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MEMORY, HISTORY, AND IDENTITY IN THE FORMER SOVIET UNION

JAMES V. WERTSCH

Washington University, St. Louis

Abstract

Genuinely post-Soviet accounts of history began to appear in Russian history textbooks only in 1995. The production of these new accounts has been shaped more by the tendency to refute earlier textbooks than by the appearance of new archival materials. As a result, portrayals of events such as the Civil War take the form of narratives composed of counterclaims.

Teachers generally believed, in 1996, that students do and should rely on unofficial sources of information such as discussions with friends and with adults outside the family more than on official sources textbooks (at least older ones) for their information about history.

Teachers ranked family discussions lower than discussions with friends and adults outside the family as a source of information about history. This primarily reflects the opinion of teachers in Moscow, however, who ranked families as sources of information lower than did their counterparts in rural Russia and Ukraine. In Moscow, teachers believe their students were as skeptical in 1996 as they had been in 1986 about what they were taught in school about history, whereas teachers in rural Russia viewed their students as having become more skeptical over this period.

In contrast to teachers' views about students using older materials, there was some evidence that students using post-Soviet textbooks believe what they find in these texts.

The Russian (and perhaps the Ukrainian) subjects' interpretations of what it means to respond to items on a questionnaire seem to differ from those found in other populations, raising methodological questions about how to interpret data generated by questionnaires and interviews in the former Soviet Union.

1. In addition to Wertsch, several other scholars contributed to the planning and execution of this project. These include Michael Cole (Department of Communication, University of California, San Diego), Michael Finke (Department of Russian, Washington University), Michael Holquist (Department of Comparative Literature, Yale University), Mikhail Palatnik (Department of Russian, Washington University), Aleksandr Asmolov (Ministry of Education of the Russian Federation), Nina Korzh (Institute of Psychology, Russian Academy of Sciences), Valentina Pavlenko (Department of Psychology, Kharkov University), Mikhail Shneider (vice-principal, School no. 45, Moscow), and Peeter Tulviste (Department of Psychology, Tartu University).
Introduction

In a 1992 survey, Moscow’s Center for the Study of Public Opinion asked Russians which emotion they associated with their country’s history. The most frequent answer was "shame." A majority also responded that the history of the Soviet Union consisted largely of "seizures and crimes."\(^2\) During the few short years since this survey was conducted the former Soviet Union has undergone major changes, including changes in people’s ideas about its history. If such ideas provide the basis for a nation’s understanding of who it is and where it is going in relatively stable times,\(^3\) then they are all the more important in settings like Russia and Ukraine with their ongoing efforts to negotiate new national identities.

This study was designed to provide an update on some of these issues. The data were collected in Russia and Ukraine during 1996 and hence constitute a snapshot of only one moment in an ongoing process. However, this was an important moment since it was only in the mid 1990s that several major battles were fought over how the past is to be presented in Russia and Ukraine, and the results began to shape the presentation of history to the general public. For example, it was only in 1996 that genuinely post-Soviet history textbooks began to be widely used in Russian schools.

In planning our study we recognized that people’s ideas about history are shaped by many sources of information (e.g., film, novels, family discussions), and indeed we touch on several of these. However, we focused primarily on how history is taught in schools. In particular, we examined textbooks used in history instruction and teachers’ and students’ views about where they obtain their ideas about the past.

From Soviet to Post-Soviet Instruction in History

During the Soviet era the goal of history instruction was to "bring up true sons of the Motherland [i.e., the USSR], steadfast ideological fighters."\(^4\) The means used in Soviet schools to reach this goal were both monolithic and monologic. Students across all eleven time zones of the USSR were literally on the same page of the same history textbook on any particular day of the school year, and the official history taught allowed little room for competing voices. This began to unravel, however, during perestroika. For example, high school students were told in the late 1980s that what they had studied was not really history and hence there would be no national examinations in this subject area. In the wake of this development many history teachers found themselves in the position of organizing their instruction around whatever materials they could find. These ranged

---

\(^2\) Newsweek, March 16, 1992, p.36.
from newspapers to family stories, and the resulting decentralization, if not chaos, continued for several years.

Of course Russia and other former Soviet republics were not willing to leave decisions about history instruction to individual teachers or schools indefinitely. Like any other nation-state, they had a fundamental interest in producing and distributing officially sanctioned narratives about their past since such narratives are viewed as providing crucial underpinnings for national identity and political discourse. Russia and other former Soviet republics quickly established commissions to formulate new history standards, write new instructional materials, and so forth. Given that history is one of the tools that make it possible to "think the nation," these are important tasks anywhere; given that "Nothing is so unpredictable as the past" is still part of folk wisdom in Russia, such tasks take on particular significance in that setting.

Efforts to rewrite history are always fraught with ideological and political difficulties, but the massive effort undertaken in Russia and other areas of the former Soviet Union in the 1990s was especially difficult since it often involved the outright rejection of previous accounts. Those involved in this effort often found themselves in the middle of a political maelstrom. Several of the individuals charged with the production of new history textbooks in Russia were vilified in the press, and they and their families were threatened by nationalist organizations such as Pamyat. The result has been a complex, uneven, and as yet far from finished struggle to come up with a new picture of the past.

Our review of this episode in rewriting history is organized around two related processes: 1) the production of historical texts, and 2) the consumption of these texts. Under the heading of "historical texts" we include items such as films, newspaper stories, and oral texts handed down from one family member to another, but we focus in particular on history textbooks used in high schools (grades 9 to 11). The next section of this report focuses on production, or more accurately on the product itself, i.e., textbooks. The section following turns to the consumption of these textbooks by students. The two sites in which research was conducted were Russia and Ukraine, but there is more complete data on the former, especially with regard to production. Finally, in the course of carrying out this study we encountered some methodological issues that raise interesting questions about how research findings from the former Soviet Union are generated and interpreted, these are reviewed at the end of this report.

The Production of History: Textbooks in Russia

The first task we undertook in our study of production was a comparative analysis of high school history textbooks published in Russia in 1976, 1989, 1992, and 1995 (see Appendix A, page 13). Although we had some information about the actual processes through which these textbooks were produced (based on discussions in the press, interviews with individuals from the Ministry of Education and publishing firms), we did not conduct anything approaching a full scale analysis of these processes. Instead, our focus was on the products these processes yielded.

We selected four textbooks from a more extensive set of materials as a way of tracking the changes in historical representation that occurred before, during, and after perestroika. Each of the first three volumes was published as the single history textbook for a particular grade in high school (the 1976 text for ninth graders, the 1989 and 1992 texts for tenth graders), and the 1995 version (for eleventh graders) was one of several competing textbooks published for a single grade level (eleventh grade). As Appendix I shows, there is a vast difference in the publishing runs for the Soviet and post-Soviet texts, something that reflects different forms of organizing and controlling the production of these texts. In contrast to Soviet years when there was only one basic history textbook per grade level in the USSR, the Russian Ministry of Education now works with several private publishing firms to produce multiple, competing accounts of history for each grade.

As an index of how these textbooks differ, we will focus on the treatment of the period between 1918 and 1920. The presentation of the Civil War and the foreign intervention that took place during these years provides a good illustration of differences since there are sharply conflicting views of what occurred. A further reason for our interest in these events was that during the Soviet era they often served as the basis for official interpretations of what were viewed as interventionist plans by the U.S. and others.

The major divide in how events of the Civil War are represented is between the textbooks of 1976, 1989, and 1992, on the one hand, and 1995, on the other. While there are some differences among the 1976, 1989, and 1992 versions, these are quite minor when compared to the difference between these versions and the one presented in the 1995 textbook. In contrast to claims about how much Soviet society had changed during the last half of the 1980s, or even before, the official production of history in the form of high school textbooks did not undergo fundamental transformation until after the events of 1991 (the 1992 book was in production during that time).

The nature of the differences in historical representation has several dimensions. The two that we will review concern: a) the importance attributed to foreign intervention in the Civil War, and b) the motives attributed to the participants. The 1976, 1989, and 1992 textbooks vary somewhat in their assessment of the importance of foreign intervention, but it was consistently portrayed as quite significant and as motivated by aggressive imperialist intentions. For example, the authors of the 1992 volume wrote:
A new step in the Civil War . . . was characterized by combined actions on the part of the Entente and the White Army . . . The mind behind the idea for foreign intervention in Russia was Churchill. He worked out the plan to reconstitute the German Army for the struggle with the Bolsheviks and then undertook efforts to unite the counter-revolutionary forces with the goal of overthrowing the Soviet government and breaking up Russia into a multitude of weak political units. These plans were supported by the U.S. State Department. . . Churchill was even contemplating the use of chemical weapons. . . The “help” given to the Northern Army increased and increased such that it led Chernilov to observe, “If Petrograd is seized, it will be thanks to our military supplies and with the help of the British navy.”

In general, the authors of the 1992 textbook spent a great deal of time describing the intervention of foreign powers, and they argued that it played a major role in initiating and prolonging the Civil War. Furthermore, these authors assumed that the motives behind the intervention could be understood in terms of Soviet Marxist categories. The actors in these historical narratives are “collective individuals” in the sense that they were understood as acting solely in accordance with class struggle, revolution, counter-revolution, and other concepts from Soviet Marxism. For example, the title of the section of this textbook in which the Civil War is covered is “At the Brink of a Historical Turning Point. The Development of Psychological Confrontation in Society into Open Civil War and the Establishment of a Dictatorship of the Proletariat in Russia.”

The treatments of the Civil War in the 1976 and 1989 textbooks were in many respects just more polemical versions of that found in the 1992 book. For example, in both of these earlier texts the events were covered in a section having to do with “the period of intervention by imperialist governments and the Civil War.” The fact that the term “intervention by imperialist governments” appeared before “Civil War” in both accounts reflects the general line of reasoning that without imperialist intervention there would have been little reason to expect the Civil War to have started.

The 1995 history textbook is strikingly different from all the earlier ones in several ways. First, it is just one of three textbooks supported by the Ministry of Education of the Russian Federation for a single grade level. Indeed, it was one of a much larger number of alternatives since many schools and publishing firms are now putting out other textbooks as well. Furthermore, it was published by a private firm. The Ministry of Education provided much of the funding for this publication and retained some oversight, but it was also this Ministry that insisted on having several competing history textbooks published for this grade level. Hence the level of central governmental control over what appeared in the textbook is quite different than what had existed earlier.

Taking the treatment of the Civil War again as an index, the product of these efforts was quite different from earlier ones. Whereas imperialist intervention as a cause of the Civil War had been heavily stressed in earlier texts, there was virtually no mention of it here. Intervention did not appear in the title of any chapter or section, and there was no mention of imperialism. Indeed, the only mention of intervention was the passing comment that “The assistance of European countries to Poland [during the Soviet intervention] was greater there than their help to the White movement in Russia.”

There is also a striking difference between the 1995 textbook and previous accounts in the interpretation of the motives of the actors. Instead of treating them as collective individuals mobilized by class interests, revolutionary and counter-revolutionary zeal, and so forth, the account points to common and often base motives of unique individuals and groups concerned with local issues. These points are reflected in passages from the section of the 1995 textbook titled simply “Revolution in Russia. March 1917 - March 1921.”

The peasants from the central regions of Russia did not actively come out against the Bolsheviks, being engaged in the spontaneous demobilization and the return to farming. But in the spring of 1918 the peasants' mood went through a turning point. More and more they expressed their discontent with the new power. The situation began to change, and not for the benefit of the Soviets. The main force operating in opposition to them became the so-called “democratic counter-revolution,” which united the former Socialist Revolutionaries and other moderate socialist parties and groups. They came out under the banner of restoring democracy in Russia and a return to the ideas of a constituent assembly. In the summer of 1918 these groups created their own regional governments: in Arkhangelsk, Samara, Ufa, Omsk, and also in other cities . . . The suspicious and scornful approach that local soviet powers took toward [White elements such as] the Czechs led them to armed conflict . . . At this time Trotsky, combining the most brutal measures for laying down discipline and for attracting the old officer corps into the Red Army, succeeded in creating a regular, battle-worthy army. The officers were recruited by force (officers' family members were held as hostages), and some also volunteered. As a rule, the new army attracted those who thought that in the old army they had not realized their professional capacity.11

In sharp opposition to previous textbook accounts, this narrative makes the point that any intervention by outside powers in the events of 1917 to 1920 was relatively unimportant. Furthermore, it asserts that the motives of the actors in these events were not grounded in revolutionary zeal: rather than wishing to participate in the Revolution, peasants simply wanted to

return to earning a living; rather than engaging in counter-revolution, the Czechs were simply responding to hostile treatment by local soviets; and rather than joining the Red Army out of a new form of universal, class patriotism, men joined out of fear and for base human motives. Instead of viewing the Russian Revolution as the beginning of a new, glorious, and progressive period of Russian and world history, it is presented in this textbook as the beginning of an interruption of a process of growth and democratization—a process that was only able to get underway again with the collapse of the Soviet Union.

In general, there is a sharp break in the production of history in textbooks between 1992 and 1995. Taking the presentation of the Civil War as an index, there was a shift from a narrative about imperialistic intervention, collective individuals, and Soviet patriotism to an account of internal strife grounded in local conditions, common and often base motives, and a brutal interruption of a process of democratization.

What underlay the generation of the new historical narrative found in the 1995 textbook? There are several answers to this question, but two are most often mentioned. The first has to do with archival materials that have only recently become available. In this view, the production of a new narrative about the Civil War and other events was guided by the need to take into account newly uncovered facts. A second view holds that the generation of this new historical narrative is not driven so much by the need to take into account new evidence as it is by a desire to respond to previous texts. Instead of talking about newly available archival material, those taking this view are likely to talk about how it is now possible to correct Soviet lies about the past. From this perspective, the 1995 textbook account of the Civil War emerged largely through a dialogue with earlier texts—primarily in the form of a rebuttal.

Virtually any reasonable historical account reflects both of these views: responsible historians take into account the latest relevant evidence, and at the same time they are always involved in some kind of dialogic encounter with earlier narratives. In the case of the account of history that emerged in the 1995 textbook, however, we would argue that the major force was the tendency to respond to earlier accounts. We say this first of all because there is relatively little in the way of new historical facts that shaped the narrative presented in this textbook.

A second indicator of this is that the events selected or neglected and the motives for the agents’ actions can all readily be viewed as rebuttals of what had been reported in earlier texts. Indeed, the basic narrative seems to consist of a set of counterclaims that refute earlier accounts, counterclaims such as: a) the main cause of the Civil War was not imperialist intervention; it was instead internal dissatisfaction with the new Soviet powers plus a desire on the part of democratic counter-revolutionaries to return to a legitimate constitutional form of government; b) the actors can not be defined in basic Marxist categories; the Civil War is not a story involving workers and peasants on one side and foreign imperialists and capitalists on the other; and c) the people were not
motivated by issues of class struggle; they were instead motivated by local, and often base, professional and political issues.

Before concluding our account of the production of history in textbooks, we would emphasize that this process is still in a great deal of turmoil and that several different types of textbooks have recently appeared in Russia. Overviews of these new materials have identified several distinct categories into which they can be divided. For example, some textbooks are viewed as "remakes," which involve little more than changes in terminology in comparison with Soviet accounts; "Marxoid" analyses, which are unsuccessful attempts by old Soviet Marxist authors to produce a new formulation of the past; and genuinely post-Soviet accounts, of which the 1995 textbook we have examined is an example.

The Consumption of History in Russia and Ukraine

Our analysis of the official history provided by textbooks deals with one of the forces that shape people's ideas about the past. However, any attempt to understand these ideas that focuses solely on production and its resulting artifacts is certain to be incomplete if not misleading. This is because it does not address the issues of how the textbooks are actually used in schools and whether students actually believe the information they contain. Research on how history textbooks are used in the U.S. suggests that there may be a large gap between what appears in textbooks and what students actually hear and understand, while research in Estonia suggests that teachers often sent subtle, but quite powerful messages to students about how to interpret textbooks during the Soviet era. Furthermore, the Estonian study indicated that even when students demonstrated thorough knowledge of official history during the Soviet era they often did not believe or appropriate it.

In the former Soviet Union the differences between production and consumption of official history, as well as between knowing and believing it, were often quite pronounced. Many Soviet citizens became experts at knowing but not believing official governmental accounts of history, and they approached official accounts with the assumption that they were fundamentally biased, if not simply false. Given this, any attempt to interpret people's beliefs about history based on analyses of textbooks or other sources of information must be viewed with skepticism.


Developing a picture of the consumption of texts about history presents several challenges. The first of these is that there is little agreement in general on what comprises an appropriate measure of consumption. While a great deal of research has been conducted on how people comprehend texts or are able to repeat them, we know relatively little about how people come to believe, or appropriate texts.

In our particular study we were further limited by the fact that we had no data about the consumption of textbook history from earlier periods to compare with the information we had about the textbooks from these periods. Given the underdeveloped state of our knowledge about appropriating texts and other limitations, we employed several measures, many in pilot form, to develop a preliminary picture of the consumption of history textbooks at one particular, post-Soviet time.

The first means we employed to develop this picture was a questionnaire (see Appendix B, page 14). We collected responses from 101 teachers in Russia and 90 in Ukraine. Approximately half the respondents in Russia were from Moscow and half from a rural setting about 200 kilometers from Moscow, and all the respondents in Ukraine were from Kharkov. The respondents represented various subject areas (about one-third taught history and the rest ranged across other areas of the curriculum). They also came from various national and regional groups: Russians in urban Russia (n = 57), Russians in rural Russia (n = 35), Ukrainians in Ukraine (n = 61), Russians in Ukraine (n = 29), members of national minorities in Russia (Tatar, Armenian, Jewish, Georgian) (n = 9).

Given the massive amount of time, effort, and heated debate that go into the production of history textbooks, one of the most striking findings from this questionnaire was the lack of importance teachers attached to them as sources of information. When asked to rank ten sources of information about history (textbooks, discussion with family, films, novels, etc.), teachers judged textbooks to be least important. When asked where they would prefer their students to obtain information about history, teachers again placed textbooks at the bottom of their list. It is important to note that in responding to these questions the teachers had pre-1995 textbooks in mind.

The teachers' low ranking of textbooks as sources of students' information about history was uniform across national groups with the exception of national minorities (all in Russia). This group viewed students as relying as heavily on textbooks as on several other sources of information about history. Attempts to interpret this finding must be tempered by the fact that only a small number of respondents fell in this category (n = 9), but we believe it reflects the fact that teachers in this group, unlike those in all others, viewed students as being insufficiently skeptical about information in history textbooks.

---

15. All differences between groups reported here were statistically significant at the .01 level or lower.
Teachers generally placed "discussions with adults outside the family" and "discussions with friends" at the top of their list of sources of information about history used by students. These two sources were also ranked at the top of the list of where teachers preferred their students to obtain information. This suggests that the teachers believed that students both do and should place greater faith in unofficial sources of information about history than in official, state supported sources.

The tendency to give high ratings to discussions with adults outside the family and with friends as sources of information contrasts with teachers' assessment of the role of "discussion with family." Family discussions were estimated to rank lower than discussions with adults outside the family and with friends in terms of where students do and should obtain information. This is complicated, however, by some group differences. Teachers in Ukraine and in rural Russia ranked family discussions more highly as a source of information for their students than did teachers in Moscow. Furthermore, the first two groups believed that family discussions should play a more important role in providing information to students than did the group of teachers in Moscow. The most plausible interpretation we could make of these findings is that they reflect a general difference between groups in Moscow and elsewhere in how trustworthy families are perceived to be as sources of information about loaded political and historical issues.

In addition to questions about where students currently obtain and should obtain information about history, we asked teachers whether they detected any change over time. This revealed an urban-rural difference in Russia. Whereas the teachers in Moscow saw virtually no difference in student belief between 1986 and 1996, teachers in rural Russia saw a significant decrease, moving from a level that was higher to a level that was lower than their Moscow counterparts' ratings. Hence the teachers in Moscow viewed their students as having been as skeptical ten years earlier as they were in 1996, whereas the level of skepticism in rural Russia seems to have grown.

This might be changing somewhat with the appearance of the new history textbooks. In a videotaped classroom discussion in May 1997 students in a Moscow school stated that they not only used, but believed history textbooks as sources of information. Also, in short essay responses to the question, "Do you believe [history] textbooks (yes, no, why)?", 12 students in this class replied yes, none said no, and four gave equivocal answers (e.g., "It's very difficult for me to answer"). In another survey conducted in two Moscow schools in October 1996, 58 of 72 students mentioned textbooks as a source they used to obtain information about history, whereas only 10 mentioned family and friends. It is not entirely clear how to interpret the difference between these results and those produced by the teacher questionnaire. The two schools in which these students were enrolled are progressive and academically oriented, something that was usually associated with sophisticated skepticism during Soviet years. However, the latest, post-Soviet textbooks were being used in these schools, and it is possible that they were beginning to produce different responses among students. Other interpretations are also possible—including one that would point to the impact of the social
conditions in which the data were collected (surveys or public discussions conducted in classrooms vs. private discussions with a researcher administering a questionnaire). Such interpretations touch on some methodological issues that we take up in the next section.

Problems in Collecting Data in the Former Soviet Union

We believe that the methods we employed in this study yielded important results. However, in conducting the study we encountered some intriguing, and sometimes troubling methodological questions that are seldom discussed when conducting research in Russia, Ukraine, and other areas of the former Soviet Union.

It has long been recognized that questionnaires and interviews are "obtrusive" instruments in social science research. For those who deal with this issue, obtrusiveness is usually assumed to be a fact about questionnaires and interviews wherever and whenever they are used. Some of our experiences in conducting this study, however, led us to reflect on how obtrusiveness, while present everywhere, may operate differently in different sociocultural settings and hence have varying influences on the data. These issues emerged forcefully when Nina Korzh, our colleague who collected the questionnaire data in Russia, reflected on her experience.

The first point Korzh made was that even though most teachers she contacted agreed to fill out the questionnaire, the majority did not actually do so without extensive additional effort on her part. In some cases this additional effort involved further explanation about why it was important to obtain their opinion and so forth, but in many cases further issues arose. For example, Korzh reported that perhaps a fourth of those who eventually agreed to respond to the questionnaire were clearly hesitant to state their positions openly. Such subjects often tried to respond indirectly by employing hints and other forms of evasion. Another group seemed generally unwilling to put in the effort required to generate adequate answers and produced quite formulaic responses. In contrast, a third group identified by Korzh seemed both quite willing to express their opinion openly and to put in the effort required to generate adequate answers. We do not have precise information about how this pattern compares with those for other populations, but we believe the proportion of subjects in the first two groups to be quite high.

The response of our data collectors in Russia and Ukraine to these problems was to interact extensively with those subjects who seemed to require it. Such differential treatment of course raises questions about the reliability and validity of the results of our study, but more importantly it raises general concerns about how to interpret responses to questionnaires and interviews in the former Soviet Union. For example, unlike their American counterparts, who are thoroughly familiar with

the practice of responding in writing to examination questions. Russian students and teachers are used to oral examinations, and hence the general interpretation of what it means to write down an answer is quite different in the two places. Furthermore, for many adults in the former Soviet Union the implications of responding to oral or written questions about their private opinions can still be quite ominous. In general, the social context in which questionnaire, interview, and group discussion data are collected in the former Soviet Union may be having a powerful and little appreciated impact on the information generated. This of course raises questions about how we should interpret data gathered there, let alone make comparisons with data generated elsewhere.

Of course the point is not that questionnaires are obtrusive in Russia and Ukraine but not in the U.S. or elsewhere. Instead, it is that questionnaires are obtrusive in different ways in various settings and the analysis of responses needs to take this into account. Our experience in conducting this study alerted us to some of these issues, but much more obviously needs to be done to deal with them effectively. We leave this as a topic for additional methodological inquiry in the future.

Summary

By way of conclusion, we restate the following points that were made initially in the abstract: Genuinely post-Soviet accounts of history began to appear in Russian history textbooks only in 1995. The production of these new accounts has been shaped more by the tendency to refute earlier textbooks than by the appearance of new archival materials. As a result, portrayals of events such as the Civil War take the form of narratives composed of counterclaims. While teachers generally believe that students do and should rely on textbooks (at least older ones) less than on other sources of information about history, they also feel that students rely on unofficial sources of information such as discussions with friends and with adults outside the family more than on official sources such as textbooks for this information.

Teachers ranked family discussions lower than discussions with friends and adults outside the family as a source of information about history. This primarily reflects the opinion of teachers in Moscow, however, who ranked families as sources of information lower than their counterparts in rural Russia and Ukraine. In Moscow, teachers believe their students were as skeptical in 1996 as they had been in 1986 about what they were taught in school about history, whereas teachers in rural Russia viewed their students as having become more skeptical over this period.

In contrast to teachers’ views about students using older materials, there was some evidence that students using post-Soviet textbooks believe what they find in these texts. The Russian (and perhaps the Ukrainian) subjects’ interpretations of what it means to respond to items on a questionnaire seem to differ from those found in other populations, raising methodological questions about how to interpret data generated by questionnaires and interviews in the former Soviet Union.
Appendix A

Soviet and Russian Secondary School History
Textbooks: 1976-1995


Appendix B

Questionnaire for:
Memory, History, and Identity: An International Study

Virtually everywhere in the world today people find themselves in the midst of rapid social change, and as a result the problems confronting teachers are greater than ever. We are conducting an international study to examine the problems faced by teachers in this changing context. We would very much appreciate your participation in this study. Teachers from Estonia, Russia, Ukraine, and the U.S. are taking part in this research.

Naturally, everyone responding to our questions does so from a particular perspective. All of our perspectives are shaped by who we are, where we come from, and where we are located in history. As a result, we begin by asking you a series of questions about yourself in general. We then move on to a set of questions about your opinions as a teacher.

I. General Questions about You

Date of birth ______
Sex ______
Nationality ____________
How many years experience do you have as a teacher? ______
What is your subject matter speciality? _______________

II. Questions for You as a Teacher

1. Why should we teach history? (Give a score each reason from 1 to 7.)
   a. to help produce loyal citizens
      very important 1 2 3 4 5 not important 6 7 at all
   b. to help develop critical citizens
      very important 1 2 3 4 5 not important 6 7 at all
   c. to help develop problem solving skills in citizens
      very important 1 2 3 4 5 not important 6 7 at all
d. to help citizens understand contemporary problems

very
important 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 at all

not important

e. list your own reason

very
important 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 at all

not important

2. What are the 5 most important events in the 20th century that your students need to learn about? List these in their order of importance from 1 (most important) to 5 (least important). Over the course of a year’s instruction what proportion of time would you devote to each of these events? (Indicate by putting a percentage figure in the parentheses at the end of each line.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>% of instructional time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. What are the 5 most important events in World War II that your students need to learn about? List these in their order of importance from 1 (most important) to 5 (least important). (Please complete this question whether or not you have included World War II as one of your responses to Question 2 above.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Who are the 5 most important historical figures from the 20th century that your students to know about? List these in their order of importance from 1 (most important) to 5 (least important).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What is the reason for including each of these figures?

1. 
2. 
3. 
4. 
5. 

5. Where do your students get most of their information about history? (Put a number before each item to indicate its rank in order of importance from 1 to 10.)
   - school textbooks
   - classroom discussions
   - discussions with family
   - discussions with adults outside their family
   - discussions with friends
   - films
   - novels
   - television
   - radio
   - press
   - other (please specify)

6. Where would you prefer that your students obtain their information about history? (Put a number before each item to indicate its rank in order of importance from 1 to 10.)
   - school textbooks
   - classroom discussions
   - discussions with family
   - discussions with adults outside their family
   - discussions with friends
   - films
   - novels
   - television
   - radio
   - press
   - other (please specify)

7. Where do you get most of your information about history? (Put a number before each item to indicate its rank in order of importance from 1 to 10.)
   - school textbooks
   - classroom discussions
   - discussions with family
   - discussions with adults outside their family
   - discussions with friends
   - films
   - novels
   - television
   - radio
   - press
   - other (please specify)
8. Do students believe more about what they are taught concerning history in school today than they did 10 years ago?

___ yes ___ no

9. We know that there are often different and conflicting interpretations of historical events. Do you think that your students should learn one version of history or should learn different and perhaps conflicting versions of history? (to be framed by investigators at each site in most appropriate way)

- Name an event or figure as an example and in a paragraph or two give two different interpretations of it.

10. In a paragraph or two can you say which of the historical events or figures you mentioned have had the most influence on you and your family? What is the nature of this influence?