours ainsi à une meilleure existence, il apprivoise le sens des éléments des récits préétablis de manière dynamique et tient compte de leur transformation perpétuelle pour construire sa réalité sociale. Il s'ouvre donc aux points de vue des autres afin de mieux comprendre sa propre vision des choses et de les intégrer dans une perspective élargie du changement temporel. Dans cette logique, la reconnaissance de sa propre historicité permet à l'individu de respecter celle des autres. De ce fait, l'histoire sert principalement à transformer des formes de vies étrangères en des formes de vies propres.

4. Étude qualitative de la conscience historique

Comme la conscience historique est un concept de recherche empirique assez récent en sciences sociales, son étude est limitée à certains de ses aspects précis plutôt qu'à ses manifestations globales. Par conséquent, il n'y a pas de travaux sur ses effets globaux sur l'agentivité humaine. Jusqu'à présent, les recherches ont généralement porté sur ses rapports avec la pensée historique, ses implications politiques, ses expressions cognitives, ses caractéristiques narratives et sur certains côtés de son articulation et de son développement (Angvik et Von Borries 1997; Leeuw-Roord 1998; Macdonald 2000; Kölbl et Straub 2001; Charland 2003; Seixas 2004; Straub 2005; Wineburg 2007). Même si tous ces travaux ont contribué à valoriser les aspects théoriques de la conscience historique, aucun ne l'a abordée du point de vue de l'ethnicité ou des relations intergroupes et aucun ne l'a étudiée auprès des enseignants d'histoire à ce dernier égard.[15] De plus, à notre connaissance, personne ne semble avoir travaillé sur la conscience historique des enseignants d'histoire nationale quant

---

[15] Ce constat vaut pour le monde anglophone et francophone. L'étude de la conscience historique est plutôt avancée en Allemagne, où il existe déjà une grande littérature. Malheureusement, notre méconnaissance de l'allemand limite nos capacités à bénéficier de cette richesse. Voir Kölbl et Straub (2001) pour un recensement anglais des écrits en allemand.

à leurs rapports à l'Autre dans le contexte québécois de dualité entre Francophones et Anglophones.

Pour combler ces manques dans la littérature, nous avons fixé comme but général d'étudier la manière dont des enseignants d'histoire nationale francophones tendent à historiciser la présence des Anglophones dans le passé québécois, pour ensuite voir jusqu'à quel point ils reconnaissent l'agentivité morale et historique de ces derniers. Comme procédé pour y arriver, nous avons « confronté » la conscience historique des répondants avec les catégories des quatre tendances issues de la typologie de Rüsen. Ceci nous a aussi donné une excellente occasion de mettre en application notre répertoire de tendances afin de l'améliorer à des fins herméneutiques et empiriques.

C'est pourquoi, nous avons établi trois objectifs et quatre grandes questions de recherche. Le premier objectif, qui correspond à la première question de recherche, vise à bien cerner le rôle que les répondants accordent à l'histoire dans la manifestation générale de leur conscience historique face aux événements du passé. Nous cherchions à saisir quelle pertinence ils attribuent à l'histoire dans la recherche du sens du changement temporel. Le deuxième objectif, qui correspond aux trois autres questions de recherche, est d'étudier plus particulièrement la manière dont les répondants historicisent les significations du passé dans les faits pour bien se connaître en tant que Franco-québécois et mieux se situer face à la minorité anglophone au Québec. Dans cette logique, les questions de recherche correspondantes portent sur la conscience historique des répondants dans trois contextes thématiques reflétant les composants fondamentaux de la négociation de l'ethnicité. Il s'agit de leur rapport à l'Autre lorsqu'ils se souviennent et narrent les rôles des anglophones et leurs expériences dans le passé du Québec, de leur conscience des relations entre Anglo et Franco-québécois incluant les rapports de pouvoirs dans le passé, le présent et le futur et de la conscience qu'ils ont de leur propre groupe quand ils sont confrontés à des éléments des récits préétablis de leur propre passé. Finalement, notre troisième objectif, qui regroupe les quatre questions

de recherches, est d'étudier la solidité des positions de la conscience historique des répondants selon différents contextes thématiques du passé.

En somme, c'est en vérifiant le degré d'historicisation de toutes ces questions que nous avons vraiment été en mesure de repérer l'ouverture des répondants à l'égard des Anglo-québécois. Nous sommes partis de l'idée qu'une volonté d'historiciser le passé d'une manière *génétique* prédispose l'acteur social à rendre ses frontières ethniques très perméables à l'Autre. Ainsi, nous étions portés à croire *a priori* qu'en ayant la même tendance pour chacune des questions de recherche, les répondants seraient plus aptes à inclure les Anglo-québécois dans une identité collective commune.

4.1 Méthodologie de la recherche

Suivant la logique de notre conceptualisation, l'accès aux expressions de la conscience historique d'un acteur social se concrétise en faisant émerger les négociations de ses valeurs morales dans une situation actuelle où il se réfère à des significations du passé pour justifier ses choix de la praxis. Nous supposons ici que les rapports de pouvoir entre Francophones et Anglophones, issus de contacts soutenus et prolongés au Québec, forment une telle situation. Nous suggérons donc que tout contexte thématique qui poussera un répondant francophone à discuter des Anglo-québécois dans le cours du temps nous offrira l'occasion de faire émerger sa conscience historique face à ces derniers.

Quant à l'étude empirique de ces manifestations, nous croyons qu'il est nécessaire de se pencher sur le récit qui sous-tend leurs discours, surtout que la capacité à donner un sens aux événements du passé s'exprime à travers la forme narrative (Wertsch 2004; Rüsen 2005; Straub 2005). Il s'agit donc d'une méthode révélatrice permettant de discerner non seulement les thèmes, les intrigues et les structures majeures des discours d'une personne, mais aussi ses formes, ses logiques ou ses raisonnements sous-jacents. C'est surtout ce dernier point, ressortant à la fois des réflexions et des justifications des répondants sur ce qu'ils racontent et sur la manière, plus utile selon

nous, dont ils structurent leurs idées pour outiller réellement leur conscience historique, qui nous semble le plus intéressant.

À ces fins, nous avons sollicité les discours de 17 répondants francophones de descendance canadienne-française qui enseignaient le cours « Histoire du Québec et du Canada » au quatrième secondaire dans des écoles de langue française. Ayant une moyenne d'âge de 41 ans, 15 d'entre eux travaillaient dans des écoles publiques et deux dans des collèges privés. De plus, 14 d'entre eux enseignaient dans la grande région de Montréal et trois dans les régions aux alentours. Enfin, quatre répondants détenaient une maîtrise dont deux en lien avec l'histoire, tandis que les autres n'avaient qu'une formation de premier cycle et cela souvent en histoire ou en un programme connexe.

4.1.1 Recueil des données

Sur le plan méthodologique, nous avons repris et adapté les approches de Seixas et Clark (2004) et de Létourneau et Moisan (2004) afin de construire trois stratégies de cueillette de données. La première se présente sous forme de résolution de problème et vise à étudier le rapport que les répondants entretiennent avec le passé à travers un enjeu historique controversé qui occupe l'actualité (Seixas et Clark 2004).[16] Étant donné que les répondants interagissent avec des significations du passé pour justifier leurs choix moraux, nous avons pu analyser leurs stratégies d'historicisation dans une situation actuelle de controverse. Cette démarche nous a surtout informé sur la manière dont ils théorisent l'utilité de l'histoire pour comprendre le présent et pour résoudre des problèmes historiques en général, comblant ainsi la première question de recherche. En complément, comme résolution d'un problème historique réel à caractère moral, nous avons présenté une des controverses entourant le nouveau programme d'Histoire et d'Éducation à la citoyenneté au Québec au printemps 2006,

---

[16] Ayant à résoudre un problème historique dans le présent, soit que faire avec des murales démodées présentant des images stéréotypées des Amérindiens dans un lieu public, les élèves dans l'étude de Seixas et Clark ont fait appel à leurs idées du passé collectif pour justifier leurs réponses. Les auteurs ont pu ainsi analyser les outils dont les élèves se sont servis pour donner un sens aux événements du passé dans un présent litigieux.

soit la diminution de la place accordée aux expériences historiques et sociales des Franco-québecois au profit des anglophones et des autres groupes minoritaires. Nous avons demandé aux répondants de raisonner à haute voix sur la place qu'ils accorderaient à chacun de ces groupes s'ils étaient chargés d'écrire un nouveau programme d'histoire.

La deuxième stratégie consistait à poser une question ouverte où nous avons demandé aux répondants de narrer ce qu'ils connaissaient, percevaient ou se rappelaient de l'histoire des Anglo-québecois (Létourneau et Moisan 2004).[17] De ce fait, nous cherchions à connaître le type de récit rapporté oralement. En nous concentrant sur leur logique de pensée, nous voulions cerner comment ils mobilisaient des éléments de récits préétablis pour narrer l'histoire de l'Autre et voir comment ils historicisaient leurs propos. Quant à la troisième stratégie, elle était composée d'une série de questions semi-structurées et visait à faire émerger la conscience historique des répondants sur les rapports de pouvoir intergroupes au fil du temps et sur les visions préétablies de leur propre groupe. Dans le premier cas, nous leur avons demandé de décrire les relations entre les deux communautés au Québec et entre la province et le reste du pays aux niveaux politique, économique, interpersonnel et de la société civile, dans le passé, le présent et le futur. Dans le deuxième cas, nous voulions percevoir leurs réactions sur la vision « misérabiliste » du passé québecois qui reprend plusieurs éléments des récits préétablis et donne une identité collective de victime aux Québecois de descendance canadienne-française. La définition était empruntée à Létourneau et Moisan (2004), qui ont constaté que la plupart de leurs répondants relataient l'expérience historique de leur groupe ethnoculturel comme reflétant « une vision d'un peuple abandonné, reclus, abusé par l'Autre et toujours hésitant à se prendre en main » (p.348).

---

[17] Nous avons emprunté la formulation de la question de Létourneau et Moisan (2004), qui ont réalisé une étude qualitative pour mieux comprendre la complexité des connaissances des jeunes Québecois de descendance canadienne-française quant aux expériences historiques de leur propre communauté au Québec.

4.1.2 Méthode d'analyse des données

Pour examiner nos données, nous avons d'abord réalisé une analyse verticale qui nous a permis de comparer les discours des répondants à des catégories préétablies et semi-ouvertes. Notre but était de déterminer leurs tendances de conscience historique dominante afin de nuancer notre classification (Miles et Huberman 1994; Lessard-Hébert et al. 1995; Van Der Maren 1996; Boutin 1997; Mason 2002). En nous servant d'une grille d'analyse pour les quatre questions de recherche, nous avons défini ces catégories avec les critères fondamentaux de chaque tendance, selon les quatre types analysés plus haut. Pour synthétiser ces critères, le tableau ci-dessous présente les formes d'interaction avec le passé dont chaque tendance peut représenter pour les répondants, ce qui leur permet de se connaître et s'orienter dans le temps.

Tableau I

Synthèse des critères des catégories préétablies de la conscience historique

Catégorie	Critères
Traditionnelle	• Répétition des significations du passé pour vivre sa vie
Exemplaire	• Justification des significations du passé pour vivre sa vie
Critique	• Problématisation des significations du passé pour vivre sa vie
Génétique	• Reconnaissance de la complexité de la vie humaine • Reconnaissance de la temporalité des formes de pensée humaine • Reconnaissance de la variabilité du temps • Avoir constamment le besoin d'améliorer le sens qu'on donne au passé

Ainsi, pour la tendance *traditionnelle*, le répondant véhicule des significations du passé dans le temps sans s'interroger sur leur véracité. Pour la tendance *exemplaire*, le répondant donne un sens au passé à l'aide des régularités de la vie tenues pour acquis, qu'il généralise à tout contexte similaire. Pour la tendance *critique*, le répondant ressort les aspects problématiques des significations du passé pour le présent et justifie leurs non-pertinences. Enfin, pour la tendance *génétique*, le répondant apprécie la difficulté de comprendre la réalité, et donc la nécessité d'une façon plus sophistiquée et fluide de l'appréhender. Il comprend que la manière dont on conçoit le monde non seulement fait partie du temps et varie selon le temps, mais consiste aussi en une construction historique en soi qui évolue à sa propre manière et

rythme. De plus, il reconnaît la distanciation temporelle entre le passé et le présent quant aux façons de faire et de vivre. Et finalement, il s'aperçoit qu'il ne détient pas toujours les connaissances suffisantes pour comprendre le passé et qu'il a besoin d'en connaître davantage.

Une fois l'analyse verticale terminée, nous avons rédigé des rapports finaux pour chacun des répondants. Deux codeurs nous ont aidés à vérifier non seulement la fiabilité de ce processus, mais aussi la pertinence des critères des catégories. Étant donné la multiplicité et le parallélisme de la conscience historique des répondants, ainsi que la complexité de leurs discours, nous avons décidé de classer les répondants selon une lecture plutôt globale de leur conscience historique pour chaque question. Pour ce faire, nous nous sommes constamment rappelés que chaque tendance formait un idéal-type auquel les répondants tendent à adhérer, malgré quelques petites nuances idiosyncratiques (Weber 1965).

Dans une deuxième étape, nous avons procédé à une analyse horizontale en comparant les données pertinentes des rapports finaux, selon chaque tendance, pour chaque question, entre tous les répondants. Le but était de mieux comprendre les tendances par l'étude des discours déjà classés. En mettant les tendances de chacune des quatre questions de l'analyse verticale ensemble, nous avons pu vérifier la fiabilité de notre catégorisation du discours des répondants, et apporter des nuances importantes aux critères de nos catégories préétablies surtout pour surmonter des ambiguïtés potentielles lors de la catégorisation des données. Comme complément à l'analyse verticale, l'analyse horizontale nous a donc permis de mieux cerner comment les répondants exprimaient chaque tendance. En laissant leurs discours nous parler librement, nous avons pu regrouper des thématiques récurrentes et complémentaires pour chaque tendance, pour chacune des questions, nous laissant ainsi l'opportunité de saisir ce que chaque tendance impliquait pour nos répondants, dans le contexte des questions posées.

4.2 Présentation des résultats

En tout, quatre constats importants ont émergé des analyses verticale et horizontale, ce qui permet de tenir compte des ambiguïtés potentielles lors de la catégorisation des discours. Premièrement, nous avons dû créer deux sous-catégories pour la tendance *génétique* afin de mieux classer les données, dont les critères sont repartis dans le tableau ci-dessous.

Tableau II

Les critères des sous-catégories de la tendance *génétique*

La catégorie *génétique* et ses deux sous-catégories	Critères
Génétique	• Reconnaissance de la complexité de la vie humaine • Reconnaissance de la temporalité des formes de pensée humaine • Reconnaissance de la variabilité du temps • Avoir le besoin de constamment améliorer le sens qu'on donne au passé
Quasi-génétique	• Reconnaissance de la variabilité du temps • + 1 ou 2 des autres 3 critères pour être *génétique*
Génétique résistant	• Être *quasi-génétique* • + Un refus clair et ouvert de reconnaître la complexité d'un aspect particulier du passé ou de chercher à mieux le comprendre

Étant donné que certains répondants démontraient parfois une capacité d'être presque *génétique*, mais pas tout à fait, la première sous-catégorie, nommée *quasi-génétique*, reflète la position des enseignants qui répondent à un maximum de trois des quatre critères pour devenir *génétique*. Cependant, comme l'un de ces quatre critères, à savoir la variabilité du temps, est évident dans presque toutes les tendances de la conscience historique (surtout la tendance *critique*), la sous-catégorie *quasi-génétique* se caractérise par le fait que l'on n'y retrouve pas les trois autres critères, mais plutôt un ou deux critères, soit la reconnaissance de la complexité de la vie humaine, la

temporalité des formes de pensée humaine, ou le besoin de constamment mieux saisir le passé. À son tour, la deuxième sous-catégorie, baptisée *génétique résistant*, caractérise l'enseignant ayant une tendance *quasi-génétique*, mais qui refuse clairement de reconnaître la complexité d'un aspect particulier du passé ou de chercher à mieux le comprendre. Sur cet aspect particulier, il s'attache à certaines significations préétablies du passé, même si, face à d'autres aspects, il est capable de faire la part des choses. Selon notre conceptualisation de la conscience historique, cette résistance pourrait émerger des raisons éthiques, politiques ou même pratiques.

Un deuxième constat se rapporte encore à la tendance *génétique*. Lors des analyses, nous avons remarqué que certains répondants complexifiaient le passé, tout en y apportant parfois des patterns de vie pour le doter de sens. Au premier regard, cet aspect pourrait s'apparenter à des régularités de la vie, comme dans la tendance *exemplaire*. Cependant, un regard plus approfondi nous permet de croire que ce qui peut avoir l'air des régularités de la vie par certains répondants de variations différentes de la tendance *génétique* sont plutôt des mises au point qui font la part de la complexité des choses passées dans le présent pour mieux comprendre et expliquer la complexité du changement temporel. Donc, ces mises au point sont des perspectives raisonnées pour donner un sens au passé à partir des critères d'aujourd'hui, et non pas pour constituer des régularités de la vie à travers le temps.

Dans un troisième temps, nous avons également constaté que les répondants de tendances *exemplaires* présentent des régularités de la vie à deux niveaux qui transcendent le temps, soit spécifiques au passé québécois ou canadien, soit généraux pour la nature humaine.

Enfin, comme dernier constat, pour mieux distinguer la catégorie *critique* de la catégorie *génétique*, il suffit de souligner que les répondants de tendances *critiques* conçoivent les éléments constitutifs du changement temporel de façon très simple, même s'ils peuvent reconnaître la variabilité du temps. Ils voient toujours le passé de

façon rigide et manichéenne sans vraiment tenir compte de sa complexité et de sa fluidité pour comprendre et construire la réalité sociale du présent.

4.2.1 Description générale des répondants et de leurs tendances de conscience historique

Lors de la présentation du répertoire de la conscience historique, nous avons suggéré que chacune de ses tendances se manifeste d'une manière parallèle que l'on peut échanger selon la relation sociale dans laquelle on se trouve. Conséquemment, nous pensions que les tendances de conscience historique des répondants varieraient selon le contexte différent de leurs rapports avec le passé suscité. En effet, en déterminant leurs tendances dominantes lors de l'analyse verticale, notre hypothèse s'est avérée juste : aucun des répondants n'a la même tendance pour les quatre questions de recherche formulées. Cette confirmation peut être constatée dans le tableau III, qui repartit les tendances de conscience historique de chacun des répondants selon ces questions qui, rappelons-le, correspondaient à l'utilité de l'histoire pour donner du sens au passé et aux trois moments de la négociation de l'ethnicité.

Tableau III

Les résultats de l'analyse verticale[18]

	L'utilité de l'histoire pour historiciser le passé	La CH de l'Anglophone dans le passé québécois	La CH des relations Francophones-Anglophones à travers le temps	La CH du récit traditionnel sur l'identité collective francophone
François	*Critique*	*Quasi-génétique*	*Exemplaire*	*Génétique résistant*
Frédéric	*Exemplaire*	*Traditionnelle*	*Exemplaire*	*Critique*
Inès	*Génétique*	*Critique*	*Critique*	*Critique*
Jacques	*Critique*	*Exemplaire*	*Quasi-génétique*	*Génétique résistant*
Jeanne	*Critique*	*Traditionnelle*	*Exemplaire*	*Critique*
Jean-Marie	*Exemplaire*	*Exemplaire*	*Exemplaire*	*Critique*
Kévin	*Quasi-génétique*	*Quasi-génétique*	*Quasi-génétique*	*Génétique résistant*
Lucien	*Exemplaire*	*Traditionnelle*	*Exemplaire*	*Exemplaire*
Ludovic	*Génétique*	*Quasi-génétique*	*Génétique*	*Génétique*
Mathieu	*Exemplaire*	*Critique*	*Critique*	*Critique*
Maude	*Quasi-génétique*	*Critique*	*Quasi-génétique*	*Critique*
Monique	*Exemplaire*	*Quasi-génétique*	*Exemplaire*	*Critique*
Richard	*Génétique*	*Quasi-génétique*	*Quasi-génétique*	*Quasi-génétique*
René	*Exemplaire*	*Traditionnelle*	*Exemplaire*	*Exemplaire*
Robert	*Exemplaire*	*Exemplaire*	*Exemplaire*	*Quasi-génétique*
Sébastien	*Critique*	*Quasi-génétique*	*Quasi-génétique*	*Critique*
Victor	*Exemplaire*	*Traditionnelle*	*Exemplaire*	*Exemplaire*

Malgré cette répartition des tendances, il faut apporter une précision. Reflétant la complexité de la conscience historique, leur variabilité parmi les répondants consiste en deux inclinations. Tout en révélant un parallélisme et interchangeabilité, il y a ceux qui démontrent majoritairement une tendance spécifique de conscience historique pour les quatre questions de recherche, et ceux qui manifestent des tendances plutôt mixtes. Le premier regroupement consiste en ceux qui révèlent trois fois la même tendance de conscience historique pour les quatre questions de recherche. Ainsi, cinq de ces dix répondants ont une tendance majoritairement *exemplaire* (Jean-Marie, Lucien, René, Robert, et Victor). Deux ont une tendance majoritairement *critique* (Inès et Mathieu) et *quasi-génétique* (Kévin et Richard),

---

[18] Nous utilisons des prénoms fictifs pour conserver l'anonymat des participants.

tandis que le dernier est majoritairement de tendance *génétique* (Ludovic). Quant au deuxième regroupement, il comprend les répondants qui manifestent, soit une tendance différente pour chacune des questions de recherche, soit deux tendances pareilles pour seulement deux des quatre questions de recherche. Ainsi, deux de ces sept enseignants ont une tendance complètement mixte (François et Jacques), deux ont une tendance mixte plutôt *exemplaire* (Frédéric et Monique) et deux autres, une tendance mixte plutôt à la fois *critique* et *quasi-génétique* (Maude et Sébastien). Un dernier répondant est de tendance mixte plutôt *critique* (Jeanne). En somme, même si certains individus ont une séquence de tendance de conscience historique spécifique majoritaire, ils peuvent par le même effet extérioriser une séquence plutôt ou même complètement mixte.

Un aspect central de ce parallélisme et interchangeabilité des tendances est la variabilité de la manière dont les répondants visualisent et mobilisent le passé pour donner du sens au changement temporel. Ils conçoivent le passé d'une façon rigide et manichéenne (pour les tendances *traditionnelle*, *exemplaire*, et *critique*), d'une façon fluide et complexe (pour les zones élargies de la tendance *génétique*), ou les deux en même temps (s'ils manifestent un mélange des tendances *génétique* avec les autres). En d'autres mots, les répondants imaginent et interagissent avec le passé comme s'il était soit statique, à multiples facettes ou les deux à la fois.

À cette réflexion s'en ajoutent d'autres. D'abord, la façon dont les répondants intellectualisent la pertinence de l'histoire pour donner sens au passé ne reflète pas toujours la manière dont ils historicisent les différents aspects du passé dans les faits. Penser l'utilité de l'histoire pour vivre ne correspond donc pas toujours aux sens que l'on donne au changement temporel pour mieux se connaître et s'orienter. De plus, lorsque les répondants se souviennent de l'Anglo-québécois, ils racontent majoritairement des récits de rapports intergroupes, ce qui rejoint la même thématique de la question de recherche sur l'élaboration des relations passées entre Francophones et Anglophones. Non seulement ceci montre une méconnaissance du passé Anglo-québécois, mais aussi une tendance à ériger une frontière rigide entre le

nous et le eux. Cela confine l'Autre, de manière exclusive et largement intemporelle, dans une catégorie d'altérité, que nous désignerons comme l'*othering*. En présentant un récit qui prend complètement le point de vue de l'Anglo-québécois, Richard est cependant la seule exception. Un troisième constat réfère au fait que ce dernier répondant a une tendance *quasi-génétique* lorsqu'il se souvient de l'Anglo-québécois. En le confrontant aux autres répondants, qui sont aussi de tendance *quasi-génétique* et qui racontent un récit de rapports intergroupes, nous pouvons suggérer qu'en apprivoisant l'Autre, les acteurs ethnoculturels qui extériorisent des tendances des variations différentes *génétiques* peuvent également se mettre à la place de l'Autre ou faire de l'*othering* en montrant une connaissance des points de vue multiples du passé. Et finalement, étant donné que la seule fois où les répondants manifestent une tendance *génétique résistante* concerne la vision misérabiliste, nous pouvons croire qu'en tant qu'acteurs ethnoculturels, des individus peuvent renier leurs capacités *quasi-génétiques* lorsqu'ils sentent le besoin de rectifier un aspect controversé du passé du soi ethnique. Comme nous le verrons, pour des raisons éthiques et politiques, le passé complexe et fluide semble devenir rigide et manichéen.

4.2.2 L'analyse horizontale

Ayant décrit la solidité des positions de la conscience historique des répondants, il reste, maintenant, à détailler les thèmes de leurs historicisations du passé, et ce, selon la pertinence accordée à l'histoire pour vivre sa vie et la manière dont l'Anglo-québécois, le soi ethnique et les relations entre Francophones et Anglophones sont repérés dans les constructions des réalités sociales. Une telle analyse horizontale permettra de voir si les répondants apprécient l'histoire comme un vecteur de changement qui leur offre des moyens d'améliorer à la fois leur existence et celles des autres qui les entourent. Par la suite, elle offrira une chance de voir comment les répondants historicisent le passé selon les trois moments de la négociation de l'ethnicité, pour ensuite constater les degrés de leur reconnaissance de l'Anglo-québécois comme étant des acteurs moraux et historiques. Par le même effet, elle révèlera aussi s'ils sont sensibles aux réalités sociales et expériences historiques des

Anglo-québécois, s'ils les acceptent comme faisant partie d'une identité nationale commune et s'ils transmettent ces informations à leurs élèves.

Le tableau ci-dessous nous met en contexte en regroupant les tendances similaires de conscience historique des répondants selon les quatre questions de recherche. Ceci permettra de visualiser notre catégorisation avant d'amorcer une discussion détaillée des thèmes émergents.

Tableau IV

Les résultats de l'analyse horizontale

Tendance de CH	Enjeux			
	L'utilité de l'histoire pour historiciser le passé	La place des Anglophones dans le passé québécois	Les rapports Francophones-Anglophones à travers le temps	Le rapport au récit traditionnel sur l'identité collective francophone
Traditionnelle		(5) Frédéric; Jeanne; Lucien; René; Victor		
Exemplaire	(8) Frédéric; Jean-Marie; Lucien; Mathieu; Monique; René; Robert; Victor	(3) Jacques; Jean-Marie; Robert	(9) François; Frédéric; Jeanne; Jean-Marie; Lucien; Monique; René; Robert; Victor	(3) Lucien; René; Victor
Critique	(4) François; Jacques; Jeanne; Sébastien	(3) Inès; Mathieu; Maude	(2) Inès; Mathieu	(8) Frédéric; Inès; Jeanne; Jean-Marie; Mathieu; Maude; Monique; Sébastien
Génétique	(3) Inès; Ludovic; Richard		(1) Ludovic	(1) Ludovic
Quasi-génétique	(2) Kévin; Maude	(6) François; Kévin; Ludovic; Monique; Richard; Sébastien	(5) Jacques; Kévin; Maude; Richard; Sébastien	(2) Richard; Robert
Génétique résistant				(3) François; Jacques; Kévin

4.2.2.1 L'utilité de l'histoire pour historiciser le passé

La plupart des répondants semblent adopter une tendance plutôt *exemplaire* quant à l'utilité de l'histoire pour historiciser le passé, quatre sont plutôt de tendance *critique*, deux *quasi-génétique*, et trois plutôt *génétique*.

Globalement, les huit répondants de tendance *exemplaire* jugent que l'histoire sert surtout à éviter la répétition des erreurs du passé et à offrir parfois un répertoire de solutions pour les problèmes d'aujourd'hui. Ils partagent l'idée qu'il faut utiliser l'histoire le plus honnêtement et objectivement possible et semblent aussi croire en l'existence d'une espèce de « vérité transcendante » des actions humaines qui peuvent être retrouvée dans le passé. Les quatre répondants de tendance *critique* croient, quant à eux, que la façon dont on utilise l'histoire ne sert à rien parce qu'on répète les erreurs du passé. Ils estiment qu'on n'utilise pas l'histoire comme il faut en blâmant fondamentalement la nature humaine. Ils évoquent l'impuissance de l'homme à changer son sort face à ceux qui ont le pouvoir, son refus de transcender les savoirs tenus pour acquis que les élites ou autres transmettent, ou simplement son propre égocentrisme. Les deux répondants de la sous-catégorie *quasi-génétique* croient que l'histoire sert tout simplement à mieux comprendre les enjeux actuels. Comme on peut voir avec l'extrait de Kévin, l'histoire n'offre que des éclairages sur le présent, surtout que les problèmes d'aujourd'hui ne sont pas les mêmes que ceux d'hier :

> « Les problèmes ou les situations qu'on vit aujourd'hui sont différentes. Mais [l'histoire] nous aide à remettre en perspective certaines de ces problèmes-là et aussi à mieux les comprendre..... Donc, ça nous aide à voir un peu la genèse des situations qu'on retrouve aujourd'hui, sans nécessairement chercher une solution aux problèmes d'aujourd'hui, mais simplement mettre le problème d'aujourd'hui dans un contexte plus grand. »

Comme on peut le voir, ces perspectives ne reflètent pas des patterns, mais émanent de considérations actuelles. Finalement, si nous n'avons pas classé ces répondants dans la tendance complètement *génétique*, c'est parce qu'ils ne reconnaissent pas la temporalité des formes de pensée humaine.

Les trois répondants de tendance *génétique* reconnaissent tous la complexité de la vie humaine, la temporalité de l'homme et la variabilité du temps. Pour eux, les significations du passé varient selon le temps, l'espace et le contexte. Par exemple, Ludovic souligne que ce qui a été fait dans le passé a été fait à un moment précis dans un contexte précis, tandis que Richard insiste que l'histoire n'est qu'un discours, une position et pour cette raison, il faut créer sa propre vision du passé, tout en intégrant des points de vue différents. Finalement, les trois tendent aussi à vouloir constamment mieux saisir le passé. Pour Ludovic, le but de l'histoire est simplement de mieux comprendre le passé et de ne rien imposer du passé, sinon on pourrait manipuler les gens. Selon Richard, l'histoire sert à former nos opinions, nos idées et nos visions, à ne rien tenir pour vrai ou acquis, à être ouvert à d'autres perspectives, et à nous mettre à la place de l'Autre. Et pour Inès, c'est une question de toujours mieux se connaître.

4.2.2.2 La place de l'Anglophone dans un nouveau programme d'histoire québécois

Comme nous avons précisé plus haut, lors des questions sur la pertinence de l'histoire pour vivre, nous avons demandé aux répondants de présenter la place qu'ils accorderaient à la communauté Anglo-québécois s'ils devaient créer un nouveau programme d'histoire pour le Québec. Trois grandes positions ont émergé. Neuf répondants de tendances plutôt *exemplaire* (Frédéric, Jean-Marie, Lucien, Monique, René et Victor) et *critique* (François, Jeanne, Sébastien) ne donneraient pas la même importance aux deux communautés parce que, selon eux, le Québec est une société surtout francophone. Cinq répondants, un de tendance *exemplaire* (Robert), un *critique* (Jacques) et un *génétique* (Ludovic) et deux *quasi-génétiques* (Kévin et Maude), offriraient une place égale, mais nuancée. Ils voudraient préserver l'idée d'une société francophone au Québec, mais sont quand même soucieux d'apporter des éléments d'histoire se rapportant aux Anglo-québécois parce qu'ils ont joué un rôle important dans le passé québécois. Ludovic exprime bien ce sentiment :

« Je pense qu'il faut leur donner la place qui leur revient puis présentement, il faut faire attention pour pas aller chercher des détails qui donneraient une surreprésentation. Il ne faut pas oublier que le Canada a été, que le Québec a été quand même, est une province francophone et a toujours été à majorité francophone. Mais par contre, ça serait intéressant à l'intérieur de l'histoire des Canadiens-français de regarder l'évolution des Canadiens-anglais avec leur immigration parce que connaître l'autre c'est de toute façon [mieux se connaître]. »

Finalement, trois répondants, un *exemplaire* (Mathieu) et deux *génétiques* (Inès et Richard), donneraient la même place aux deux communautés. Comme une sorte d'imposition, le premier veut vraiment promouvoir l'idée des relations intergroupes positives afin de démontrer que les relations entre les deux communautés ont toujours fonctionné pour le bien de chaque groupe. À l'encontre de cette approche didactique, les deux répondants de tendance *génétique* croient qu'il faut comprendre les anglophones, ainsi que tous les autres groupes afin de mieux se connaître, ainsi que le passé et sa propre société.

4.2.2.3 La conscience historique de l'Anglophone dans le passé québécois

Pour cette question, presque tous les répondants évoquent une intrigue de rapports intergroupes. Ces discours sont très variés quant à l'intensité des affrontements ethniques, à la présentation des apports et des perspectives de l'Anglo-québécois et quant aux connaissances du passé, qui vont de limitées à détaillées. Seul Richard fait un récit où les anglophones sont les protagonistes de leur histoire.

Les répondants qui sont plutôt de tendance *traditionnelle* pour cette question offrent tous un récit très antagoniste, sur fond de conquête, de tentatives d'assimilation, de domination et d'exploitation perpétuelles. Même s'ils peuvent à certains moments présenter un ou deux aspects du passé qui se rapportent aux Anglo-québécois, la plupart font de l'*othering* et parlent souvent en termes de « Nous » et « Eux ». Deux semblent différencier les « bons » des « mauvais » Anglais en s'appuyant sur les similarités des expériences irlandaises et canadiennes-françaises. Un autre, Lucien, passe beaucoup de temps à justifier son attitude envers l'Anglo-québécois, citant la difficulté et l'impossibilité de relativiser l'histoire et de séparer les émotions. Il parle

aussi du passé difficile des Acadiens, de l'importance de protéger la langue française et de la validité des clichés en histoire s'ils reflètent des expériences réelles et vécues.

Quant aux répondants de tendance *exemplaire*, ils font tous des récits axés surtout sur les luttes de pouvoirs, la compétition, la confrontation et l'antagonisme et parfois sur les compromis. Parmi les thèmes dominants des régularités de la vie qu'ils apportent, on note la manière dont les leaders impérialistes, appartenant au camp des vainqueurs, règnent, les stratégies et les normes militaires durant les guerres, ainsi que la manifestation politique contre les inégalités économiques. D'autres thèmes concernent la façon dont des gens mécontents se mobilisent contre la source de leur désarroi, les attitudes coloniales envers les colonisés, ainsi que la tendance de l'Église catholique à favoriser les natalités. Finalement, ils dichotomisent les riches et mauvais Anglais contre les pauvres et bons Français. L'extrait de Robert sert comme exemple pour la compétition intergroupe :

> « Et comme je dis souvent aux élèves, l'Acte d'Union, c'est quand le vainqueur va toujours garder ce qu'il veut. Le vainqueur c'est l'Anglais. Le vainqueur n'est pas là pour partager. Je dis quand il va y avoir des médailles d'or cet été aux jeux olympiques, le gars qui a la médaille d'or n'aurait pas à la donner au gars qui a la médaille d'argent [et]dire, ah on va se la partager six mois, six mois. C'est le vainqueur qui gagne. »

Deux des répondants de tendance *critique* avouent les limites de leurs connaissances de l'histoire des Anglo-québécois et transmettent des récits fragmentés et incomplets, tandis que le troisième, Mathieu, reconnaît sa subjectivité, parle de compétition, de tension et de coopération, et s'efforce de mieux comprendre la mentalité des francophones face aux anglophones. Ensemble, ces trois répondants cherchent à démystifier certains éléments des récits préétablis et à questionner le contenu du programme. Ils affirment que ce dernier ne correspond pas à la réalité ou aux expériences des Anglo-québécois et qu'il fait plutôt la promotion des exagérations du passé sans assez faire la part des choses. Ils cherchent aussi à promouvoir une conciliation et une harmonie intergroupe.

En ne reconnaissant que la complexité de la vie humaine et la variabilité du temps, les répondants *quasi-génétiques* placent le passé dans une perspective raisonnée qui rend justice à sa complexité, mais qui reste figée dans le temps. Une fois que le passé est raisonné, c'est comme s'ils avaient compris ce qu'il suffit de savoir. Ces perspectives des relations intergroupes varient entre des thèmes caractérisés en termes d'intérêts de groupes et de la mobilisation de l'ethnicité pour promouvoir des intérêts économiques. Ils parlent aussi des similitudes entre les clivages socio-économique, linguistique ou culturel et les sentiments de menace de disparition vécus par les deux communautés. Pour sa part, Richard, qui présente les Anglo-québécois comme les « protagonistes » de leur histoire, parle à la fois des vagues d'immigration et des différents groupes d'immigrants anglophones, de la majorité démographique anglophone de Montréal au XIXe siècle, d'une minorité qui garde les rênes de l'économie, et des autres apports politiques et culturels.[19]

4.2.2.4 La conscience historique des relations Francophones-Anglophones à travers le temps

Malgré la variabilité des tendances de conscience historique pour cet enjeu thématique, la plupart des répondants distinguent les relations Francophones-Anglophones au Québec de celles avec le reste du Canada et ce, à travers le temps.

Ceux de tendance *exemplaire* émettent des thèmes des régularités de la vie qui sont plus ou moins semblables à ceux qui ressortent lors de leur historicisation du passé Anglo-québécois dans la section précédente. En plus des thèmes déjà scrutés pour ce dernier, soit ceux abordant les luttes de pouvoir, la compétition, la confrontation et le compromis, les différences de statut socioéconomique et les attitudes intériorisées des colonisés, d'autres s'ajoutent. De l'ordre politique et économique, ces nouvelles régularités touchent le partage des ressources, la primauté des groupes dominants au

---

[19] Parmi les groupes d'anglophones qu'il distingue, il énumère les Américains, les Britanniques, les administrateurs, les marchands, les Irlandais, les Écossais, les soldats démobilisés, les loyalistes, les Noirs, les Grecs et les Italiens.

détriment des groupes dominés, le parallélisme social entre francophones et anglophones et la quête de survie des groupes menacés de disparition.

Les deux répondants de tendance *critique* problématisent, soit les significations du passé qu'ils doivent transmettre aux élèves, soit la perception que l'endogroupe a de lui-même. Inès problématise l'idée de conflit intergroupe après la Conquête et nie complètement l'idée de relation dominant-dominé. Après avoir relativisé les significations, elle affirme que le problème des relations intergroupes est attribuable au sensationnalisme des médias et réitère que, dans le fond, les deux groupes ont les mêmes valeurs, et que malgré leurs différences, ils peuvent se rejoindre. Mathieu est très critique vis-à-vis de son groupe ethnoculturel, qu'il perçoit vivant toujours dans le passé, ne s'intégrant pas à la réalité actuelle et se confinant dans une bulle. Il problématise leurs sentiments et leurs actions de « victimes » qui s'apitoient sur leur sort, ainsi que leurs perceptions des relations avec les anglophones.

Des quatre critères pour être *génétique*, les *quasi-génétiques* reconnaissent la difficulté de donner un sens au passé et la variabilité du temps. À cet effet, trois des cinq répondants ne tiennent pas ce qu'ils disent pour acquis, tandis que les deux autres avouent leur propre subjectivité et les limites de leurs connaissances. De plus, quatre d'entre eux affirment que les relations Francophones-Anglophones varient avec le temps, l'espace et le contexte, alors que le cinquième parle de collaboration et de conflit en apportant des nuances. Quant aux perspectives raisonnées pour appréhender le passé, les thèmes les plus pertinentes sont : la convergence et la divergence des intérêts politiques et économiques, la compétition politique et économique à connotations ethniques, ainsi que la volonté constante d'assimiler les francophones à travers des relations intergroupes de confrontation et de compromis. L'extrait de Sébastien sert comme exemple :

> « Les revendications de l'élite canadienne vont être plus politique à la base, mais pour aller chercher un appui supplémentaire, on va dévier le sujet vers un volet ethnique, qui dans le fond n'en est pas un. À l'intérieur du mouvement Patriote qui va remplacer le Parti canadien en chambre, vous retrouvez des Anglophones. Il y a des Irlandais, on peut retrouver aussi certains Écossais. Il ne faut pas voir la Rébellion des Patriotes comme seulement ethnique.

C'est à la base un mouvement politique et c'est un mouvement politique qui s'imbrique dans une tangente qui est mondiale à l'époque. »

De plus, lorsque ces répondants font allusion aux perceptions mutuelles entre francophones et anglophones au Québec, ils discutent des perceptions qu'un groupe peut avoir de lui-même, de l'Autre ou du contexte qu'il partage avec cet Autre.

Le seul répondant de tendance *génétique*, Ludovic, se distingue de ses collègues *quasi-génétiques*, surtout par son besoin clair de toujours mieux connaître le passé. Il semble perpétuellement chercher à rendre plausibles les interprétations du passé et ne pas s'arrêter en donnant l'impression qu'il a tout compris. Il essaie de comprendre sans cesse les tensions entre Francophones et Anglophones, mais une époque ou un événement à la fois. Il présente les points de vue des deux groupes et la logique de leurs perceptions face à l'Autre au fil du temps. Il évoque des mini-patterns pour expliquer certaines actions, et il problématise les généralités qu'on peut faire du passé. De plus, il reconnaît les limites de ses connaissances et critique souvent ses propres propos tout en y apportant toujours des nuances. Finalement, en supposant que les perceptions, connaissances et constructions de la réalité varient selon le temps, Ludovic précise que la manière dont les Canadiens-français comprenaient le monde par le passé est complètement différente de celle d'aujourd'hui. Cet extrait démontre quelques-unes de ces caractéristiques *génétiques* :

> « Mais est-ce que le Canadien-français paysan savait qu'il n'était plus minoritaire? [Je ne] pense pas qu'en 1840 il le sait. Je pense qu'aujourd'hui on le sait, mais lui dans sa tête, ce qu'il se dit, c'est il y a des bateaux, bien sur qu'ils sont conscients. D'après moi, il y a une certaine conscience de ça… il y a des bateaux bourrés d'Anglais qui arrivent. Donc, c'est sûr qu'il y a l'impression qu'il va se faire ramasser. Donc, c'est sûr que ça crée des tensions. Surtout le jour où l'Anglais n'est plus le boss, mais l'Anglais occupe le même job. Là, il y a des tensions nécessairement, moi je crois que oui. »

4.2.2.5 La conscience historique du récit traditionnel sur l'identité collective francophone

La plus grande variation des tendances s'est produite quand les répondants ont discuté de la vision misérabiliste du passé canadien-français. Même si la plupart sont

de tendance *critique* (huit répondants), trois ont une tendance *exemplaire*, deux *quasi-génétiques*, trois *génétiques résistants* et finalement, un *génétique*.

En général, les répondants de tendance *exemplaire* jugent que la vision misérabiliste est réelle, mais qu'elle ne reflète pas la situation d'aujourd'hui parce que les Canadiens français ont fait leurs preuves et remporté nombre de succès. René et Victor justifient cette vision en utilisant la logique de la relation conquérant-conquis comme une régularité de la vie. Pour sa part, Lucien offre des régularités basées sur des idées comme : les Britanniques représentaient un pouvoir impérial qui savait comment exploiter l'autre, les élites étaient toujours conscientes de ce qu'elles faisaient subir aux plus faibles, et la vision catholique des choses faisait la promotion de l'histoire des martyrs dans les mentalités.

Tous les répondants de tendance *critique* rejettent la vision misérabiliste en affirmant qu'elle ne reflète pas la réalité du passé. Ils essaient de comprendre pourquoi cette vision existe et, même s'ils le considèrent souvent de manière intelligente, ils le font sans vraiment reconnaître la difficulté de donner un sens au passé. Ainsi, parmi d'autres conceptions, ils expliquent la vision misérabiliste comme étant normale pour les groupes qui se posent en victimes, comme reflétant l'estime de soi de l'endogroupe face aux attitudes de l'Autre dominant et comme servant une thèse utile dans l'imaginaire collectif pour constituer la mémoire collective. Quant aux éléments de contre-récit qui soulignent la non-pertinence de ces significations du passé, deux thématiques populaires ressortent. La première touche la responsabilité de l'Église catholique et d'autres élites francophones dans les problèmes vécus par les francophones. La deuxième se réfère à la critique de la position trop facile de victime qui reproche à l'Autre d'être la cause de sa propre misère. Parmi d'autres thèmes pertinents pour ce qui est des éléments de contre-récit, on retrouve : le fait que les francophones ont fait leurs preuves et ont plus de pouvoir économique et politique, que le passé est manipulé par des politiciens à des fins personnelles, et que la vision incarne un esprit revanchard, qui est à l'origine du nationalisme. Les extraits de Jean-Marie incarnent bien cette tendance :

> « Moi j'ai bien de misère, ça me pue au nez, c'est carrément ça, les victimes que ça soit chez les individus, que ça soit chez les peuples. J'ai bien de la misère avec les palestiniens qui se présentent toujours comme des victimes. Oui, ils sont victimes, mais en quelque part, à un moment donné, tu n'es pas juste ça une victime…Ce n'est pas vrai, il faut être réaliste. »

> « Non. Non. Non. Non. Il y a du monde qui gueule fort par exemple. .. Il y a du monde qui gueule fort. Des polémistes professionnels, il y en a au Québec. Des gens à la radio qui ont l'habitude de beurrer épais, puis d'exagérer, de tomber dans la démagogie. On en a. C'est eux qui peuvent laisser croire qu'on est des victimes. Les politiciens aussi, il y en a qui vont jouer la carte. Je ne considère pas les québécois comme des victimes de quoi que ce soit. C'est sûr qu'on a un contexte, on a une histoire qui est la nôtre. On n'est pas plus victime que qui que ce soit. »

Quant aux deux répondants de tendance *quasi-génétique*, ils vont plus loin que leurs collègues de tendance *critique*. En plus de reconnaître la complexité du passé et la variabilité du temps, ils donnent un caractère temporel à la vision misérabiliste en affirmant qu'elle n'est qu'une construction qui a servi une cause par le passé et qu'aujourd'hui on est prêt à passer à autre chose. Ils reconnaissent donc non seulement l'historicité de la vision, mais aussi celle des visions historiques en général. À cet effet, Robert, par exemple, estime que les visions changent et sont toujours mises de côté au gré des nouvelles découvertes en histoire. Selon lui, ceci démontre que les gens passent à un niveau de pensée supérieur et que les grands courants de pensée consistent toujours en des faits constitués des significations voulues dans la mesure où elles se tiennent.

Encore une fois, Ludovic, l'unique répondant de tendance *génétique*, se démarque de ses collègues par son obstination à constamment questionner et approfondir sa façon de penser, ses idées et ses discours. On dirait qu'il considère toujours la plausibilité des faits pour mieux comprendre le passé. De plus, il temporalise non seulement la vision de l'histoire et son enseignement, mais aussi nos modes de pensées actuels. Quant au dernier, il propose une probabilité nulle de répondre à des questions d'entrevue comme les nôtres concernant la vision misérabiliste si on vivait durant les années 1950.

Finalement, les trois répondants *génétiques résistants* reconnaissent, à des degrés différents, la complexité de la vie humaine, la variabilité du temps et la temporalité des formes de pensée humaine. Mais, quand on en vient à la vision misérabiliste, même s'ils sont capables d'y apporter des nuances, il semble qu'ils refusent de la problématiser et de la temporaliser. Ils croient que la vision misérabiliste est vraie pour le passé et que les francophones étaient conquis et soumis. Il en découle un refus de mieux saisir cet aspect du passé qui est vu de manière rigide et manichéenne pour des raisons éducationnelles (soit éthique ou politique). Les extraits de Kévin et de Jacques démontrent bien ces caractéristiques :

> « Oui, sûrement [qu'on peut changer n'importe quelle vision, n'importe comment], mais en histoire il serait appuyer quand même sur des faits et essayer de faire de l'histoire le portrait de la population, le portrait le plus fidèle possible. … Je pense qu'il y a une grande vérité dans ce portrait de l'histoire difficile du peuple québécois. Le peuple québécois, à travers le temps, ont dû surmonter beaucoup d'obstacles. Et c'est justement peut-être en enseignant cette vision-là, qu'il y a le plus fidèle de la réalité historique, même si c'est quelque chose qui nous échappe assez souvent, qu'on peut aujourd'hui avoir une vision des anglophones, une vision de l'autre qui est très positive. On peut savoir que le Québec a traversé des luttes, a été en lutte contre les anglophones dans une bonne partie de son histoire, a résisté à l'assimilation, a vécu l'exploitation et regardez le Québec d'aujourd'hui et dire cette situation-là ne s'applique plus. [Les élèves doivent] être au courant que cette exploitation a existé, c'est une réalité historique. » (Kévin).

> « C'est l'histoire des Canadiens-français qu'on fait. On apprend à ces jeunes leur passé. On ne peut pas dire que ce n'est pas ça. Donc, c'était le cas. Puis bon, on vas-tu sortir Bombardier puis un autre puis les huit Vachon puis les huit personnes qui ont réussi en affaire? Je vais les mentionner, mais ce n'est pas ça l'histoire des Canadiens-français, vous comprenez? Si on leur demande, quand ils viennent de finir ce cours-là, est-ce que tu as une vision misérabiliste, bien ils vont me dire oui. Parce qu'ils ont suivi le cours puis ils pensent que c'est vrai. … Je leur dis d'ailleurs que ce n'est pas des misérables parce que c'est des Français. Puis les Anglais, ce n'est pas des méchants parce qu'ils ont fait ça, c'était dans l'ordre des choses à ce moment-là. Puis, c'est tout. Puis, ça s'est réglé dans le fond. Après la guerre, la prospérité est arrivée puis c'est conjoncturel. » (Jacques).

5. Discussion générale

Ayant décrit les tendances de conscience historique des répondants selon les quatre questions de recherche, il reste à préciser quelques constats importants. Le premier rejoint l'idée de l'*othering* que nous avons évoqué plus haut lorsque les répondants se souviennent de l'Anglo-québécois. En confrontant ceux des tendances *traditionnelle* et *exemplaire* à ceux des tendances *critique* et *quasi-génétique*, nous pouvons penser

que deux pôles d'inclinations de l'*othering* peuvent exister et qui varient selon leur intensité. À cet effet, les huit premiers semblent faire un *othering fort* parce qu'ils appuient des significations préétablies du passé d'une manière rigide et manichéenne. Et les neuf autres semblent faire de l'*othering doux*, surtout qu'ils problématisent des éléments des récits préétablis ou qu'ils reconnaissent la complexité et la fluidité du passé. Toutefois, malgré le degré d'ouverture de ces derniers envers l'Anglo-québécois, le fait qu'ils ne reconnaissent pas la temporalité des formes de pensée humaines et ne cherchent pas constamment à mieux saisir le passé porte à croire qu'ils négligent quand même de reconnaître l'Anglo-québécois comme acteur moral et historique. Ainsi, selon notre conceptualisation de la conscience historique sous l'angle constructiviste de l'ethnicité, ceci signifierait qu'ils ne considèrent pas nécessairement la minorité Anglo-québécois comme faisant parti du *Nous collectif*. Peut-être ces répondants, tout comme leurs pairs *traditionnelles* et *exemplaires*, mobilisent-ils toujours des marqueurs identitaires, tels que l'histoire de leur propre communauté et leur langue, pour maintenir des frontières intergroupes afin de distinguer les Franco-québécois de la minorité anglophone.

Selon l'analyse de la place accordée à l'Anglophone dans un nouveau programme d'histoire, un deuxième constat permet de noter que près de la moitié des répondants sont favorables à l'enseignement du passé Anglo-québécois aux élèves. En grande majorité, ce sont surtout les répondants des tendances *quasi-génétique* et *génétique* qui seront plus portés à mieux connaître cette communauté et à transmettre ses réalités et expériences. Ils rejoignent ainsi leurs pairs qui, lorsqu'ils se souviennent des Anglo-québécois, font de l'*othering doux*. En dépit de ce constat, il ne faut quand même pas oublier que deux enseignants de tendance *exemplaire* et un de tendance *critique* ont aussi manifesté une ouverture aux Anglo-québécois. Même si *a priori* ceci signifierait que chaque tendance de conscience historique peut être associée à une sensibilité aux expériences et réalités de l'Autre, l'ouverture de ces trois répondants, comme nous avons vu avec Mathieu, résulte plutôt des intérêts politiques de vivre ensemble et non pas nécessairement d'un besoin de mieux connaître et apprécier l'Anglo-québécois en soi. De plus, autant les répondants des tendances

exemplaire ou *critique* extériorisent une ouverture à l'Anglo-québécois, autant ils peuvent la refuser, ce qui n'est pas le cas des répondants *quasi-génétiques* et *génétiques* dans l'échantillon.

Le troisième constat s'adresse à la variabilité des tendances de conscience historique des répondants entre deux contextes thématiques du passé qui peuvent se ressembler. À cet égard, nous pensons à la similarité entre les récits rapportés pour les souvenirs des Anglo-québécois et les discours évoqués pour l'évolution spécifique des relations entre Francophones et Anglophones au Québec. En abordant presque tous une même thématique de rapports intergroupes pour le premier, les répondants ont pu élaborer leurs idées lors de la suite de l'entretien pour le deuxième. Comme le tableau ci-dessous le démontre, seulement sept répondants ont gardé la même tendance de conscience historique pour les deux questions. Les dix autres ont changé de tendance majoritairement vers des manières plus complexes d'historiciser, mais aussi vers des façons plus simples.

Tableau V

Comparaison de tendances entre les consciences historiques de l'Anglo-québécois et des relations Francophones-Anglophones

	La CH de l'Anglophone dans le passé québécois	La CH des relations Francophones-Anglophones à travers le temps
Même Tendance		
Jean-Marie	*Exemplaire*	*Exemplaire*
Robert	*Exemplaire*	*Exemplaire*
Inès	*Critique*	*Critique*
Mathieu	*Critique*	*Critique*
Kévin	*Quasi-génétique*	*Quasi-génétique*
Richard	*Quasi-génétique*	*Quasi-génétique*
Sébastien	*Quasi-génétique*	*Quasi-génétique*
Changement vers une tendance plus complexe		
Frédéric	*Traditionnelle*	*Exemplaire*
Jeanne	*Traditionnelle*	*Exemplaire*
Lucien	*Traditionnelle*	*Exemplaire*
René	*Traditionnelle*	*Exemplaire*
Victor	*Traditionnelle*	*Exemplaire*
Maude	*Critique*	*Quasi-génétique*
Ludovic	*Quasi-génétique*	*Génétique*
Jacques	*Exemplaire*	*Quasi-génétique*
Changement vers une tendance moins complexe		
François	*Quasi-génétique*	*Exemplaire*
Monique	*Quasi-génétique*	*Exemplaire*

Ce qui nous intéresse ici ce sont les changements des tendances des répondants. En confirmant le parallélisme et l'interchangeabilité de la conscience historique, ces changements suggèrent que la manière dont les enseignants historicisent une thématique particulière et élaborée du passé peut varier selon les différentes formes de raisonnement qu'ils emploient pour donner sens au changement temporel. Ainsi, ils peuvent soit complexifier leur raisonnement pour mieux faire sens du passé ou même le rendre plus simple afin de faire la part des choses. Ils peuvent aussi voir le passé à la fois comme simple et manichéen, et fluide et complexe.

Par ailleurs, ces changements des tendances semblent aussi remettre en question la progression linéaire et idéelle de la typologie rüsenienne du développement ontogénétique évoquée plus haut. En effet, sa mobilité restreinte ne nous permet pas d'altérer nos types de conscience historique selon des contextes différents et même semblables du passé. De plus, il n'est pas clair si, par exemple, l'on reste toujours *génétique* une fois arrivé à cette dernière étape ou si l'on peut régresser de stades. Ainsi, nous n'apprécions pas l'interaction complexe des différentes capacités cognitives de doter le passé de sens chez un individu. Sans nécessairement renier la notion du développement ontogénétique, nous croyons donc que d'autres recherches devront être effectuées sur la variabilité des tendances de conscience historique selon des contextes thématiques similaires du passé. Ceci permettra de cerner si la progression des stades est véritablement linéaire et rigide ou, comme nous le croyons, plutôt complexe et fluide.

Il est intéressant de souligner avant de clore cette section, les influences pouvant déterminer la manifestation de la conscience historique des répondants. Certes, parmi les trois facteurs les plus importants, seul le niveau de formation professionnelle s'avère à être non négligeable. Il semble prédisposer les enseignants à reconnaître la complexité et la fluidité du passé, et même à être plus ouvert à prendre en compte les perspectives autres que les siennes ou que leurs groupes pour faire sens du passé. À cet effet, les quatre répondants détenant une maîtrise, soit connexe à l'histoire (Ludovic et Maude) ou dans un autre domaine dans les sciences humaines (Kévin et Richard), manifestent une conscience historique dans les tendances plutôt *génétique*, *quasi-génétique* et *génétique résistant*, plus que ceux qui n'en ont pas. Quant aux deux autres facteurs, l'âge et le degré de contact avec la communauté Anglo-québécoise s'avèrent négligeables. Dans le cas du premier, la taille de l'échantillon est trop limitée pour faire des généralités, tandis que pour le deuxième, qu'il soit sur une base régulière ou non, qu'il soit de près, de loin, ou même non existant, le contact intergroupe n'a pas un impact direct. Autant on peut être en contact avec l'Anglo-québécois, manifester une tendance *traditionnelle* et faire de l'*othering fort*, autant on peut ne jamais être en contact et tendre à reconnaître l'agentivité morale et historique

de ce dernier. De plus, même si le contact encourage l'apport des perspectives raisonnées pour faire sens du passé parmi certains répondants, cela ne les empêche pas, toutefois, aussi de répéter, justifier ou problématiser le passé d'une manière rigide et manichéenne.

6. Conclusion

En examinant la conscience historique des répondants, il devient clair que la manière dont ils historicisent la présence des Anglophones dans le passé québécois ne les amène pas nécessairement à reconnaître l'agentivité morale et historique de cette minorité et à la percevoir dans une perspective d'identité commune.

D'une part, la façon dont la grande majorité des répondants intellectualisent la pertinence de l'histoire pour donner sens aux situations morales à caractère historique ne les conduit pas à élargir l'étendue de la construction de leurs réalités sociales pour inclure l'Anglo-québécois. L'histoire n'est donc pas vue comme un moyen de se transformer pour mieux se connaître soi-même et son environnement en améliorant l'existence de soi et des autres. En conséquence, les humains ne sont pas vus comme des acteurs historiques et moraux qui s'insèrent et vivent dans le temps en tant que contributeurs fondamentaux.

D'autre part, en percevant souvent les rapports de pouvoir interethniques comme étant inégaux, les répondants font presque tous de l'*othering* lorsqu'ils se souviennent de l'Anglo-québécois et lorsqu'ils élaborent sur les relations Francophones-Anglophones dans le passé. En termes de la négociation de l'ethnicité, peu importe la manière dont les significations préétablies du passé sont mobilisées, cet *othering* suggère le maintien des frontières intergroupes afin de délimiter les différences ethnoculturelles entre les deux communautés. Ainsi, les répondants ne reconnaissent pas l'agentivité morale et historique des Anglo-québécois et ne les incluent pas dans une identité commune nationale.

Finalement, en responsabilisant leur propre groupe pour la vision misérabiliste du passé et pour un épanouissement national et historique, les répondants aliènent indirectement toute participation importante de l'Anglo-québécois à la construction d'une identité collective commune. Sans pour autant reconnaître leur propre agentivité historique et morale, les répondants semblent préconiser néanmoins une vision du Québec comme une société avant tout francophone, et ce, sans y nécessairement identifier un rôle clair pour la minorité anglophone.

En dépit de ces constats, il faut, toutefois, apporter deux précisions importantes. Premièrement, ce sont les enseignants des tendances plutôt *génétiques* qui sont généralement les plus aptes à reconnaître que les Anglo-québécois sont des acteurs moraux et historiques à part entière, à moins qu'ils ne le refusent afin de maintenir des frontières intergroupes plutôt rigides pour des raisons éthiques, pratiques ou politiques, comme dans le cas des *génétiques résistants*. Nous sommes donc portés à croire que les répondants de tendances *quasi-génétique* et *génétique* accepteraient l'Anglo-québécois plus comme faisant partie d'une identité collective québécoise que les répondants appartenant aux autres tendances. Deuxièmement, il semble aussi exister une différence entre la reconnaissance de l'historicité des Anglo-québécois et l'ouverture des répondants aux réalités sociales et aux expériences historiques de ces derniers. Malgré la manifestation d'une méconnaissance du passé Anglo-québécois, beaucoup de répondants restent favorables à son apprentissage et à son enseignement. Ainsi, ils peuvent démontrer une volonté pour comprendre l'Autre, même s'ils font de l'*othering*.

Même si ces constats et précisions peuvent être valides pour notre étude qualitative, il faut garder à l'esprit qu'on ne peut pas les étendre à toute la population des enseignants d'histoire nationale francophone. Il faudrait plutôt les voir comme des réflexions qui peuvent amorcer un intérêt pour mieux comprendre le rôle que joue la conscience historique dans les négociations de l'ethnicité et du rapport à l'Autre. À cette fin, il faudrait, avant tout, revisiter la tendance *génétique* afin de mieux nuancer les sous-catégories *quasi-génétique* et *génétique résistant* et de voir si elles peuvent

éventuellement former des tendances à part entière dans notre répertoire de la conscience historique. Ceci nous permettra donc de mieux repérer et généraliser leurs conséquences non seulement sur la manière dont les acteurs sociaux mobilisent le passé pour se connaître et s'orienter, mais aussi sur les capacités de ces derniers à reconnaître à la fois leur propre agentivité morale et historique et celle des autres.

Références

Angvil, Magne et Bodo Von Borries, dirs. 1997. *Youth and History. A Comparative European Survey on Historical Consciousness and Political Attitudes among Adolescents*. Hamburg : Edition Körber-Stiftung. 2 volumes.

Barth, Frederik. 1996. Ethnic Groups and Boundaries (1969). Dans *Theories of Ethnicity: A Classical Reader*, dir. Werner Sollor, 294-324. New York : New York University Press.

Barton, Keith C. et Alan McCully. 2003. History Teaching and the Perpetuation of Memories : the Northern Ireland Experience. Dans *The Role of Memory in Ethnic Conflict*, dirs., Ed Cairns and Michael D. Roe, 107-124. New York : Palgrave Macmillan.

Barton, Keith C. et Alan W. McCully. 2004. History, Identity, and the School Curriculum in Northern Ireland: An Empirical Study of Secondary Students' Ideas and Perspectives. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*. 36, no. 6 : 1-32.

Barton, Keith C. et Linda Levstik. 2004. *Teaching History for the Common Good*. Mahwah, New Jersey : Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Becker, Carl. 1932. Everyman his Own Historian. *The American Historical Review*. 37, no. 2 : 221-236.

Boutin, Gérald. 1997. *L'entretien de recherche qualitatif*. Québec : Presses de l'Université du Québec.

Charland, Jean-Pierre. 2003. *Les élèves, l'histoire et la citoyenneté : Enquête auprès d'élèves des régions métropolitaine de Montréal et de Toronto*. Québec : Les Presses de l'Université Laval.

Gadamer, Hans-Georg. 1987. The Problem of Historical Consciousness. Dans *Interpretive Social Science. A Second Look*, dirs. P. Rabinow et W. M. Sullivan, 82-140. Berkeley, Los Angeles : University of California Press.

Jenkins, Richard. 1997. *Rethinking Ethnicity: Arguments and Explorations*. Thousand Oaks, California : SAGE Publications.

Juteau, Danielle. 1996. Theorising Ethnicity and Ethnic Communalisations at the Margins: From Quebec to the World System. *Nations and Nationalism*. 2, no. 1 : 45-66.

Juteau, Danielle. 1999. *L'ethnicité et ses frontières*. Montréal : Presses de l'Université de Montréal.

Kitson, Alison. 2007. History Teaching and Reconciliation in Northern Ireland. Dans *Teaching the Violent Past: Reconciliation and History Education*, dir. E. Cole, 123-154. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Kölbl, Carlos et Jürgen Straub. 2001. Historical Consciousness in Youth. Theoretical and Exemplary Empirical Analysis. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research. Sozialforschung*. 2, no. 3. Revue en ligne: www.qualitative-research.net.

Laville, Christian. 2004. Historical Consciousness and Historical Education: What to Expect from the First for the Second. Dans *Theorizing Historical Consciousness*, dir. Peter Seixas, 165-182. Toronto : University of Toronto Press.

Lee, Peter. 2004. Understanding History. Dans *Theorizing Historical Consciousness*, dir. Peter Seixas, 129-164. Toronto : University of Toronto Press.

Leeuw-Roord, Joke van der, dir. 1998. *The State of History Education in Europe. Challenges and Implications of the "Youth and Hitsory" Project*. Hamburg : Körber-Stiftung.

Lessard-Hébert, Michelle et al. 1995 *La recherche qualitative : Fondements et pratiques*. Montréal : Éditions Nouvelles.

Létourneau, Jocelyn. 2004. *A History for the Future. Rewriting Memory and Identity in Quebec*. Traduit par Phyllis Aronoff et Howard Scott. Montreal et Kingston : McGill-Queen's University Press.

Létourneau, Jocelyn et Sabrina Moisan. 2004. Mémoire et récit de l'aventure historique du Québec chez les jeunes Québécois d'héritage canadien-français : coup de sonde, amorce d'analyse des résultats, questionnements . *The Canadian Historical Review*. 84, no. 2, Juin : 325-356.

Lukacs, John. 1985. *Historical Consciousness or the Remembered Past*. New York : Schocken Books.

MacDonald, Sharon, dir. 2000. *Approaches to European Historical Consciousness: Reflections and Provocations*. Hamburg : Koerber Stiftung.

Malesevic, Sinisa. 2004. *The Sociology of Ethnicity*. Thousand Oaks, California : SAGE Publications.

Marcus, John T. 1980. *Sub Specie Historiae. Essays in the Manifestation of Historical and Moral Consciousness*. Londres et Toronto : Associated University Press.

Mason, Jennifer. 2002. *Qualitative Researching*. 2ième éd. Londres : SAGE Publications.

McAndrew, Marie. 2000. Conclusion : comparabilité des expériences décrites et perspectives de collaboration. Dans *Relations ethniques et éducation dans les sociétés divisées (Québec, Irlande du nord, Catalogne et Belgique)*, dirs. Marie McAndrew et France Gagnon, 225-239. Montréal: L'Harmattan Inc.

McAndrew, Marie. 2002. Ethnic Relations and Education in Divided Societies : Belgium, Catalonia, Northern Ireland, Quebec. *Kolor, Journal on Moving Communities*. 1 : 5-19.

McAndrew, Marie. 2003. Should National Minorities/Majorities Share Common Institutions or Control Their Own Schools? A Comparison of Policies and Debates in Quebec, Northern Ireland and Catalonia. Dans *The Social Construction of Diversity : Recasting the Master Narrative of Industrial Nations*, dirs. Danielle Juteau et Christiane Harzig, 369-424. New York : Berghahn Press.

McCully, Alan et al. 2003. *Teaching History in Societies Emerging from Conflict*. Report of an International Seminar Held in the UNESCO Centre, University of Ulster, Coleraine, Northern Ireland, September 9-13, 2002. University of Ulster : UNESCO Centre, Août.

Miles, Mathew B. et A. Michael Huberman. 1994. *An Expanded Sourcebook : Qualitative Data Analysis*. 2$^{\text{ième}}$ ed. Londres : SAGE Publications.

Rosenzweig, Roy et David Thelen. 1998. *Presence of the Past : Popular Uses of History in American Life*. New York : Columbia University Press.

Rüsen, Jörn. 2005. *History : Narration, Interpretation, Orientation*. New York : Berghahn Books.

Schieder, Theodor. 1978. The Role of Historical Consciousness in Political Action. Dans *History and Theory. Studies in the Philosophy of History*. 17, no. 4 : 1-18. *Beiheft 17 Historical Consciousness and Political Action*. Wesleyan University Press.

Seixas, Peter et Penney Clark. 2004. Murals as Monuments: Students' Ideas about Depictions of Civilization in British Columbia. *American Journal of Education*. 110, Février : 146-171.

Seixas, Peter et Carla Peck. 2004. Teaching Historical Thinking. Dans *Challenges and Prospects for Canadian Social Studies*, dirs Alan Sears et Ian Wright, 109-117. Vancouver : Pacific Educational Press.

Seixas, Peter. 2004. Introduction. *Theorizing Historical Consciousness*, dir. Peter Seixas, 3-20. Toronto : University of Toronto Press.

Stearns, Peter N. et al. 2000. *Knowing, Teaching, and Learning History. National and International Perspectives*. New York and London : New York University Press.

Straub, Jürgen. 2005. Telling Stories, Making History: Toward a Narrative Psychology of the Historical Construction of Meaning. Dans *Narration, Identity, and Historical Consciousness*, dir. Jürgen Straub, 44-98. New York : Berghahn Books.

Van der Maren, Jean-Marie. 1996. *Méthodes de recherche pour l'éducation*. Montréal : Les Presses de l'Université de Montréal.

Van Hover, Stephanie et Elizabeth Yeager. 2005. *'I want to use my subject matter to…' The Role of Purpose in One Secondary U.S. History Teacher's Instructional Decision-Making*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association. Montréal, Canada. April 11-15.

Weber, Max. 1965. *Essais sur la théorie de la science*. Traduit par Julien Freund. Paris: Plon.

Weber, Max. 1968. *Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology*. Guenther Roth et Claus Wittich, dirs. Traduit par Ephraim Fischoff et al. New York : Bedminster Press.

Wertsch, James. 2004. Specific Narratives and Schematic Narrative Templates. In *Theorizing Historical Consciousness*, dir. Peter Seixas, 49-62. Toronto : University of Toronto Press.

Wineburg, Sam. 2001. *Historical Thinking and Other Unnatural Acts. Charting the Future of Teaching the Past*. Philadelphia : Temple University Press.

Wineburg, Sam et al. 2007. Common Belief and the Cultural Curriculum: An Intergenerational Study of Historical Consciousness. *American Educational Research Journal*. 44, no.1 : 40-76.

CHAPTER SIX

General Discussion and Concluding Remarks

One of this dissertation's primary concerns has been to link the concept of historical consciousness to negotiations of ethnicity and the fluctuations in ethnic boundary maintenance. Another important concern has been to examine the expressions of such a connection among national history teachers in Quebec's context of ambiguous ethnic dominance. Each of the three articles in this thesis dealt with these objectives in its own way. Among other contributions, Chapter Three's theoretical framework underscored how the recognition of human moral and historical agency is central to rendering group boundaries more porous. Chapter Four's exploratory study described the differences in Franco and Anglo-Québécois history teachers' sensitivities to the social realities and historical experiences of the other parallel community. And Chapter Five's in-depth study nuanced the complexities in historicizing the common past when Francophone history teachers negotiate the Anglo-Québécois's place in a common collective identity. In summing up these main findings, this concluding chapter discusses the dissertation's prevailing theoretical insights as well as its other contributions to improving our common knowledge of history teaching and Francophone-Anglophone relations in Quebec. The chapter then provides some recommendations for overcoming group parallelism in the national history classroom before touching upon both the dissertation's overall limitations and important prospects for future research in the field.

1. Thesis Contributions to Theorizing Historical Consciousness and Ethnicity

From the outset, I have argued that the relevance of historical consciousness for both ethnicity delineations and ethnic boundary fluctuations depends upon the manner in which group members historicize the past, or rather see emerging from it meaningful moral life patterns for orientation in time (Rüsen 2005). Highlighting the centrality of human agency, such historicizing involves interacting with pre-established configurations of the past to not only define the in-group and its power struggles with the significant Other, but also the workings of history for making sense of temporal change. When forming their understanding of current inter-group power relations, group members thus coordinate pertinent historical visions of the past with

interiorized cultural patterns of historical thought so as to situate their value principles in constructions of social reality. In this process, they repeat, justify, criticize or transform pre-established configurations according to their need for ethno-cultural awareness and agency.

Inspired by Jörn Rüsen's (2005) fourfold typology, the emerging model that connects the several tendencies of historical consciousness to the different possibilities of structuring group boundaries mirrors these four modes of temporal interaction. Accordingly, when signifying their group and its relations with the significant Other, social actors with traditional and exemplary tendencies firmly maintain inter-group dichotomies. In contrast, those with critical tendencies question the efficacy of standardized inter-group dichotomies and possibly seek to restructure them. And finally, social actors with genetic tendencies potentially render group boundaries more porous, especially if they are willing to recognize the significant Other's moral and historical agency in the flow of time. However, while such recognition can be achieved irrespective of whether current inter-group relations are perceived as equitable or inequitable, as improved or not, it can also be refused for ethical, practical and political reasons.

Of importance, both studies in this thesis reinforce this theoretical standpoint's underlying view of the pervasiveness of essentialized historical visions in negotiations of ethnicity. In so doing, they clearly demonstrate that social actors may either succumb to or transform shared historical memories for signifying the past that competing group trendsetters variously manipulate for political or other personal gains. Depending on how the evolution of the power structure between the competing communities is perceived, group members may thus interact with mobilized conceptions of the past and develop a rapport with the significant Other that adheres to or contradict general norms. Not only does this underscore the malleability of essentialized historical visions, but also the possibility of changing trendsetters' imposed formulae for constructing social reality.

Probing deeper into the workings of historical consciousness, the in-depth study in Chapter Five expands on this notion of individual agency in the negotiations of ethnicity. Underscoring the novelty of my work in the field, it becomes clear that social actors variously mobilize equal and parallel tendencies when making historical sense of the past for moral orientation. As the scope of these predispositions reflect the different capacities that individuals possess for reasoning temporal change, these tendencies, comparable to interchangeable filters, alter according to different and, even at times, when elaborated upon, similar thematic contexts that require historicizing for ethno-cultural awareness and agency. In thus determining personal negotiations of ethnicity, social actors do not necessarily employ a uniform type of historical consciousness in an ontogenetic manner when signifying the past for moral orientation, as suggested by Rüsen (2005). Instead of mobilizing such cognitive capacities in a linear fashion and using the highest-attained type consistently and rigidly, group members actualize their historical consciousness more complexly, fluidly and even irregularly, thereby accentuating the parallelism and reciprocity of its tendencies. In this logic, developing an ethno-cultural sense of Self and of the significant Other is not a simple process. Relevant aspects of the past for negotiating ethnicity may be historicized differently or similarly, statically or dynamically, depending on social actors' capacities of both signifying inter-group power structures and making moral decisions for constructing social reality.

The in-depth study also offers important insight regarding the transformation of group boundaries. In highlighting the complexity of genetic social actors' aptitudes for recognizing human moral and historical agency and thus for rendering group boundaries more porous, it distinguishes between full-fledged genetic social actors and somewhat *quasi*-genetic ones. This distinction further complements my model's supposition of social actors' possible refusal of genetic capacities for ethical, practical or political purposes. So, while genetic group members would ideally recognize the complexity of human life, the temporality of human thought and the variability of time, as well as demonstrate a conscious will to constantly improve their understanding of the past, not all of them fully adhere to these criteria. As a result,

three main genetic moments of structuring group boundaries emerge. When interacting with pre-established configurations of the past to negotiate their ethnicity, full-fledged genetic social actors use the past to transform and improve the surrounding world, thereby rendering ethnic boundaries very porous. Quasi-genetic social actors simply comprehend the socio-historical context of the past and adapt it to current socio-political realities, thereby rendering boundaries potentially porous. Finally, in order to preserve the memory of some controversial aspect of the past, genetic-*resistant* actors deny their possibilities for evoking change, thereby preserving boundaries as rigidly as they can.

On the whole, in light of these theoretical contributions, it becomes clear that social actors' moral and historical reasoning determines their agency when negotiating ethnicity and structuring group boundaries. Furthermore, the greater number of intellectual tools group members possess for theorizing temporal change and for historicizing relevant aspects of the past, the more they may be capable of appreciating and benefitting from the various possibilities of improving the quality of future life, especially if they will to. In this sense, seeing as moral and historical reasoning involves the development of a particular rapport with pre-established configurations of the past for constructing social reality, the acquisition of adequate know-how for developing personal values for living life becomes primordial. By widening their capacities for reasoning temporal change, group members would thus gain more leeway in assessing how their patterns of historical thought navigate through the different narrative configurations of the past. Not only could this lead them to possibly place in-group cultural markers into socio-historical context, but to also potentially recognize human moral and historical agency. In re-conceptualizing the power structure with the significant Other, group members may thus come to autonomously construct personal perspectives of the past and to create some form of inter-group commonality, unless they conscientiously refuse to do so.

Of particular relevance, transposing such a view on to school history-teaching points to enabling students to consciously transform group boundaries in societal contexts

where political forces overwhelmingly support the necessity of inter-group dialogue. From this perspective, school history in Western societies should prepare students to develop and exercise their capacities of moral and historical reasoning. Such knowledge would inform them about the different possibilities of using history for life so as to make conscientious decisions when negotiating identity and guiding agency. This would not only assist them to understand the moral and political implications in constructing social reality, but would also lead them to recognize that they are part of the world and actively contribute to it. In realizing the potential history holds for effectuating change, students may thus autonomously and scrupulously acknowledge their readiness to transform group boundaries while being answerable to their choices. Rather than interiorizing an identity imposed from above, such decision-making would reinforce students' allegiances to the democratic social structure of which they form an important part.

2. Contributions to Quebec History Teaching and Francophone-Anglophone Relations

In tandem with its theoretical contributions, my dissertation also offers some important insight into mutual group attitudes between Quebec Francophone and Anglophone national history teachers. Given that these educators are responsible for socializing students for future common life, a look at their perceptions contributes to better understanding their role in the maintenance and transformation of group boundaries as well as in the promotion of inter-group dialogue. As the exploratory study in Chapter Four generally describes teachers' mutual group attitudes, the ensuing in-depth one elaborates on those held specifically by educators from the Franco-Québécois community. This latter focus was deemed sociologically relevant because it was believed that many teachers from this group would in all probability harbour antagonistic feelings toward the Anglo-Québécois, a former dominant minority with whom the history of often unequal power relations has only recently been revamped in favour of Quebec's previously subordinate Franco-Québécois majority (Schermerhorn 1978; Levine 1990; McAndrew 2000; 2002; 2003). While

my overall observations may be pertinent for the respondents in both my qualitative studies, I am aware that these cannot be generalized to the wider Quebec history teaching population. With this in mind, however, it should not impede my views from serving as general points for reflection and further study.

Reflective of Quebec's context of ambiguous ethnic dominance, the dissertation's exploratory study reveals a general divergence in mutual group attitudes between Francophone and Anglophone national history teachers, which, due to a lack of inter-group dialogue, amplifies both communities' sentiments of estrangement. Clearly viewing the other group as a possible impediment to their own community's cultural maintenance and development, many teachers inevitably and inadvertently reinforce group boundaries and ethno-cultural group markers as a means of co-existence. Consequently, it becomes clear that Quebec's sociological parallelism is bolstered in its national history classrooms. On the whole, as educators from the Anglophone minority display an overwhelming awareness of the ambiguous majority's social realities and historical experiences, they also resent the fact that their own historical memories are neglected in the history program they are charged with transmitting. In their turn, largely displaying "insensitivity" or at most "indifference" to the social realities and historical experiences of the ambiguous minority, Francophone teachers do not necessarily realize that their Anglophone counterparts transmit the Franco-Québécois narrative framework while feeling excluded.

With these differences in mind, Chapter Five's in-depth study delves deeper into Franco-Québécois history educators' attitudes toward Quebec's Anglophone minority. If general to the wider teaching community, its findings of overall unfamiliarity with Anglo-Québécois social realities and historical experiences would point to a belief that the latter are not necessarily considered as forming part of a common collective identity. Respondents' overwhelming perceptions of unequal power structures would moreover suggest a prevalent tendency of reinforcing ethno-cultural differences by *Othering* members of this competing group. Despite visible willingness by some teachers to both learn about Anglo-Québécois realities and

experiences and to transmit such knowledge to their students, it would seem that pre-established configurations of the past largely prevail for making sense of the significant Other. Furthermore, respondents' overall unawareness of human moral and historical agency would also indicate that the Anglo-Québécois are not recognized as active or important contributors to Quebec's past, present and future. On the whole, while most respondents believe Francophone-Anglophone relations have evolved, they are wary of viewing them as having necessarily improved for the better, believing that they could rather easily become strained. In this perspective, the Anglo-Québécois could possibly either be seen as a threat or a necessary "Other" for the advancement of the Franco-Québécois community. As a result, teachers may be uncertain as to how to even think about including Anglo-Québécois realities, experiences and desires in classroom discussions of group commonality, possibly not knowing where and how to begin.

As demonstrated in the in-depth study, the basic structuring of these attitudes toward the Anglo-Québécois emerges from respondents' differing capacities to historicize common past events for temporal orientation. Making sense of this latter minority group in constructions of social reality varies according to how Franco-Québécois national history teachers coordinate their aptitudes for moral and historical reasoning with the many contexts of the past that demand such historicizing. Of importance, by underscoring the dynamism of their historical consciousness, this process shows how these educators do not possess one all-encompassing tendency of historicizing the past for making sense of and *Othering* the Anglo-Québécois. In effect, rather attesting to the variability and irregularity of their historical consciousness, different inclinations to historicizing and thus understanding the latter emerge. Of further importance, the in-depth study also indicates how Franco-Québécois national history teachers may alter their tendencies of historical consciousness when elaborating upon specific contexts of the past. In other words, while they may possibly maintain a similar tendency for particular aspects of the past, they can equally gear toward either a more complex manner of historicizing or rather a simpler one. Given such potential transformations, specific contexts of the past can thus be seen as fluid and

multifaceted, simple and rigid, or both, depending on the different forms of reasoning educators possess or mobilize for interacting with, and thus making sense of, temporal change. In this view, the Anglo-Québécois can be understood in all the complexity of the common past, in the simplicity of its interpretations or in both modes of temporal interaction.

On top of these general and specific workings of Franco-Québécois teachers' historical consciousness, the in-depth study also demonstrates some potential for orchestrating change in attitudes toward the significant Other. Among the respondents who are open to learning and teaching about the Anglo-Québécois past, mostly those with quasi-genetic and fully genetic expressions of historical consciousness are interested in better knowing and appreciating the latter for its own sake, rather than solely for the expediency of political coexistence. While not necessarily always apt to recognizing their own or Anglo-Québécois moral and historical agency in the flow of time, such educators are nevertheless open to integrating differing viewpoints of the past when constructing their social reality of inter-group relations.

On the whole, in comparing both the exploratory and in-depth studies, a clearer picture emerges on the role of history teaching and Francophone-Anglophone relations in Quebec. Looking at the larger Anglo-Québécois school history teaching community, my dissertation suggests that they most possibly face a moral dilemma, similar to the tension I identified in Chapter Two between promoting critical thinking skills and a collective narrative framework for maintaining the state. Ready to encourage students to integrate more fully into Quebec society and to even anticipate a more central role in defining future societal projects –an inevitable privilege they believe is guaranteed by their group's historic presence in the province–, many of these teachers willingly recognize and transmit Franco-Québécois visions of the past possibly in exchange for similar acknowledgment of their own past or for assistance in conforming their own historical visions to those of the majority. However, feelings of rejection in the 1982 history program and its June exam sow the seeds of their

discontent, leading teachers to instead display openness to the Francophone majority while denigrating the exclusion of their own community's realities and experiences. As a result, educators could over-emphasize critical thinking skills at the expense of the state's narrative framework, which would effectively lead students to possibly reject the majority group's legitimacy in governing their lives.

In their turn, those Franco-Québécois history teachers who tend to be indifferent to the realities, experiences and desires of Quebec's Anglophone minority may instead not be faced with any moral dilemma relative to Francophone-Anglophone relations when teaching history. Keen on preserving the current state of peaceful co-existence between both communities, they may not even question their group's exclusivity over Quebec's common collective identity narrative and thus over future societal projects. In all, Anglo-Québécois historical visions of the common past may be disregarded possibly because Franco-Québécois teachers are not aware of them or not even faced with having to deal with Anglophone issues on a regular basis in school. As members of the host society responsible for integrating newcomers to the province, their priorities may rather focus on assisting the latter to adapt to their new social environment. As a result, Franco-Québécois teachers may view their own group's social realities and historical experiences as the only viable ingredients for forming a collective narrative framework aimed at socializing their students. Having said this, it should also be stated that some Franco-Québécois teachers could also consciously decide to exclude Anglo-Québécois perspectives when teaching national history. Given the recentness of the Quiet Revolution and the emergence of Franco-Québécois nationalist and linguistic affirmation, more politically-minded teachers may fear the ubiquity of English-language usage in North America and its popular presence in Montreal as a threat to their own group's maintenance and development. At the very least, group insecurity could lead them to advocate the preservation of a controlled form of peaceful co-existence through the history classroom, or in extreme cases to possibly even expect an assimilation of the Anglo-Québécois in the long-run.

3. Recommendations for Improving Francophone-Anglophone Relations
 In Quebec History Teaching

In comparing both Francophone and Anglophone teachers' mutual group attitudes in Quebec's context of ambiguous ethnic dominance, it becomes clear that their apprehensions regarding community maintenance and development impact how they transmit the national history program's collective identity framework. As a result, teachers' differing perceptions hinder inter-group comprehension and communication as well as impede the creation of a common historical vision. While the new History and Citizenship Education program aims to overcome this impasse, the effects of its implementation on inter-group relations has yet to be determined. Seeing as the program emphasizes both a socio-constructivist outlook on history for promoting common civic consciousness and a collective narrative framework that solely configures the main socio-cultural and historical markers of the Franco-Québécois, such attempts at inter-group conciliation do not necessarily seem promising (Laville 2006; Létourneau 2006; BHP 2007). Instead of bridging differences with the Anglo-Québécois, the program risks preserving the parallelism between both groups by continuing to differentiate the Franco-Québécois as an ethno-cultural majority from the rest of Quebec's cultural communities.

Despite these potential limitations in the new program, two important recommendations for encouraging mutual group comprehension and ethno-cultural boundary transformation come to mind. Of great significance, mandatory workshops assisting national history teachers to develop and expand their personal capacities for moral and historical reasoning should be regularly offered by the *Ministère de l'éducation, du loisir et du sport* (MELS). In recognizing their active involvement in the making of history, educators should ideally come to grasp the many ways in which humans develop particular rapports with pre-established configurations of the past for constructing social reality. Such an acknowledgment would not only lead to an appreciation of the usefulness of history for living life, but also to an understanding of the different workings of historical consciousness on human identity

and agency. As an intended effect, teachers would thus come to appreciate how genetic outlooks on reality open up a plethora of opportunities for improving the quality of common future life. Comprising a win-win situation for both communities, the chances of inter-group comprehension and dialogue may accordingly increase. While not all teachers would embrace such possibilities for change due to ethical, political or practical reasons, the appropriate tools for making conscientious decisions on instructional gate-keeping would nonetheless be known. As a result, teachers who refuse to promote group commonality would at least be consciously answerable to their choices when socializing students in the national history classroom.

To complement these workshops on moral and historical reasoning, the MELS should furthermore develop a document that informs and sensitizes Francophone teachers on Anglo-Québécois identity, past and present. As a collaboration of historians, history educationalists and English-speaking community organizations and interest groups, such a text should touch upon Anglo-Québécois social realities, historical experiences and overall desires for common future life with the Francophone majority. Such a standardized narrative would enable national history teachers to not only appreciate this minority group's shared historical memories as a historic Quebec community in its own right, but to also acknowledge its contributions to the province from the group's own perspective. Undoubtedly, such documentation would be welcomed by those Franco-Québécois teachers who are open to learning and teaching about Anglophone perspectives, especially since they do not always have the time, skills and motivation to research relevant information on their own.

4. Prospective Research on Historical Consciousness and the Construction of Inter-Group Relations

In order to enhance the relevance of these recommendations in the long-run, a few final words need to be included about some potential avenues for future research in the field of historical consciousness and inter-group relations. By probing deeper into the global effects of historical consciousness on both human agency and the

structuring of group boundaries, such prospective work would continue to improve our general understanding of the role that moral and historical reasoning plays in increasing inter-group comprehension and dialogue. As a result, mutual group attitudes between Franco and Anglo-Québécois national history teachers could possibly transform for the better, eventually leading to the creation of a common historical vision for both communities.

To these ends, one important suggestion for future investigation would be to conduct quantitative research in order to uncover necessary patterns of teacher expressions of historical consciousness among a vast sample of respondents. Overcoming an important limitation in this thesis, the attainment of such a quantitative complement would better contextualize my specific findings on teacher constructions of inter-group realities. Seeing as obtaining such information was not possible at the time of my two studies because no relevant institutional database was available, the development of a necessary resource base would now be greatly needed and welcomed. In outlining the main characteristics of how teachers historicize past events for ethno-cultural awareness and guidance, quantitative research would permit an assessment of the extent to which the findings of my dissertation can be generalized to the larger history teaching population in Quebec.

Given my aforementioned interest in focusing specifically on the workings of Franco-Québécois teachers' historical consciousness, another possibility for future research consists of conducting a similar in-depth study on members of the Anglo-Québécois national history teaching community. By thus addressing another important limitation in my work, intricate similarities and differences between the tendencies of both groups' history educators to historicize common past events could be discerned. Accordingly, a new in-depth investigation would examine the capacities of moral and historical reasoning that underlie Anglo-Québécois respondents' sensitivity to Franco-Québécois social realities and historical experiences. It would moreover look at how their various parallel tendencies of historical consciousness enable them to not only appreciate common past events to structure their realities of Francophone-

Anglophone relations in Quebec, but to also consider the place of the ambiguous majority in future common life. The ultimate aim would then be to assess the extent to which they recognize Franco-Québécois moral and historical agency and how such acknowledgment affects the structuring of group boundaries.

To build upon Quebec's experience of group duality and national history teaching, studies similar to my exploratory and in-depth ones should also be conducted in other societies with ambiguous ethnic dominance, such as Belgium, Northern Ireland, Catalonia and even Switzerland, where competing historical memories of the past coexist. As a starting point, such work could focus on Northern Ireland, where the abundance of research on history teaching between its Catholic and Protestant communities lacks particular knowledge of how history educators from both groups historicize common past events. Seeing as this state epitomizes a high degree of institutional, political and even, at times, violent division (McAndrew 2000), examining the effects of national history teachers' historical consciousness on the maintenance and transformation of group boundaries would indicate whether educators' capacities of moral and historical reasoning encourage similar or rather different manners of historicizing the past than in Quebec. Since most history teachers in Northern Ireland prefer avoiding controversial issues in class (McCully et al. 2003; Conway 2004; Smith 2005; Barton 2007; Allison Kitson 2007), such work would moreover clarify whether "playing safe" is simply a means of skirting undesirable social and pedagogical consequences or whether it also offers teachers ways of disregarding rather than embracing the competing community's social realities and historical experiences. In this logic, by grasping how they make sense of temporal change to construct realities of inter-group relations, the workings of educators' historical consciousness would explain whether their interactions with pre-established configurations of the past predispose them to recognize human moral and historical agency and whether such acknowledgment leads them to develop understandings of group commonality.

Finally, with regard to theoretical considerations, one last suggestion for future research involves the genetic sub-categories that were discovered and presented in Chapter Five. While both the quasi-genetic and genetic-resistant types proved to be useful for explaining how Franco-Québécois respondents interact with pre-established configurations for signifying the Anglo-Québécois and structuring group boundaries, further research would need to delve deeper into how these two sub-categories specifically affect human identity and agency. Since they hold important implications for moral and historical reasoning, the study of these variations would help better establish the particular criteria that impede certain individuals with genetic tendencies from recognizing human moral and historical agency. Such an examination would also permit discernment of whether both sub-categories actually do form parallel and equal tendencies in my repertoire of historical consciousness or whether they merely represent some important deviations from the general norm of the genetic tendency.

As an overall desired outcome, it is hoped that by pursing these four suggestions for future research, general interest would increase among educationalists and other social scientists for studying the effects of historical consciousness on constructions of social reality. Of particular importance, if such enthusiasm were to gain momentum in the field of inter-group relations and history teaching, such research could have profound consequences on how students are socialized for common future life, eventually leading to the continuous development and implementation of new strategies for improving the quality of inter-group relations. By thus increasing our knowledge of how historical memory and thinking interact in constructions of inter-group reality, we can better comprehend how different ethno-cultural group members intermingle with their peers in democratic societies, thereby opening up new potential avenues for change. As a welcomed result, these possibilities would offer different opportunities to not only encourage the celebration of diversity, but to also respect and promote the mutual threads of group commonality.

References

Barton, Keith C. 2007. Teachers, Students, and History Education in Northern Ireland: A Commentary on the Research Studies. In *Recent Research into Teaching History in Northern Ireland: Informing Curriculum Change*, 37-42. University of Ulster, UNESCO Centre.

Bulletin d'histoire politique (BHP). 2007. *Débat sur le programme d'enseignement de l'histoire au Québec*. 15, no. 2, Winter.

Conway, Margaret. 2004. Identifying the Past: An Exploration of Teaching and Learning Sensitive Issues in History at Secondary School Level. *Educate*. 4, no. 2: 22-26.

Kitson, Alison. 2007. History Teaching and Reconciliation in Northern Ireland. In *Teaching the Violent Past: Reconciliation and History Education*, ed. E. Cole, 123-154. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Laville, Christian. 2006. La crise du programme d'histoire au Québec : Quelles leçons en tirer? *Canadian Issues/Thèmes canadiens*. Fall: 80-85.

Létourneau, Jocelyn. 2006. Faut-il craindre une autre histoire du Québec? *Canadian issues/Thèmes canadiens*. Fall: 87-90.

Levine, Marc V. 1990. *The Reconquest of Montreal. Language Policy and Social Change in a Bilingual City*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

McAndrew, Marie. 2000. Conclusion: comparabilité des expériences décrites et perspectives de collaboration. In *Relations ethniques et éducation dans les sociétés divisées (Québec, Irlande du nord, Catalogne et Belgique)*, eds. Marie McAndrew and France Gagnon, 225-239. Montreal: L'Harmattan Inc.

McAndrew, Marie. 2002. Ethnic Relations and Education in Divided Societies: Belgium, Catalonia, Northern Ireland, Quebec. *Kolor, Journal on Moving Communities*. 1: 5-19.

McAndrew, Marie. 2003. Should National Minorities/Majorities Share Common Institutions or Control Their Own Schools? A Comparison of Policies and Debates in Quebec, Northern Ireland and Catalonia. In *The Social Construction of Diversity: Recasting the Master Narrative of Industrial Nations*, eds. Danielle Juteau and Christiane Harzig, 369-424. New York: Berghahn Press.

McCully, Alan et al. 2003. *Teaching History in Societies Emerging from Conflict*. Report of an International Seminar Held in the UNESCO Centre, University of Ulster, Coleraine, Northern Ireland, September 9-13, 2002. University of Ulster: UNESCO Centre, August.

Rüsen, Jörn. 2005. *History: Narration, Interpretation, Orientation*. New York: Berghahn Books.

Schermerhorn, Richard. 1978. *Comparative Ethnic Relations: A Framework for Theory and Research*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Smith, Margaret. 2005. Historical Memory, Ethnonationalism and Peacebuilding in a Divided Society: The Teaching of History and Group Identity in Northern Ireland. Based on her book*: Reckoning with the Past: Teaching History in Northern Ireland*. Lanham, MD, USA: Lexington Books, 8-11.

References

Adams, Stephen G. 1983. *A Textual Analysis of Challenge and Survival and Canada - Quebec.* Master's thesis. McGill University.

Alba, Richard D. 2000. Ethnicity. In *Encyclopaedia of Sociology*, eds. Edgar F. Borgatta and Rhonda J. V. Montgomery. 2nd ed., Volume 2., 840-852. New York: Macmillan Reference USA.

Angvil, Magne and Bodo Von Borries, eds. 1997. *Youth and History. A Comparative European Survey on Historical Consciousness and Political Attitudes among Adolescents*. Hamburg: Edition Körber-Stiftung. 2 volumes.

Assman, Aleida. 2001. History and Memory. In *International Encyclopaedia of the Social and Behavioural Sciences*, eds. Neil J. Smelser and Paul B. Baltes, Volume 10, 6822-6829.

Barth, Frederik. 1996. Ethnic groups and boundaries (1969). In *Theories of Ethnicity: A Classical Reader,* ed. Werner Sollor, 294-324. New York: New York University Press.

Barton, Keith C. 2005. Best Not to Forget Them: Adolescents' Judgements of Historical Significance in Northern Ireland. *Theory and Research in Social Education*. 33: 9-44.

Barton, Keith C. 2007. Teachers, Students, and History Education in Northern Ireland: A Commentary on the Research Studies. In *Recent Research into Teaching History in Northern Ireland: Informing Curriculum Change*, 37-42. University of Ulster, UNESCO Centre.

Barton, Keith C. et al. 2003. History Education and National Identity in Northern Ireland, *International Journal of Historical Learning, Teaching and Research*. 3, 1: 31-43

Barton, Keith C. and Alan McCully. 2003. History Teaching and the Perpetuation of Memories: the Northern Ireland Experience. In *The Role of Memory in Ethnic Conflict*, eds. Ed Cairns and Michael D. Roe, 107-124. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Barton, Keith C. and Alan W. McCully. 2004. History, Identity, and the School Curriculum in Northern Ireland: An Empirical Study of Secondary Students' Ideas and Perspectives. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*. 36, no. 6: 1-32.

Barton, Keith C. and Alan McCully. 2005. History, Identity, and the School Curriculum in Northern Ireland: An Empirical Study of Secondary Students' Ideas and Perspectives. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*. 37, no. 1: 85-116.

Barton Keith C. and Alan McCully. Forthcoming. Secondary Students' Perspectives on School and Community History in Northern Ireland. *Teachers' College Record*.

Barton, Keith C. and Linda Levstik. 2004. *Teaching History for the Common Good*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Becker, Carl. 1932. Everyman his Own Historian. *The American Historical Review*. 37, no. 2: 221-236.

Béland, Paul. 2006. *La fréquentation du réseau scolaire Anglophone : une étude exploratoire des statistiques de 2000 à 2004*. Quebec City: Conseil supérieur de la langue française.

Berger, Peter L. and Thomas Luckmann. 1967. *The Social Construction of Reality. A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge*. New York: Anchor Books.

Billmann-Mahecha, Elfriede and Monika Hansen. 2005. Empirical Psychological Approaches to the Historical Consciousness of Children. In *Narration, Identity, and Historical Consciousness*. Jürgen Straub, ed., 163-186. New York: Berghahn Books.

Black, Jeremy and Donald D. MacRaild. 2000. *Studying History*. 2nd ed. London: Macmillan Press Ltd.

Bogdan, Robert and Sari Knopp Biklen. 1992. *Qualitative Research for Education: An Introduction to Theory and Method*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Boutin, Gérald. 1997. *L'entretien de recherche qualitatif*. Quebec City: Presses de l'Université du Québec.

Bouvier, Félix. 2008. *Bilan du débat relative au programme Histoire et Éducation à la citoyenneté du deuxième cycle de l'ordre d'enseignement secondaire qui a eu cours au Québec 2006-2007*. Commission de consultation sur les pratiques d'accommodement reliées aux différences culturelles, January.

Breton, Raymond. 2005. *Ethnic Relations in Canada. Institutional Dynamics*. With an introduction by Jeffrey G. Reitz. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Brighouse, Harry. 2003. Should We Teach Patriotic History? In *Citizenship and Education in Liberal-Democratic Societies. Teaching for Cosmopolitan values and Collective Identities*, eds. Kevin McDonough and Walter Feinberg, 157-176. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Buckley, Anthony. 1989. 'We're Trying to Find our Identity': Uses of History among Ulster Protestants. In *History and Ethnicity*, eds. Elizabeth Tonkin, Maryon McDonald, and Malcolm Chapman, 183-197. London and New York: Routledge.

Bulletin d'histoire politique (BHP). 2007. *Débat sur le programme d'enseignement de l'histoire au Québec*, 15, no. 2, Winter.

Caldwell, Gary. 1994. *La question du Québec anglais*. Quebec City: Institut de recherche sur la culture.

Cardin, Jean-François. 2004. Le nouveau programme d'histoire au secondaire : le choix d'éduquer à la citoyenneté. *Formation et profession. Bulletin du CRIFPE*, 10, no. 2, December: 44-48.

Cardin, Jean-François. 2007. « L'œuvre de destruction de l'identité nationale se poursuit » : quelques commentaires d'un didacticien dans la foulée des réactions au projet d'histoire nationale au secondaire. *Bulletin d'histoire politique*, 15, no. 2, Winter: 67-84.

Carretero, Mario and James F. Voss. 1994. *Cognitive and Instructional Processes in History and the Social Sciences*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Chambers, Greta. 1992. *Taskforce on English Education*. Quebec City: Report to the Minister of Education of Quebec.

Chambers, Greta. 2001. *Français langue seconde dans les écoles anglophones du Québec*. Report for the Estates-General on the Situation and Future of the French Language in Quebec.

Charland, Jean-Pierre. 2003. *Les élèves, l'histoire et la citoyenneté : Enquête auprès d'élèves des régions métropolitaine de Montréal et de Toronto*. Québec: Les Presses de l'Université Laval.

Chartier, Roger. 1988. *Cultural History: Between Practices and Representations*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Comaroff, John and Jean Comaroff. 1992. *Ethnography and the Historical Imagination*. Boulder, San Francisco and Oxford: Westview Press.

Connerton, Paul. 1989. *How Societies Remember*. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press.

Conway, Margaret. 2004. Identifying the Past: An Exploration of Teaching and Learning Sensitive Issues in History at Secondary School Level. *Educate*, 4, no. 2: 22-26.

Davis, John. 1989. The Social Relations of the Production of History. In *Ethnicity and History*, eds. Tonkin, Elizabeth et al., 104-120. London and New York: Routledge.

Dening, Greg. 1991. A Poetic of Histories. Transformations that Present the Past. In *Clio in Oceania. Toward a Historical Anthropology*, ed. Aletta Biersack, 347-380. Washington and London: Smithsonian Institution Press.

Eriksen, Thomas Hylland. 1993. *Ethnicity and Nationalism: Anthropological Perspectives*. Boulder, CO: Pluto Press.

Éthier, Marc-André. 2007. Apprendre à exercer sa citoyenneté à l'aide de l'histoire. *Bulletin d'histoire politique*. 15, no. 2, Winter : 53-58.

Éthier, Marc-André et al. 2007. Enseignement de questions controversées en histoire : tensions entre politique de la reconnaissance et politique du passé. In *Éducation et francophonie*. 23, no. 1, Spring: 65-85.

Fullinwider, Robert K. 1996. Patriotic History. In *Public Education in a Multicultural Society: Policy, Theory, Critique*, ed. R.K. Fullinwider, 203-227. Cambridge and New York City: Cambridge University Press.

Gadamer, Hans-Georg. 1987. The Problem of Historical Consciousness. In *Interpretive Social Science. A Second Look*, eds. P. Rabinow and W. M. Sullivan, 82-140. Berkeley, Los Angeles : University of California Press.

Gergen, Kenneth J. 2005. Narrative, Moral Identity and Historical Consciousness: A Social Constructionist Account. In *Narration, Identity, and Historical Consciousness*, ed. Jürgen Straub, 99-119. New York: Berghahn Books.

Guérin, Marc-Aimé. 1996. *La faillite de l'enseignement de l'histoire au Québec*. Montreal: Guérin.

Halbwachs, Maurice. 1992 (1925). *On Collective Memory*. Edited and translated with an introduction by Lewis A. Coser. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Hutchinson, John and Anthony D. Smith, eds. 1996. *Ethnicity*. New York, Toronto: Oxford University Press.

Jenkins, Richard. 1997. *Rethinking Ethnicity: Arguments and Explorations*. Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE Publications.

Juteau, Danielle. 1996. Theorising Ethnicity and Ethnic Communalisations at the Margins: From Quebec to the World System. *Nations and Nationalism*, 2, no. 1: 45-66.

Juteau, Danielle. 1999. *L'ethnicité et ses frontières*. Montréal: Presses de l'Université de Montréal.

Juteau, Danielle. 2000. Du dualisme canadien au pluralisme québécois. In *Relations ethniques et éducation dans les sociétés divisées (Québec, Irlande du nord, Catalogne et Belgique)*, eds. Marie McAndrew and France Gagnon, 13-26. Montreal: L'Harmattan Inc.

Kitson, Alison. 2007. History Teaching and Reconciliation in Northern Ireland. In *Teaching the Violent Past: Reconciliation and History Education*, ed. E. Cole, 123-154. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Kölbl, Carlos and Jürgen Straub. 2001. Historical Consciousness in Youth. Theoretical and Exemplary Empirical Analysis. Dans *Forum: Qualitative Social Research. Sozialforschung*. 2, no. 3. On-line journal: www.qualitative-research.net.

Lamarre, Patricia. 2005. L'enseignement du français dans le réseau scolaire anglophone : à la recherche du bilinguisme. In *Le français au Québec : Les nouveaux défis*, eds. A. Stefanescu and P. Georgeault, 553-568. Quebec City: Conseil supérieur de la langue française.

Lamarre, Patricia. 2007. Anglo-Quebec Today : Looking at Community and Schooling Issues. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*. 185: 109-132.

Lamarre, Patricia. 2008. English Education in Quebec: Issues and Challenges. In *The Vitality of the English-Speaking Communities of Quebec: From Community Decline to Revival*, 63-86. Montreal: CEETUM, Université de Montréal.

Lapkin, Sharon and Merrill Swain. 1990. French Immersion Research Agenda for the 90's. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*. 46, no. 4: 638-674.

Lagueux, Maurice. 2001. *L'actualité de la philosophie de l'histoire*. Québec: Les Presses de l'Université Laval

Laville, Christian. 2004. Historical Consciousness and Historical Education: What to Expect from the First for the Second. In *Theorizing Historical Consciousness*, ed. Peter Seixas, 165-182. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Laville, Christian. 2006. La crise du programme d'histoire au Québec: Quelles leçons en tirer? *Canadian Issues/Thèmes canadiens*. Fall: 80-85.

Lee, Peter. 2004. Understanding History. In *Theorizing Historical Consciousness*, ed. Peter Seixas, 129-164. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Leeuw-Roord, Joke van der, ed. 1998. *The State of History Education in Europe. Challenges and Implications of the "Youth and Hitsory" Project*. Hamburg: Körber-Stiftung.

Lemon, M.C. 2003. *Philosophy of History. A Guide for Students*. London and New York: Routledge.

Lessard-Hébert, Michelle et al. 1995 *La recherche qualitative : Fondements et pratiques*. Montreal: Éditions Nouvelles.

Létourneau, Jocelyn. 1986. Historiens, sociogrammes et histoire : l'interaction complexe entre mémoire collective, mémoire individuelle, passé construit et passé vécu. In *Étude de la construction de la mémoire collective des Québécois au XXe siècle. Approches multidisciplinaires*, ed. Jacques Mathieu, 99-108. Québec: Cahiers du CELAT.

Létourneau, Jocelyn. 1996. L'historiographie comme miroir, écho et récit de « Nous Autres ». In *L'histoire en partage : usages et mises en discours du passé*, eds. Bogumil Jewsiewicki and Jocelyn Létourneau, 25-44. Paris: L'Harmattan.

Létourneau, Jocelyn. 2004. *A History for the Future. Rewriting Memory and Identity in Quebec.* Translated by Phyllis Aronoff and Howard Scott. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Létourneau, Jocelyn. 2006. Faut-il craindre une autre histoire du Québec? *Canadian issues/Thèmes canadiens*. Fall: 87-90.

Létourneau, Jocelyn and Sabrina Moisan. 2004. Young People's Assimilation of a Collective Historical Memory: A Case Study of Quebeckers of French-Canadian Heritage. In *Theorizing Historical Consciousness*, ed. Peter Seixas, 109-128. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Létourneau, Jocelyn and Sabrina Moisan. 2004. Mémoire et récit de l'aventure historique du Québec chez les jeunes Québécois d'héritage canadien-français : coup de sonde, amorce d'analyse des résultats, questionnements. *The Canadian Historical Review*. 84, no. 2, June: 325-356.

Lévesque, Stéphane. 2004. History and Social Studies in Québec: An Historical Perspective. In *Challenges and Prospects for Canadian Social Studies*, eds. Alan Sears and Ian Wright, 55-72. Vancouver: Pacific Educational Press.

Levine, Marc V. 1990. *The Reconquest of Montreal. Language Policy and Social Change in a Bilingual City*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Levstik, Linda S. 2000. Articulating the Silences. Teachers' and Adolescents' Conceptions of Historical Significance. In *Knowing, Teaching, and Learning History.*

National and International Perspectives, eds. Peter N. Stearns et al., 284-305. New York and London: New York University Press.

Locher, U. and P.G. Locher. 1983. *Le fait français vécu par les élèves étudiant en anglais en 4ième et 5ième secondaire et en 1ère et 2ième collégial*. Volume 3. Quebec City: Conseil de la langue française.

Lowenthal, David. 1985. *The Past is a Foreign Country*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.

Lowenthal, David. 2000. Dilemmas and Delights of Learning History. In *Knowing, Teaching and Learning History. National and International Perspectives*, eds. Peter N. Stearns et al., 63-82. New York: New York University Press.

Lukacs, John. 1985. *Historical Consciousness or the Remembered Past*. New York: Schocken Books.

MacDonald, Sharon, ed. 2000. *Approaches to European Historical Consciousness: Reflections and Provocations*. Hamburg: Koerber Stiftung.

Maclure, Jocelyn. 2003. *Quebec Identity. The Challenge of Pluralism.* Translated by Peter Feldstein. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Malesevic, Sinisa. 2004. *The Sociology of Ethnicity*. Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE Publications.

Marcus, John T. 1980. *Sub Specie Historiae. Essays in the Manifestation of Historical and Moral Consciousness*. London and Toronto: Associated University Press.

Mason, Jennifer. 2002. *Qualitative Researching*. 2nd ed. London: SAGE Publications.

McAndrew, Marie. 2000. Conclusion: comparabilité des expériences décrites et perspectives de collaboration. In *Relations ethniques et éducation dans les sociétés divisées (Québec, Irlande du nord, Catalogne et Belgique)*, eds. Marie McAndrew and France Gagnon, 225-239. Montreal: L'Harmattan Inc.

McAndrew, Marie. 2002. Ethnic Relations and Education in Divided Societies: Belgium, Catalonia, Northern Ireland, Quebec. *Kolor, Journal on Moving Communities*, 1: 5-19.

McAndrew, Marie. 2003. Should National Minorities/Majorities Share Common Institutions or Control Their Own Schools? A Comparison of Policies and Debates in Quebec, Northern Ireland and Catalonia. In *The Social Construction of Diversity: Recasting the Master Narrative of Industrial Nations*, eds. Danielle Juteau and Christiane Harzig, 369-424. New York: Berghahn Press.

McAndrew, Marie. 2010. *Les majorités* fragiles *peuvent-elles s'ouvrir au pluralisme? Les enjeux éducatifs au Québec et en Europe*. Montréal: Les Presses de L'Université de Montréal.

McAndrew, Marie and Michel Ledoux. 1995. La concentration ethnique dans les écoles de langue française de l'île de Montréal : un portrait statistique. *Cahiers québécois de démographie*, 24, no. 2: 343-370.

McAndrew, Marie et al. 1999. Densité ethnique de l'école et intégration sociale des élèves néo-québécois. *Canadian Ethnic Studies/Études ethniques au Canada*. 31, no. 1: 5-25.

McAndrew, Marie and Paul Eid. 2003. La traversée des frontières scolaires par les francophones et les anglophones au Québec : 2002 - 2003. In *Cahiers québécois de démographie*. 32, no. 2, Fall: 223-253.

McAndrew, Marie and Rudi Janssens. 2004. The Role of Schooling in the Maintenance and Transformation of Ethnic Boundaries between Linguistic Communities: Contrasting Quebec and Belgium. *Canadian Ethnic Studies/Études ethniques au Canada*, special issue, eds. Guy Bourgeault et al., *Ethnic Relations and Education in Divided Societies: Comparing Belgium and Canada*. 36, no. 3: 61-83.

McAndrew et al. 2006. L'éducation et les relations entre les francophones et les anglophones au Québec : les perceptions des directeurs d'école. *Brusselse Thema: Politiek, Taal, Onderwijs en Samenleving in Beweging*, special issue, eds. De Groof, R. et al., 14: 335-359.

McCully, Alan et al. 2003. *Teaching History in Societies Emerging from Conflict*. Report of an International Seminar Held in the UNESCO Centre, University of Ulster, Coleraine, Northern Ireland, September 9-13, 2002. University of Ulster: UNESCO Centre, August.

McCully, Alan et al. 2003. *Speak Your Piece. Exploring Controversial Issues in Northern Ireland, a Development Project for Teachers and Youth Workers*. Final Report, School of Education, University of Ulster at Coleraine.

McRoberts, Kenneth. 1993. *Quebec: Social Change and Political Crisis*. Don Mills, Ontario: Oxford University Press.

Miles, Mathew B. and A. Michael Huberman. 1994. *An Expanded Sourcebook: Qualitative Data Analysis*. 2nd ed. London: SAGE Publications.

Ministère de l'Éducation du Québec. 1983. *History of Quebec and Canada Program; Secondary IV; General and Vocational Education*. Quebec City: MEQ.

Ministère de l'Éducation du Québec. 1996. *Se souvenir et devenir. Rapport du groupe de travail sur l'enseignement de l'histoire.* Quebec City: MEQ.

Ministère de l'Éducation du Québec. 1998. *A School for the Future: Policy Statement on Educational Integration and Intercultural Education*. Quebec City: MEQ.

Ministère de l'Éducation du Québec. 1998. *Overview of the Teaching of Elementary Social Studies and Secondary History within the Anglophone Community of the Province of Quebec. A Report by the History Task Force*. Quebec City: MEQ, October.

Ministère de l'Éducation, du Loisir et du Sport. 2003. *Programme de formation de l'école québécoise. Domaine de l'univers social. Géographie. Histoire et Éducation à la citoyenneté*. Quebec City: MELS.

Ministère des Communautés culturelles et de l'Immigration. 1981. *Autant de façons d'être Québécois : plan d'action du gouvernement du Québec à l'intention des communautés culturelles*. Quebec City: MICC

Ministère des Communautés culturelles et de l'Immigration. 1990. *Au Québec pour bâtir ensemble. Énoncé de politique en matière d'immigration et d'intégration*. Quebec City: MICC.

Mink, Louis. 1987. *Historical Understanding*. Ithaca & London: Cornell University Press.

Nash, Manning. 1989. *The Cauldron of Ethnicity in the Modern World*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.

Nash, Gary et al. 1997. *History on Trial: Culture Wars and the Teaching of the Past*. New York: A.A. Knopf.

Nietzsche, Friedrich. 1997 (1874). On the Uses and Disadvantages of History for Life. In *Untimely Meditations*, ed. Daniel Breazeale. Translated by R.J. Hollingdale, 57-124. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nora, Pierre. 1984. *Les lieux de mémoire*. Paris: Gallimard.

O'Brien, Jay and William Roseberry. 1991. *Golden Ages, Dark Ages. Imagining the Past in Anthropology and History*. Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: University of California Press.

Pagé, Michel et al. 1998. Intégration sociale des élèves montréalais d'origine immigrante : rapport à la société d'accueil et rapport au groupe culturel d'origine. *Revue québécoise de psychologie*. 19, no. 1: 116-149.

Peel, J. D. Y. 1989. The Cultural Work of Yoruba Ethnogenesis. In *History and Ethnicity*, eds. Elizabeth Tonkin, Maryon McDonald, and Malcolm Chapman, 198-215. London and New York: Routledge.

Ricoeur, Paul. 1984. *Time and Narrative*. Volume 1. Translated by K. McLaughlin and D. Pellauer. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Ricoeur, Paul. 2004. *Memory, History, Forgetting*. Translated by K. Blamey and D. Pellauer. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Rosenzweig, Roy and David Thelen. 1998. *Presence of the Past: Popular Uses of History in American Life*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Roy, Simon et al. 1992. *Évolution des programmes d'histoire de 1861 à nous jours*. Ste-Foy: Université Laval, Laboratoire de recherche en administration et politiques scolaire.

Rudin, Ronald. 1985. *The Forgotten Quebecers. A History of English-Speaking Quebec, 1759-1980*. Quebec City: Institut québécois de recherché sur la société.

Rüsen, Jörn. 2005 *History: Narration, Interpretation, Orientation*. New York: Berghahn Books.

Sandwell, Ruth W., ed. 2006. *To the Past: History Education, Public Memory, and Citizenship Education in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Schermerhorn, Richard. 1978. *Comparative Ethnic Relations: A Framework for Theory and Research*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Schieder, Theodor. 1978. The Role of Historical Consciousness in Political Action. In *History and Theory. Studies in the Philosophy of History*. 17, no.4: 1-18. *Beiheft 17 Historical Consciousness and Political Action*. Wesleyan University Press.

Seixas, Peter. 2000. Schweigen! Die Kinder! Or, Does Postmodern History Have a Place in the Schools. *Knowing, Teaching and Learning History. National and International Perspectives*, eds. Peter N. Stearns, Peter Seixas and Sam Wineburg, 19-37. New York: New York University Press.

Seixas, Peter, ed. 2004. *Theorizing Historical Consciousness*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Seixas, Peter. 2004. Introduction to *Theorizing Historical Consciousness*, ed. Peter Seixas, 3-20. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Seixas, Peter. 2005. Historical Consciousness: The Progress of Knowledge in a Postprogressive Age. In *Narration, Identity, and Historical Consciousness*, ed. Jürgen Straub, 141-160. New York: Berghahn Books.

Seixas, Peter and Penney Clark. 2004. Murals as Monuments: Students' Ideas about Depictions of Civilization in British Columbia. *American Journal of Education*. 110, February: 146-171.

Seixas, Peter and Carla Peck. 2004. Teaching Historical Thinking. In *Challenges and Prospects for Canadian Social Studies*, eds. Alan Sears and Ian Wright, 109-117. Vancouver: Pacific Educational Press.

Simon, Roger I. 2004. The Pedagogical Insistence of Public Memory. In *Theorizing Historical Consciousness*, ed. Peter Seixas, 202-215. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Smith, Margaret. 2005. Historical Memory, Ethnonationalism and Peacebuilding in a Divided Society: The Teaching of History and Group Identity in Northern Ireland. Based on her book*: Reckoning with the Past: Teaching History in Northern Ireland*. Lanham, Maryland, USA: Lexington Books, 8-11.

Spencer, Stephen. 2006. *Race and Ethnicity. Culture, Identity and Representation*. New York: Routledge.

Stearns, Peter N. et al. 2000. *Knowing, Teaching, and Learning History. National and International Perspectives*. New York and London: New York University Press.

Stevenson, Garth. 1999. *Community Besieged. The Anglophone Minority and the Politics of Quebec*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Straub, Jürgen, ed. 2005. *Narration, Identity, and Historical Consciousness*. New York: Berghahn Books.

Straub, Jürgen. 2005. Telling Stories, Making History: Toward a Narrative Psychology of the Historical Construction of Meaning. In *Narration, Identity, and Historical Consciousness*, ed. Jürgen Straub, 44-98. New York: Berghahn Books.

Tonkin, Elizabeth et al., eds. 1989. *Ethnicity and History*. London and New York: Routledge.

Trudel, Marcel and Geneviève Jain. 1970. *Canadian History Textbooks: A Comparative Study*. Ottawa: Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism.

Tutiaux-Guillon, Nicole and Didier Nourrisson. 2003. *Identités, mémoires, conscience historique*. Saint-Étienne: Publications de l'Université de Saint-Étienne.

Van der Maren, Jean-Marie. 1996. *Méthodes de recherche pour l'éducation*. Montréal: Les Presses de l'Université de Montréal.

Van Hover, Stephanie and Elizabeth Yeager. 2005. *'I want to use my subject matter to…' The Role of Purpose in One Secondary U.S. History Teacher's Instructional Decision-Making*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association. Montréal, Canada. April 11-15.

Vickers, Edward. 2005. History, Nationalism, and the Politics of Memory. In *History Education and National Identity in East Asia*, eds. Edward Vickers and Alisa Jones, 1-30. New York and London: Routledge.

Weber, Max. 1965. *Essais sur la théorie de la science*. Translated by Julien Freund. Paris: Plon.

Weber, Max. 1968. *Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology*. Guenther Roth and Claus Wittich, eds. Translated by Ephraim Fischoff et al. New York: Bedminster Press.

Wertsch, James. 2002. *Voices of Collective Remembering*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.

Wertsch, James. 2004. Specific Narratives and Schematic Narrative Templates. In *Theorizing Historical Consciousness*, ed. Peter Seixas, 49-62. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

White, Hayden. 1987. *The Content of the Form: Narrative Discourse and Historical Representation*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.

Wineburg, Sam. 2001. *Historical Thinking and Other Unnatural Acts. Charting the Future of Teaching the Past*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Wineburg, Sam et al. 2007. Common Belief and the Cultural Curriculum: An Intergenerational Study of Historical Consciousness. *American Educational Research Journal*. 44, no.1: 40-76.

Wrzosek, Wojciech. 2000. Histoire, valeurs, éducation. De la formation spontanée de la conscience historique. In *L'histoire et ses fonctions. Une pensée et des pratiques au présent*, eds. Henri Moniot and Maciej Serwanski, 113-126. Paris: L'Harmattan.

Young, Brian. 2006. Teaching about Racism and Anti-Semitism in the Context of Quebec's History Programs. *Canadian Issues/Thèmes canadiens*. Fall: 91-96.

Zanazanian, Paul et al. 2005. *Teaching the History of Québec and Canada Course: Perspectives of Anglophone and Francophone Teachers: A Report based on a Qualitative Study Conducted in Montréal in 2003/2004*, (unpublished) for GREAPE (Groupe de recherche sur l'ethnicité et l'adaptation au pluralisme en education).

Annexe One: Interview Guide for Exploratory Study in Chapter Four

THE TEACHING OF NON-CONSENSUAL ISSUES IN "THE HISTORY OF QUÉBEC AND CANADA" COURSE IN QUÉBEC HIGH SCHOOLS: THE FRENCH/ENGLISH DIVIDE WITHIN THE CONTEXT OF A PARALLEL SOCIETY.

Interview Guide

History Teachers in Anglophone High Schools

October 2003

Groupe de recherche sur l'ethnicité et l'adaptation au pluralisme en éducation (GREAPE)
Centre des études ethniques des universités montréalaises (CEETUM)

Université de Montréal

Section One.

<u>Teaching Experience</u>

This section focuses on the respondent's professional background for purposes of better analysing the overall results of the interviews.

1. Could you please tell me why you decided to become a teacher; and more specifically a history teacher?

2. Please describe the academic training you undertook to become a teacher.

- *Training in education*
- *Training in history*
- *Education acquired in Québec, Canada or elsewhere*
- *Education in French or in English*

3. How long have you been teaching? Within what social settings have you taught and do you teach now?

- *Teaching in general*
- *Teaching history*
- *English or French schools*
- *Montreal or elsewhere*
- *Primary or secondary school*
- *Private or public*
- *Multicultural or mono-cultural setting*
- *Challenging or not*

4. Do you think teaching history is different from teaching other subjects?

5. You told me that you received your education in Québec/Canada/outside of Canada in French/English. Do you think the fact that you were educated in Québec/Canada/elsewhere, in English/French, plays a role in the way you perceive and teach the History of Québec and Canada?

Section Two.

<u>Personal Relationship with the Discipline of History</u>

This section focuses on the respondent's personal involvement with the subject of history (more particularly the history of Québec and Canada) as well as his/her role as historical actor in the teaching process.

1. In your opinion, why is it important to teach the history of Québec and Canada to your students?

- *Student's personal and social development*
- *To promote critical thinking*
- *To promote a national identity (Québécois/ Canadian identity)*
- *To promote peaceful co-existence in multicultural Québec*
- *To bring Anglophones and Francophones together*
- *To know the "truth" about the past of the Québécois/English Canadians at the hands of the English/French*

2. What should students learn from the History of Québec and Canada course? Are there any particular events, figures or other historical phenomena they should learn about?

- *Historical method/skills*
- *Content (dates, events, historical figures, other phenomena)*
- *Ask about the other if only one is mentioned*

3. You named/didn't name the following events: the Conquest, the Patriots' Rebellions, the Act of Confederation, the Conscription Crisis, the October Crisis, and Bill 101. Why do you think these events have/do not have to be learned by your students?

- *To remember their past*
- *To remember the past of Québec/Canada*
- *To remind students how bad/good the English/French were*
- *To build a Québécois/Canadian identity*
- *To show how events have more than one interpretation*

4. What did you have to learn in your history classes when you were a student? Is it different from what you are asked to teach today?

- *Content (events, dates, historical figures)*
- *Historical method*
- *History of Québec/Canada/elsewhere exclusively/not exclusively*
- *Differences in their perception of the programmes of today and yesteryear.*

5. Were there any figures, events or other historical phenomena in Québec and Canadian history that marked you as a student? Are they the same that mark your students today? Why?

- *Eras, heroes, events that touched them personally*
- *Political reasons*
- *Changing times, attitudes, mentalities*

6. Do you think your identity influences your role as history teacher in the teaching of history?

Section Three.

Conception of Teaching

This section focuses on the respondent's pedagogical approaches to teaching history in the classroom. The history program referred to here is the old one (1982).

1. What teaching methods do you prioritize when teaching history?

- *On a continuum between <u>Memorization of facts and chronology</u> on one end and the <u>Development of critical thinking (historical method)</u> on the other, where does the teacher situate his/herself? Towards which pole do his/her tendencies lean?*

2. How do you use the MEQ programme?

- *To the letter*
- *Take initiative*
- *For historical method*
- *For historical content*

3. Do you find that the contents (choice of events, historical figures etc) of the history programme and of the didactic materials you use in class, reflect the level of importance that each Québec community attaches to it?

4. Concerning the interpretation of facts or events, do you find that multiple perspectives are present in textbooks and other didactic materials you use?

- *At an ideological level*
- *Multiple perspectives of historians*
- *Of ethnic groups*
- *Of social class*
- *Gender*

5. To what extent have you adapted your manner in teaching history to the changing social make-up of your student clientele?

6. Concerning controversial issues, what approach do you adopt for teaching about them?

- *Fosters debate*
- *Offers students the opportunity and the tools for analysing different sets of primary sources relevant to the issue*
- *Tells them what they need to know about the issue*

7. In your own words, what place do objectivity and subjectivity hold in your teaching?

8. Is there any difference between history as a disciplinary method and collective memory?

9. How do you keep yourself informed on the evolution of historical knowledge and of the teaching of history?

- *Journals*
- *Books*
- *Websites*
- *Membership in professional associations*
- *University courses*

10. What is your opinion on the bringing together of the teaching of history and citizenship education in the new program?

11. Can teaching history play a role in inter-group relations?

Thank you for your time and your participation; it was greatly appreciated. Have a nice day!

GUIDE D'ENTREVUE : Étude Deux : La conscience historique des Franco-québécois à l'égard des Anglo-québécois.

Le but de cette entrevue est de mieux comprendre le rôle des anglophones dans le passé du Québec, tel qu'il est appréhendé par les enseignants de l'histoire comme vous. Il n'y a pas de bonne ou de mauvaise réponse.

SECTION PREMIÈRE:

Question 1 : Pourriez-vous me raconter, comme vous la percevez, la savez ou vous vous en souvenez, l'histoire des Anglophones au Québec depuis le début?

- Décrire les grandes lignes de l'histoire des Anglophones au Québec.

1.1 Pouvez-vous m'expliquer ce que vous retenez de la contribution des Anglophones à l'histoire du Québec?

- En termes d'héritage ou d'apports (ou autres).

Question 2 : Comment décririez-vous les relations entre les Francophones et les Anglophones dans *le passée* du Québec?

2.1 Avez-vous des exemples concrets de situations ou d'événements historiques?

- Aux niveaux politique, économique, communautaire (société civile), ou interpersonnel.

2.2 Est-ce que cette description s'appliquerait aussi aux relations *passées* avec les Anglophones *du reste du Canada*? Sinon, quelles seraient les différences?

Question 3 : Comment décririez-vous les relations entre les Francophones et les Anglophones dans la *situation actuelle* au Québec?

3.1 Avez-vous des exemples concrets de situations ou d'événements actuels?

- Aux niveaux politique, économique, communautaire (société civile), ou interpersonnel.

3.2 Est-ce que cette description s'appliquerait aussi aux relations *actuelles* avec les Anglophones *du reste du Canada*? Sinon, quelles seraient les différences?

Question 4 : Est-ce que je me trompe ou bien vous voyez un changement / une stabilité entre les relations intergroupes passées et actuelles? (Moi : répétez ce qu'ils ont dit pour voir si on est sur la même longueur d'onde). Qu'est-ce qui vous fait penser qu'il y un changement/ une stabilité?

4.1 Est-ce que ces expériences du passé et du présent que vous venez de décrire se ressemblent? Comment se ressemblent-elles, diffèrent-elles?

- Les facteurs, les arguments.

Question 5 : Comment pensez-vous que ces relations évolueront à l'avenir au Québec?

> **5.1** Qu'est-ce qui vous fait penser que ce sera ainsi?
>
>> • Les facteurs, les arguments (preuves).

Question 6 : Y a-t-il des différences entre les Anglophones, les Allophones et les immigrants Anglophones? Si oui, quelles sont-elles?

Question 7 : Dans quelle façon est-ce que les Anglophones du Québec sont des québécois?

> **7.1** Comment se différencient-ils des Québécois-de-souche?
>
> **7.2** C'est quoi « être un québécois »?

Question 8 : Comment avez-vous appris ce que vous savez sur ce sujet?

>> • Les sources de vos connaissances.

SECTION DEUX :

Question 1 : Da quelle manière « l'histoire » aide-t-elle à comprendre le présent? Donnez un exemple.

Question 2 : Quels usages du passé doit-on faire pour résoudre les problèmes d'aujourd'hui? Donnez un exemple.

Question 3 : Récemment, un grand débat sur le nouveau programme d'histoire et éducation à la citoyenneté s'est déroulé dans les médias québécois. L'une des controverses au cœur de ce débat concernait la diminution de la place accordée aux expériences historiques et sociales des Franco-québécois au profit des Anglophones et des autres groupes minoritaires. Considérant le passé historique du Québec, dites quelle place vous accorderiez à chacun de ces groupes sociaux. Justifiez votre réponse.

>> • Place égale.
>> • Place hiérarchisée.

Question 4 : Quelques études suggèrent que la grande majorité des Franco-québécois ont une vision « misérabiliste » de leur passé : « Une vision d'un peuple abandonné, reclus, abusé par l'Autre et toujours hésitant à se prendre en main ».
Qu'en pensez-vous? Est-ce que c'est juste de dire ça?

> **4.1** Pourquoi cette vision « misérabiliste » existerait?
>
> **4.2** Est-ce que cette vision reflète votre opinion personnelle?
>
> **4.3** Croyez-vous que c'est aussi l'opinion de la majorité des Franco-québécois?
>
> **4.4** Est-ce que vous pensez que les relations entre les Francophones et les Anglophones dans le passé québécois et canadien ont contribué à cette vision?
>
> **4.5** Est-ce que vous pensez que l'évolution des relations avec les Anglophones au Québec dans l'avenir changera une telle vision du passé? Expliquez.

SECTION TROIS :
Nous allons bientôt conclure, mais juste avant j'aimerais vous poser quelques dernières questions.

Question 1 : Est-ce que vous avez l'occasion *de témoigner du vécu* des Anglophones québécois dans vos cours?
- Les expériences passées et actuelles (historiques et sociales)?
- Si oui, quels aspects est-ce que vous traitez? Dans quel contexte du cours? À quel moment?
- Si non, qu'est-ce qui vous empêche de le faire (pourquoi)?

Question 2: Quels aspects *des relations entre les anglophones et les francophones québécois* est-ce que vous abordez en classe?
- Les expériences passées et/ ou actuelles?
- Dans quel contexte du cours? À quel moment?
- Si non, qu'est-ce qui vous empêche de le faire (pourquoi)?

Question 3: Y a-t-il des éléments/aspects du vécu des Anglophones (passé et actuel) et/ ou des relations entre Francophones et Anglophones pour lesquels vous manquez d'informations/ ressources?
- Si oui, quels sont-ils?

Question 4 : Êtes-vous en contact avec la communauté anglophone au Québec? Si oui, de quelle façon?
- Amis, collègues, membres de votre famille, les sorties.

Question 5 : Est-ce que vous lisez beaucoup sur l'histoire et/ou l'identité du Québec? Sur les relations entre les Francophones et les Anglophones?

Question 6 : Jusqu'à quel point pensez-vous que la plupart de vos connaissances sur les Anglophones du Québec et sur les rapports entre les Francophones et les Anglophones sont influencées par le programme d'histoire dont vous êtes chargés de transmettre à vos élèves?