




European Journal of Educational Research

Volume 12, Issue 1, 133 - 144.

ISSN: 2165-8714

<http://www.eu-jer.com/>

Hate Speech and the Gender Perspective: A Problem from the Teaching of Social Sciences in School

Jesús Marolla-Gajardo* 
Metropolitan University of
Educational Sciences, CHILE

Felipe Zurita-Garrido 
Metropolitan University of
Educational Sciences, CHILE

Sixtina
Pinochet-Pinochet 
Universidad Católica del Norte,
CHILE

Guillermo
Castro-Palacios 
Metropolitan University of
Educational Sciences, CHILE

Received: June 12, 2022 • Revised: September 1, 2022 • Accepted: November 23, 2022

Abstract: This study explores a socially relevant problem related to teachers' conceptions of hate speech from a gender perspective present in the discourse of teaching history and social science educational practices. The methodology was used within the paradigm with a case study design, as a generalization was not intended. The sample consisted of 80 professors of history and social sciences. A quantitative questionnaire was used to determine the conceptions of the participants. The main findings include the constraints placed by programs and curricula on the presence of hate speech, student interventions in classes, and strategies implemented by participating teachers to position counter-narratives to hate in their practice. The conclusions include the importance teachers place on analyzing the prevalence of hate speech in their practice, both by students and the media, and its impact on teaching. In addition, the results offer some educational insights and perspectives for positioning hate speech as a transformative social justice perspective.

Keywords: Gender perspective, hate speech, social networks, social sciences, teacher education.

To cite this article: Marolla-Gajardo, J., Zurita-Garrido, F., Pinochet-Pinochet, S., & Castro-Palacios, G. (2023). Hate speech and the gender perspective: A problem from the teaching of social sciences in school. *European Journal of Educational Research*, 12(1), 133-144. <https://doi.org/10.12973/eu-jer.12.1.133>

Introduction

The general concern about the prevalence of hate speech and the problems its very existence brings is undeniable in various fields (Arroyo et al., 2018). Aspects such as discrimination, judgment, and stereotypes related to otherness have been common and reiterative characteristics throughout history. Recently, however, hate speech has become more prevalent in society. As Izquierdo (2019) notes, social networks and mass media create a situation in which any comment or other type of expression can be instantly spread across the globe. This finding multiplies the negative effects of hate speech.

According to Massip et al. (2021) and Stanley (1991), this type of speech has increased with the rise of new types of fascism and populist speech that propose binary structures of a struggle between "them" and "us." Social networks are the main media in which this speech is disseminated. Sponholz (2016) notes that one of the characteristics of hate speech is to attack the specific characteristics of people rather than the ideas they express or share.

Literature review

According to Emcke (2017), hate speech is an issue of the past when it attacks certain groups; however, today, it has resurfaced. The European Commission against Racism and Intolerance (ECRI) defines hate speech as follows:

"Encouragement, promotion or instigation in any of its shapes, of hate, humiliation or undervalue of a person or group. As well as harassment, discredit, and spread of negative stereotypes, stigmatization, or threat concerning the person or group of people justifying these manifestations based on race, color, ancestry, national or ethnic origin, age, disability, language, religion, or beliefs, sex, gender, sexual orientation, and other characteristics or personal conditions" (ECRI, 2016, p. 25).

* Corresponding author:

Jesús Marolla-Gajardo, Nucleus of Computational Thinking and Education for Sustainable Development (NuCES), Center for Research in Education (CIE-UMCE). Department of History and Geography, Metropolitan University of Educational Sciences, Chile. ✉ jesus.marolla@umce.cl

Researchers such as Arroyo et al. (2018), García (2018), Massip et al. (2021), and Massip and Santisteban (2020) state that the creation of an enemy image is based on some specific characteristics: a) lack of trust in others, b) blaming others for present and past events, c) negative actions with harmful outcomes, d) identification of others as wrong and with values that do not correspond to one's own, e) denial of individuality, f) representation as a homogeneous collective, g) denial of empathy.

According to Parekh (2006), three characteristics that constitute hate speech can be distinguished:

- a) Hate speech refers to an individual or a group of people, as opposed to someone expressing hatred against all people, which cannot be qualified as hate speech.
- a) Hate speech leads to stigmatization of the population against which it is directed. This result means that various characteristics are attributed to this group, which are considered undesirable.
- b) The hate group is displaced from normal social relations. Thus, these people, or groups, are considered foreign through hostile expressions (Izquierdo, 2019, p. 45).

From conceptualizations, such as the 'enemy image', the idea of a person or a group that is responsible for everything unjust or not part of the common dynamics of the system is built and, therefore, can be troubling (Anguera et al., 2018; García, 2018; Izquierdo, 2019).

In this way, according to Arroyo et al. (2018) and Santisteban (2004), the perception that is built is identified or defined by seven attitudes toward the enemy image: (a) mistrust; (b) the enemy is always the one to blame; (c) everything the enemy does harms us (negative attitude); (d) the enemy wants to destroy everything we treasure, so they must be destroyed (identification with the wrong); (e) every benefit to the enemy is therefore harm against us (negative simplification); (f) anything to do with the enemy is immediately our enemy; (g) we have nothing in common with our enemy, so nothing will make us change our minds (denial of empathy) (Izquierdo, 2019).

It is important to refer to Sakki and Pettersson's (2016) claims that three different types of hate speech are spread through digital spaces: Those that describe otherness as a difference with a focus on social exclusion, others that can understand that otherness is linked to oppressive ideologies that could pose a threat, and speech that describes internal enemies in such a way that makes it seem like a conspiracy.

According to Massip et al. (2021) and Gagliardone et al. (2015), when analyzing the emergence of hate speech on social networks, some characteristics can be distinguished: a) the duration of exposure: when the content remains online for a long period making their effects deeper concerning the formation of opinions and attitudes, b) the chance of itinerancy: when the content is withdrawn but persists or is re-shared in other areas, and c) anonymity: when anonymity is used to spread messages that lead to the radicalization of destructive behavior without fear of the consequences they may bring.

According to Emcke (2017), spreading hate speech creates certain representations of the collective marked as the enemy. People create attitudes of rejection toward people or groups based on their religion, culture, skin color, gender, and sexual orientation to make them seem dangerous to the rest of society.

Social studies instruction must promote critical thinking so students can question and intervene in real social events, seek solutions, and present alternative narratives to hate speech (Ortega-Sánchez et al., 2021).

In teacher education and classroom practice, there are clear boundaries for narratives that can be tolerated in a democratic framework (Ortega-Sánchez et al., 2021). Teaching staff needs to be familiar with hate speech that is disseminated. At the same time, addressing it in the classroom from a critical perspective promotes the construction of a counter-narrative based on social justice and the fight against discrimination.

Gender Perspectives

It must be acknowledged that there are still cases of exclusion and discrimination against gender and sexual diversity, as shown in a 2011 United Nations study. Studies such as Kattari et al. (2018) note that LGBTIQ+ people currently suffer various marginalization.

The studies of Heras-Sevilla et al. (2021), Marolla-Gajardo (2019), VanSledright (2013), and Wineburg (2001) show that the teaching of history and social sciences is still framed as a chronological, positivist, and traditional type of knowledge that moves away from socially relevant issues and the development of critical thinking. The norm is to make visible male characters in a position of political, economic, and military power (Marolla-Gajardo et al., 2021), which results in the perpetuation of structures of absence and inequality in which the rest of the characters, such as women, gender dissidents, migrants, the elderly, and children who have been excluded from sociopolitical hegemony, are relegated.

To work with and question gender, sex, and identity structures taught in school, it is necessary that we subject our patterns of language and behavior to critique. As García Luque and de la Cruz (2017) note, it is fundamental to analyze

the patterns that are transmitted through what we teach and to examine the roles, stereotypes, and prejudice that we teach about with what it means to be a man, woman, non-binary, trans, and other identities that belong to the LGBTIQ+ community.

As Díez and Fernández (2019) note, working from a gender perspective implies questioning established categories and proposing a deconstruction of intentions, absences, sources, and transmitted models. Necessarily, one must critique and fight against the schemas that have installed men as protagonists and dominant characters and position women's actions and experiences as the fundamental axis for transforming gendered social inequality.

In the work of the gender perspective in didactics, it is necessary to include reflections on the social inequality created by androcentric groups (Triviño & Chaves, 2020). Massip and Castellví (2019) state that simply making absences visible cannot solve the issues caused by gender structures. Moreover, simply including different characters in traditional and currently dominant structures does not generate the necessary impact to bring about change. A critical perspective must be taken on how the dominant hegemonic structures have been produced and reproduced (Ortega-Sánchez, 2017).

García and de la Cruz (2017) note that education with new models of masculinity and feminism promotes discussion of inequality and prevention of gender-based violence. The goal should be to work within the ethics of care, recognize emotions, and fight against violence (symbolic, psychological, and physical) to promote dialogue and deconstruction of traditionally assigned roles (Díez, 2017; Lomas, 2002).

As Díez and Juárez (2015) outline, societies have created symbols, patterns, behavioral guidelines, and gender models, among others, that have become part of normalized social structures. In these structures, current diversity is not taken into account, not only by being excluded from society but also from programs, curricula, and official speeches in school. The formal equality discussed in the media and school programs is far from actual equality (Díez & Fernández, 2019; García & de la Cruz, 2017).

In analyzing hate speech from a gender perspective, it is possible to state, following the work of Crocco (2019), Ortega-Sánchez (2020), and Triviño and Chaves (2020), that we have witnessed not only experienced post-truth as a meta-narrative but also from a postmodern perspective, the questioning of truth itself. The issue is that the goal of reaching an agreement on problematic and sensitive matters while respecting the democratic frameworks may carry the risk of generating wrongful speech concerning human rights, the inclusion of diversity, and respect for democracy, among others. Triviño and Chaves (2020) add: "Does education for globalized citizenship assume to tolerate the intolerable? As Social Science teachers, must we tolerate intolerant speech of the teacher trainees in our classrooms? Can we make room for fascist speech in our classrooms?" (p. 88).

For Ortega-Sánchez (2020) and Ortega-Sánchez and Pagès (2018), the endurance of binary gender identities and the production and reproduction of historical school texts with absences and gender inequalities, as Molet and Bernard (2015) note, urgently requires work aiming towards undermining the patriarchal system to promote the presence of diverse identities. Ortega-Sánchez (2017) adds that citizen participation is the way to face "counter-socialization" or "counter-normativity." As García and de la Cruz (2019), Marolla (2019b), and Ortega-Sánchez et al. (2021) note, the way to move forward is not to add more content to a saturated curriculum, but to deconstruct current hegemonic practices and dynamics.

However, studies on hate speech from a gendered perspective are scarce. It is worth mentioning the work of Lingiardi et al. (2020), who conducted a lexical analysis of the semantic content in a study on the "Italian hate card". This study aimed to create a social narrative about people's behavior and attitudes. Among the main findings, women and the LGTBIQ+ collective are the groups that receive more hate speech through Twitter. Although social networks can be said to provide a democratic space for people to express themselves, at the same time, they can become a place where hate speech is spread against different communities, usually under the protection of anonymity.

Methodology

Research Design

The methodology proposed is a quantitative study with a critical interpretative focus (Bisquerra & Alzina, 2004). A survey was conducted following the suggestions of Cohen et al. (2011) to answer the research questions. The instrument was built with an interpretative focus to understand the social construction of knowledge. The study's design was framed in the case study where the interest of the text lies in the comprehension of phenomena, a group, and an issue in particular (Simons, 2009). According to Rodríguez-Gómez et al. (1996), a case study allows us to contrast the gathered information without intending to generalize.

Sample and Data Collection

The sample consisted of 80 teachers, n=80 (women: 62%; men: 38%). A convenience non-probabilistic sampling (Cohen et al., 2011) was used to choose the sample based on availability and direct access to the participants. The

selection met the intended criteria based on the participants' characteristics and the study's objectives. Criteria include: a) ability to access and stay in the field, b) presence of various processes, programs, interactions, and people, c) relationship with informants, d) ensuring the quality and credibility of the study, e) being a social science teacher, f) at least one year of teaching experience.

The survey formulated Likert-type questions for measuring attitudes by indicating the degree of agreement or disagreement with the statements. A scale with five values for the levels was chosen to suggest options ranging from "completely disagree" to "completely agree." The Likert scales were supplemented by two open-ended questions to provide contrast in the instrument responses.

Regarding the characteristics of the sample, the descriptive analysis of the participants is detailed in Table 2, where we can see the greater participation of teachers aged between 23 and 40 years (79% of participants).

A survey following the guidelines of Álvarez-Gayou (2003), Bisquerra and Alzina (2004), and Rodríguez-Gómez et al. (1996) is used to construct these instruments. The instrument consisted of three major sections. The first section refers to personal identification, years of experience, postgraduate studies, workplaces, teaching level, etc. The second section consisted of a Likert scale style item with five indicators measuring the level of agreement and disagreement (completely agree, agree, undecided, in disagreement, completely disagree). The third and fourth sections consisted of two open-ended questions in which teachers were free to express their ideas.

The survey was processed using correlative and inferential descriptive quantitative analysis according to the definitions of Cohen et al. (2013) and Rodríguez-Gómez et al. (1996). The descriptive analysis focused on frequency calculations using Excel software. The rest of the analysis was performed with statistical tests (Creswell, 2014; Latorre et al., 1994) under the case applications using RStudio software.

In addition, male and female responses were analyzed to determine if they differed, as gender identity can sometimes elicit different responses to the same questions and topics. Especially given the focus of the study, it was important to understand if there was a meaningful difference in terms of gender identity expressed by the participants.

To obtain an optimal result, the instrument responses were analyzed using the nonparametric U of Mann-Whitney technique, because the male participants' responses did not have a normal distribution (Table 1). So, all participants' responses were summed to obtain a final score per participant.

Analysis of the data

To test the reliability of the instrument, Cronbach's alpha of the variables with the scale measurement was calculated. This test examines the characteristics of the measurement scales of the items that make up the instrument. The advantage of this coefficient is that it requires only one application of the instrument, considering values between 0 and 1. The theory is that a Cronbach's alpha of 0.70 or more is a sign that the instrument is internally consistent and reliable, since the result is closer to 1. In the case of our study, the calculated alpha is 0.84.

The result of the test was that, with a value of $p = 0.2413$, there is no evidence to reject a null hypothesis ($\mu_{men} = \mu_{women}$), therefore and for this case, there was no difference in the final survey score when the gender identity reported by the participants was taken into account. The details are given in Table 1. In the case of women, the value p is 0.6196, so H_0 is accepted, meaning that the distribution of their answers is normal. While the p -value of men is 0,02339, H_0 is rejected, meaning that the distribution of the answers is not normal.

Results

Concerning the academic information of the participants, table 4 shows that 61% graduated from their program after 2010. To be precise, 29% of the participants graduated from 2010-2014 and 32% from 2015-2019. It is important to mention that, due to the criteria for sample selection, all participants have college-level pedagogy degrees in history, geography, and social sciences. Similarly, table 4 shows that 53% have up to five years of experience, and 32% have reached ten years of teaching experience. This result shows that the sample consists mostly of teachers with a long teaching trajectory, consistent with the years after graduation (see Table 3).

Tables 5 and 6 show that 59% of the teachers have not completed a postgraduate degree. Those who have completed postgraduate studies (41%) are distributed as follows: Diploma courses (36%) and Master's degrees (64%).

The distribution by educational level of the participating teachers in Table 7 shows that 65% of the participants work in secondary school education. The rest of the participants (35%) work in primary school.

Instrument Analysis

Regarding the instrument analysis and the questions in the survey, it can be said that some interesting ideas emerged from this study. 47% of responses in the "agree" category with the statement "Hate speech exists in the context of

teaching practices, hate speech is present". This result is relevant because 29% stated there is no discussion of hate speech in their classroom.

Regarding the statement "Students' remarks refer to a specific population when they use hate speech," 38% of participants acknowledged that there are hateful comments and that they create conflict in the classroom at the same time. However, 12% of participants indicated that such a situation does not exist. In any case, this contrasts with the statement mentioned in the previous paragraph, in which 29% indicated that there are no problems in this regard in their classrooms, which raises doubts about what is happening in the classroom.

It is important to point out that in response to the statement "The students react against sexist or discriminatory remarks," 62% affirmed that this answer applies to their classroom practice. In comparison, 12% indicated that they disagree with this criterion. This result cannot be related to the results of the statement "student's remarks are usually sexist", where 47% declared to agree with these issues occurring during their teaching practice. In comparison, 32% disagreed with this statement.

It is interesting to note that there is a tendency towards evidence when it comes to the statement "students spread hate and gender discriminatory comments they learn through social media," where 44% of participants declare to "agree" with this statement and 12% "completely agree". This can be related to the statement "Social networks greatly influence student's speech," where 44% claim to "completely agree" and 47% "agree", thus acknowledging the importance and influence of social media on the spread of hate speech and its occurrence during class.

Regarding the statement "It is complicated to go through the content of the curriculum in the subject of history because students spread sexist, racist or discriminatory ideas and statements", 53% disagree with this criterion. However, it is important to point out that 18% agree with this statement, where it can be interpreted that such hate speech from a hate perspective cannot be included in the lessons.

The above statements can be compared to "I normally include content from social networks in my lessons" and "I include material that shows signs of hate speech from different perspectives to encourage debate among students." For the first criterion, 47% of participants agreed, and 26% disagreed with this statement. For the second criterion, 59% of answers state "agree" and 15% state "completely agree". This result shows that teachers use materials and teach with a focus on hate speech from the gender perspective. It can be assumed that such expressions occur in the classroom and that teachers care about their work simultaneously.

It is interesting to highlight that while it is implicitly assumed that such messages are spread when presented with the statement "hate speech is accepted and spread by a large proportion of students," 71% of participants disagree, and 12% disagree. This result shows that students do not accept hate speech and that there could be some discussion activity when it comes up.

In the context of hate speech expressed by students, it is important to highlight that teachers consider this situation similar to the spread of hate comments on social networks and anonymity works. There is no trend between individuality and anonymity, as 50% of the participants are "indecisive" about it, 21% disagree, and 18% agree with the criterion.

Regarding the criterion "Gender collectives and expressions are made to feel unsafe with the spread of discriminatory speech", the teachers manifested that 24% of the teachers disagreed, and 56% agreed with this criterion. This result indicates a violation of certain collectives and communities to which hate speech is directed. This result can be related to the previous paragraphs and ideas in which such difficulties related to teaching practices are highlighted.

Concerning these results and the criterion "I tend to promote attitudes and values of respect concerning the diversity of gender and all kinds in my lessons", the participants indicate that 71% fully agree and 29% agree. This result establishes a link between teachers' work and concerns about the intrusion of expressions directed at certain collectives. Regarding the criterion "I lead and disagree when gender hate speech is spread," the participants indicated 79% complete agreement and 21% agreement. This indicates that, from the teachers' point of view, there is a political and social commitment to point out hate speech the moment it occurs and make them deal with it by analyzing and reflecting on these situations.

Finally, regarding the point "The curricula provide space to work with hate speech", 59% of the teachers agree with the statement that the curricula provide space to acknowledge the existence of hate speech. From the teachers' perspective, it can be interpreted that the work on analyzing hate speech is done within the framework of a formal curriculum. To see all that was said in detail, see Table 8.

Correlation Analysis of Answer Variables

Table 9 contains only meaningful results for the correlation test, showing the relationship between the two variables studied. The correlational analysis of the responses was evaluated with a non-parametric test. In this case, Spearman correlation was used (H_0 = no relationship between the variables) because they did not show the normal distribution in

the Shapiro-Wilks test. There was a correlation between many of them (to correlate, H_0 must be discarded, which is the case for values below 0.05) (see Table 9).

Using the information in Table 9, one can see some interesting data, such as the correlation between Question 2 and Question 4. Question 2 refers to students' hateful comments toward a certain population group. Question 4, on the other hand, states that hateful comments are usually sexist. From this and the correlations made, it appears that students' hateful comments are likely directed against a diversity of identities from the teacher's perspective.

One can also observe a positive correlation (see Table 9) between question 1 and question 7. Considering the ideas manifested by teachers, it is possible to see hate speech in the context of teaching practices learned from social networks. Moreover, it can be added that there is a positive correlation between the criteria of question 2, which refers to hate comments expressed by students and directed against a specific population group, and the content of question 7, which refers to hate speech expressed on social networks. It is assumed that social networks are a focal point, a learning space, and a transmission of hate comments to specific communities.

In addition, according to Table 9, there is a positive correlation between question 3, which states that students' comments unrelated to the content cause conflicts in the classroom, and the content of question 7, where it has appeared that these comments cause conflicts that come from social networks. Based on this information, it can be assumed that these moments reflect instances of hate speech during classroom practice.

Following this thought, Table 9 shows a positive relationship with question 4, which refers to sexist comments made by students in class. These sexist comments can be related to question 7, where it can be assumed that the source of these comments is social networks, as mentioned before.

There is also a positive correlation with question 6, which refers to how students make associations between classroom content and language or language use from social networks, as shown in questions 7 and 8. These two questions refer to social networks' meaning and interest, where students also learn and share hate speech. Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that students are making connections between the content and hate speech using concepts they have learned and echoed on social networks.

There is also an interesting and positive correlation in the content of question 1. Teachers state that hate speech occurs in the context of the content in class, and question 12, states that hate speech comes from anonymity. In this case, it is interesting to note the correlation between question 2 and question 12, where we can see that this type of speech that spreads anonymously is also directed at a specific population group. In addition, one can notice the correlation between questions 1 and 13, in which it appears that teachers declare that hate speech occurs during their work and that, in this case, it is accepted and spread by other students. Also, the correlation between questions 12, 13, and 15, in which students accept hate speech and students spread it, and that this spread occurs in anonymous collective groups.

The same principle can be used to comment on the correlation between questions 7 and 13. From these questions, it can be deduced that hate speech is usually tainted with sexism and gender discrimination, originating from social networks, and at the same time accepted, reproduced, and passed on by students in the class (question 13). In this context, the existing correlation between questions 9 and 15 can be noted, in which the complexity of dealing with historical content due to the sexist, racist, or discriminatory ideas and expressions of students is noted and, as question 15 states, that they are not expressed as individuals but as a collective.

The correlation of questions 6 and 8 alongside question 20. On the one hand, the first two questions establish that students associate the lesson content with hate speech, with social media strongly influencing this relationship. All of this correlates positively with the idea that curriculum enables hate speech to spread because students interpret curriculum perspectives from their reality, and in this case, from what they experience on social media.

Discussion

Based on the results of this paper, similar to Ballbé et al. (2021) and Izquierdo (2019), it can be concluded that teachers are kept away from an adequate didactic formation that would allow them to deal with hate speech in a way that would lead them to promote education for responsible citizenship, the fight against discrimination, and social justice (Marolla-Gajardo, 2020; Ortega-Sánchez et al., 2021). This result can be associated with initial teacher training that does not focus on teachers being able to take an active role in addressing social studies topics. These socially relevant topics are aimed at developing social justice.

Hate speech generally targets traditionally excluded communities from educational programs and curricula and most social spaces (Müller & Schwarz, 2020). According to Müller and Schwarz (2020), hate speech today is mainly spread anonymously through social networks.

Educational proposals must be made from the field of didactics; those that enable teachers and students to understand how hate speech and gender discrimination are constructed, produced, and reproduced. Moreover, at the same time, it offers spaces to critique, struggle, and move towards social justice (Ballbé et al., 2021). It is important to see a deconstruction of curricula toward relevant social issues and learning service strategies, or local case studies that aim

to build critical global citizenship committed to democracy and the defense of human rights (Emcke, 2017; García, 2018).

One of the fundamental strategies that should be worked on is the proposal and construction of counter-speeches to hate. These should emerge from speeches that generate ruptures from situations of social injustice. Matters such as respect for and protection of human rights, diversity, and democratic freedom of speech should construct discursive and practical structures for deconstructing inequality, violence, and transgressions against different collectives.

Teachers should act as agents of social change by proposing in their practice a constant questioning of social normalization structures (Massip et al., 2021). There must be a commitment to social justice to position the construction of hate speech as a fundamental axis in the education of students.

Some research groups, such as the Grup de Recerca en Didàctica de les Ciències Socials (GRDCS), suggest that the construction of counter-hate speech is done under the following ideas:

“a) to identify the social problem or conflict; b) to contextualize the social problem or conflict; c) to identify the people who intervene; d) to assess the quality of their arguments; e) to interpret the emotions that are shown in the narratives; f) to metacognitively and empathically exercise, of considering how I think and how the others think; g) to propose social and political action based on human rights,” (Izquierdo, 2019, p. 48).

A gendered perspective on hate speech suggests the need to promote a critical and questioning attitude toward homogeneities and currents that seek to generate discrimination and judgment and to continue with the reproduction of patriarchal hegemonic structures (Marolla-Gajardo, 2020; Ortega-Sánchez et al., 2021). Aspects such as feminist and intersectional structures should be part of teachers' everyday practice, even if they are not included in the curriculum (Marolla-Gajardo, 2020; Ortega-Sánchez et al., 2021). Promoting critical and reflective thinking about the struggle against inequality based on gender and identity is necessary.

Recent research by Massip et al. (2021) suggests some ideas that can be considered for formulating anti-hate speech. The authors suggest some key principles based on the European Council's guidelines on education for democratic citizenship:

1. Democracy must be contemplated as a road in constant construction. Construction can present strengths and weaknesses. However, an approach must be taken that is based on democratic construction (Arnstein, 2019).
2. Liberty as an idea must be taught as a construct that encourages participation. Liberty is essential to the construction of democracy (Santisteban, 2019).
3. Social justice must be promoted as an essential component of democracy (Arnstein, 2019).
4. Citizenship education must focus on making people visible, e.g., those identities that have been made invisible (Marolla-Gajardo, 2019; Marolla-Gajardo, 2020).
5. Education for citizenship must promote the development of critical thinking as an axis of construction and struggle against social inequality (Ortega-Sánchez et al., 2021; Ortega-Sánchez & Pagès Blanch, 2020).
6. Education for critical citizenship must promote the struggle against fascism, racism, sexism, discrimination, violence, and aporophobia, among other beliefs that have produced and reproduced inequality to generate hate speech as well as alternative narratives that come from hate perspectives (Arroyo et al., 2018; Massip et al., 2021).

Teachers can use their official materials to question and address gender perspectives in their lessons (de la Cruz Redondo et al., 2019). As de la Cruz Redondo et al. (2019) note, these materials enable:

- a) Question the binary and stereotypical models of gender relations in our society's past and present.
- b) Work on gendered expressions and the omission of this diversity.
- c) Analyze the lack of cultural feminine and other identity references.
- d) Remark on how it is possible to build citizenship without half the population (women).
- e) Undervaluing by making maintenance activities invisible and thus, those who do it (women).
- f) Making invisible, ignoring, and not even considering the existence of diverse identities (p. 285).

In short, the roles and images around the main characters of history and the taught social sciences continue to be framed in traditional structures with a high presence of white men with political, economic, or military power (Crocco, 2018; Kattari et al., 2018). This contributes to hate speech being produced and reproduced in schools and continuing to be directed against this population and community. Due to the actions and decisions of those who determine and disseminate what should be taught and learned, there is little information about it. (Emcke, 2017; Müller & Schwarz, 2020).

When we look at Barendt's (2019) study, we agree with the findings presented to understand the relevance of disseminating hate speech. Such a situation was presented as a problem that needs to be addressed in the classroom, especially in history classes (Neshkovska & Trajkova, 2018).). In this context, it is important to note that according to

works such as those by Barendt (2019), Brown (2017), and Paz et al. (2020), hate speech is on the rise in society and especially in the classroom. The problem is that teachers do not have the competencies and skills to deal with such problems.

Triviño Cabrera and Chaves Guerrero (2020) suggest some useful ideas to promote in classrooms. These ideas can be summarized as follows: a) democratic citizenship education to promote the recognition of identities, the active participation of all people, and the protection of democracy; b) history to shape citizenship and democratic participation; c) promoting work on different opposites and the understanding of complexity and diversity in society; d) promoting critical and creative thinking as a focus of initial education.

Androcentric and sexist perspectives in history and the social sciences need to focus on training teachers' narrative competencies to give necessary visibility to all actors who have been set aside from a hegemonic and patriarchal perspective. As Davies et al. (2021) note, all those voices not grounded in tradition are relegated to absence, reducing opportunities to count on, identify with, empower, and participate in the struggle against inequality (Marolla, 2019b; Marolla et al., 2021).

Because of the topics covered in history, there is a tendency to encourage commentary and expression about cultures, peoples, communities, and people in general (Barendt, 2019; Brown, 2017; Paz et al., 2020). Therefore, the perspective that the teacher provides on the content is essential. However, the perspective that is worked on depends on the teacher's ideology (Bartelds et al., 2020; Ortega-Sánchez et al., 2021).

Scholars including Díez (2017), Marolla-Gajardo (2019), and Ortega-Sánchez and Pagès (2018) suggest that history and social science didactics and formative processes must be central:

- a) The formation of historical and social thought with gender perspective from plurality and social diversity.
- b) In the role of visualization, that the protagonists of the present and the past, be they groups or individuals, have had and should have, the principles of the theory of intersectionality must always be taken into account.
- c) Analyzing the narratives and productions of future teachers to analyze what they internalize and understand about gender perspectives in the social sciences and its repercussions on their professional future.
- d) Assessment of learning and teaching practices and outcomes establishes the reality of graduates and formative actions, transforming obstacles and resistance into opportunities (Ortega-Sánchez, 2020).

It is necessary to examine teacher practices, content perspectives, and teacher-student relationships in the classroom to learn how and at what times hate speech emerges (Barendt, 2019; Brown, 2017). Such discourse, as revealed in this study, is not part of teachers' programs or lesson plans but is freely expressed by student groups (Barendt, 2019; Massip et al., 2021). For this reason, there is an urgent need to understand the presence and work around hate speech in the classroom while also exploring how counter-narratives to hate can be generated through teachers' work (Neshkovska & Trajkova, 2018; Ranieri, 2016).

Conclusion

It is evident that hate speech from a gendered perspective emerges and circulates in Chilean history, geography, and social science classes. Most of these hate speeches are uttered by students influenced by sexist information on social networks. At the same time, these are complemented by the speeches they hear in their own family and environment. This situation can be used to illustrate further the great influence of cultural media on the educational processes of new generations. At the same time, it validates the importance of this study as it analyzes an issue recognized by the participating teachers.

The teachers' statements about students not accepting hate speech from a gender perspective in school because they recognize that it is a violation of the people to whom this hate speech is directed invite for us to recognize that the people who integrate school communities are not indifferent and passive to these situations. This finding reveals opposing transversal attitudes towards the emergence and spread of hate speech from a gender perspective in schools, which is fertile ground for developing actions aimed at didactically addressing this issue. At the same time, this could encourage addressing hate speech from a perspective that involves the entire educational community and assigns the educator's role to everyone who works in the school.

As mentioned above, it can be confirmed that from the teachers' point of view, there is a will to combat hate speech in their workplace pedagogically. They express their political and social commitment to address hate speech the moment they perceive it, approaching it analytically and thoughtfully and considering what might result from their dialog with formal curriculum perspectives. This situation invites us to reflect on the need to examine the foundations and capabilities in didactics that teachers have developed to provide this orientation.

First, this suggests that teachers, perhaps without instruction in gender perspectives, are embracing the option of addressing hate speech as part of their instructional proposal. For this reason, it is necessary to promote a didactic

construct within the social sciences that specifically addresses this issue. This is to provide teachers with tools to counteract the growth of hate speech from a gender perspective from a learning process perspective.

At a second level, and in the context where the work takes place, teachers prioritize the formal curriculum, perhaps showing the difficulties in developing other possible repertoires to consider when working with these topics. Concerning this result, we can highlight three aspects. First, teachers are very interested in integrating topics related to the emergence of hate speech into the curriculum. This would allow them to encourage students to recognize their ideas' origin and question their positions while participating in the construction. Secondly, the questionnaire results show that there is an immediate response to the occurrence of hate speech by not letting the opportunity pass and creating learning scenarios that allow for the development of critical judgment. Finally, it is necessary to adapt the presented proposals to combat gender hate speech to find proposals that allow teachers to propose alternative topics related to current societal issues. Most importantly, there is a need to consider gender perspectives in the school environment and the context of disseminating hate speech.

It is crucial to highlight the importance of further exploring hate speech from a gender perspective by analyzing teachers' practices and contexts experienced in educational settings. The researchers of this study believe that this promotes the creation of an overview that fits the context, thus allowing the rescue of the perspectives and feelings of all participants. At the same time, it is necessary to examine more closely the ideas and representations of children and adolescents because, according to the data collected, there is a dichotomy between this type of speech. This could lead to the hypothesis that they may not recognize this type of language in the information they receive from social networks. This is evidence of the need to create instances that allow for critical literacy development in educational practice. This is because it would enable students to adopt a more reflective attitude towards the information they receive when it shows evidence of hate speech towards a collective.

Finally, it is important to highlight early teacher education's responsibility in creating formative pathways for teachers. They need to be pathways that contribute from the pedagogical or social studies area to developing competencies that can be used to work on critical perspectives in citizenship education. For a while, teachers' political engagement has been a key element in addressing these cases in the classroom, and it is necessary to provide them with the tools to do so. This would allow for a broader view of addressing this socially relevant issue by not only addressing it through mandated curricula but also through experiences and practices that focus directly on eliminating hate speech.

Recommendations

First, proposals need to be designed for the training and professional development of teachers working in primary and secondary education and dealing with history, geography, and social science teaching from a gender equality perspective and assuming that this profile of professionals needs specific training to didactically deal with the emergence and dissemination of hate speech from a gender perspective. The question cannot be limited exclusively to the presence or absence of these counter attitudes.

Second, new studies on the emergence and spread of hate speech from a gender perspective should be developed from different angles to allow for a more complex understanding. Considering aspects such as a) inclusion of students' perspectives; b) analysis of curricular materials, with special emphasis on the study of textbooks that have wide coverage in the context of the Chilean school system; c) study of the limits and existing opportunities to include formative opportunities for didactic work with hate speech in initial and in-service teacher training; d) Joint study and visibility of the didactic experiences developed to address this issue; e) Organization of academic events that allow the educational community to learn about the findings concerning this issue, both nationally and internationally.

Limitations

It is important to point out early teacher education's responsibility in creating formative trajectories for teachers. Those in the pedagogical or social science fields help develop skills that can be used to work on critical perspectives in citizenship education. For a while, teachers' political engagement has been a key element in addressing these cases in the classroom, and it is necessary to give them the tools to do so. This would allow for a broader view of addressing this socially relevant issue by not only addressing it through the prescriptive curricula but also through experiences and practices that focus directly on eliminating hate speech.

Authorship Contribution Statement

Marolla-Gajardo: Conceptualization, methodology, validation, formal analysis, investigation, resources, data curation, writing—original draft preparation, writing—review, and editing supervision. Zurita-Garrido: Conceptualization, methodology, validation, formal analysis, investigation, resources, data curation, writing—original draft preparation, writing—review, and editing supervision. Pinochet-Pinochet: Formal analysis, investigation, resources, data curation, writing—original draft preparation, writing—review. Castro-Palacios: Formal analysis, investigation, resources, data curation, writing—original draft preparation, writing—review.

References

- Álvarez-Gayou, J. (2003). *Cómo hacer investigación cualitativa* [How to do qualitative research]. Paidós Ibérica Ediciones.
- Anguera, C., González, N., Hernández, A., Muzzi, S., Ortega-Sánchez, D., Pagès, J., Sant, E., & Santisteban, A. (2018). Invisibles y ciudadanía global en la formación inicial [Invisibles and global citizenship in initial training] In E. López, C. García & M. Sánchez (Eds.), *Buscando formas de enseñar: Investigar para innovar en didáctica de las Ciencias Sociales* [Searching for ways to teach: Research to innovate in the teaching of social sciences] (pp. 403-412). Universidad de Valladolid - Asociación Universitaria de Profesorado de Didáctica de las Ciencias Sociales AUPDCS.
- Arnstein, S. R. (2019). A ladder of citizen participation. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 85(1), 24-34. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01944363.2018.1559388>
- Arroyo, A., Ballbé, M., Canals, R., García, C., Llusà, J., López, M., Oller, M., & Santisteban, A. (2018). El discurso del odio: Una investigación en la formación inicial [Hate speech: An investigation in initial training] In E. López Torres, C. García Ruíz & M. Sánchez Agustí (Eds.), *Buscando formas de enseñar: Investigar para innovar en didáctica de las Ciencias Sociales* [Searching for ways to teach: Research to innovate in the teaching of social sciences] (pp. 413-424). Ediciones Universidad de Valladolid - Asociación Universitaria de Profesorado de Didáctica de las Ciencias Sociales AUPDCS.
- Ballbé, M., González-Valencia, G., & Ortega-Sánchez, D. (2021). Invisibles y ciudadanía global en la formación del profesorado de educación secundaria [Invisibles and global citizenship in secondary education teacher training]. *Bellaterra Journal of Teaching & Learning Language & Literature*, (14), 20-35. <https://doi.org/jm89>
- Barendt, E. (2019). What is the harm of hate speech? *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice*, 22(3), 539-553. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10677-019-10002-0>
- Bartelds, H., Savenije, G. M., & Boxtel, C. van. (2020). Students' and teachers' beliefs about historical empathy in secondary history education. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, 48(4), 529-551. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00933104.2020.1808131>
- Bisquerra, R., & Alzina, R. (2004). *Metodología de la investigación educativa* [Educational research methodology]. Editorial La Muralla.
- Brown, A. (2017). What is hate speech? Part 1: The Myth of Hate. *Law and Philosophy*, 36, 419-438. <https://doi.org/gbnmct>
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2011). *Research methods in education*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/jm9b>
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. SAGE.
- Crocco, M. (2018). Gender and sexuality in history education. In S. A. Metzger & L. M. Harris (Eds.), *The Wiley international handbook of history teaching and learning* (pp. 335-363). Wiley Blackwell. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119100812.ch13>
- Crocco, M. (2019). Teaching gender and social studies in the #MeToo Era. *Social Studies Journal*, 38(1), 6-16. <https://bit.ly/3cYFq2H>
- de la Cruz, A., Díez, M. C., & García, A. (2019). Formación de profesorado y reflexión sobre identidades de género diversas a través de los libros de texto de Ciencias Sociales [Teacher training and reflection on diverse gender identities through Social Sciences textbooks] In M. Joao Hortas, A. Dias D'Almeida & N. de Alba Fernández, N. (Eds.), *Enseñar y aprender didáctica de las ciencias sociales: La formación del profesorado desde una perspectiva sociocrítica* [Teaching and learning didactics of the social sciences: Teacher training from a socio-critical perspective] (pp. 273-287). AUPDCS-Politécnico de Lisboa.
- Davies, I., Ho, L.-C., Kiwan, D., Peck, C. L., Peterson, A., Sant, E., & Waghid, Y. (2021). *The Palgrave handbook of global citizenship and education*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Díez, M. (2017). Enseñanza de la Historia en educación preuniversitaria y su impacto en la formación de identidades de género, repercusiones en la Universidad [Teaching of History in pre-university education and its impact on the formation of gender identities, repercussions in the University]. *Clío: History and History Teaching*, (40), 219-32. <https://cutt.ly/XM3Ab0R>
- Díez, M., & Fernández, A. (2019). Enseñanza de las ciencias sociales con perspectiva de género [Teaching social sciences with a gender perspective]. *Clío: History and History Teaching*, (45), 1-10. <https://bit.ly/3L0q22c>
- Díez, M. C., & Juárez, I. (2015). Ecofeminismo, historia intercultural e identidades: Aprendizaje crítico en las aulas de educación secundaria [Ecofeminism, intercultural history and identities: Critical learning in secondary education classrooms] In A. Puleo, G. A. Tapia González, L. Torres San Miguel & A. Velasco Sesma (Eds.), *Hacia una cultura de la sostenibilidad. Análisis y propuestas desde la perspectiva de Género* [Towards a culture of sustainability. Analysis and proposals from the gender perspective] (pp. 495-502). Departamento de Filosofía de la Universidad de Valladolid - Cátedra de Estudios de Género UVA.
- Emcke, C. (2017). *Contra el odio* [Against hate]. Taurus.

- European Commission against Racism and Intolerance. (2016). *Recommendation No. 15 on the fight against hate speech and explanatory memorandum*. <https://bit.ly/3xcnXdP>
- Gagliardone, I., Gal, D., Alves, T., & Martínez, G. (2015). *Countering online hate speech*. UNESCO. <https://cutt.ly/bM3Ao90>
- García, A., & de la Cruz, A. (2017). Coeducación en la formación inicial del profesorado: Una estrategia de lucha contra las desigualdades de género [Coeducation in initial teacher training: A strategy to combat gender inequalities] In R. Martínez, R. García-Moris & C. R. García Ruíz (Eds.), *Investigación en didáctica de las ciencias sociales. Retos preguntas y líneas de investigación* [Research in teaching of the social sciences. Challenges questions and lines of research] (pp. 133-142). AUPDCS-Universidad de Córdoba.
- García, A., & de la Cruz, A. (2019). La didáctica de las Ciencias Sociales y la construcción de masculinidades alternativas: Libros de texto a debate [The didactics of Social Sciences and the construction of alternative masculinities: Textbooks under discussion]. *Clío: History and History Teaching*, (45), 99-115. <https://cutt.ly/xM3Aqne>
- García, C. R. (2018). El discurso del odio: Una investigación en la formación inicial [Hate speech: An investigation in initial training] In E. López Torres, C. García Ruíz & M. Sánchez Agustí (Eds.), *Buscando formas de enseñar: Investigar para innovar en didáctica de las Ciencias Sociales* [Searching for ways to teach: Research to innovate in the teaching of social sciences] (pp. 413-424). Ediciones Universidad de Valladolid - Asociación Universitaria de Profesorado de Didáctica de las Ciencias Sociales AUPDCS.
- Heras-Sevilla, D., Ortega-Sánchez, D., & Rubia, M. (2021). Conceptualización y reflexión sobre el género y la diversidad sexual. Hacia un modelo coeducativo por y para la diversidad [Conceptualization and reflection on gender and sexual diversity. Towards a coeducational model by and for diversity]. *Perfiles Educativos*, (43), 148-65. <https://doi.org/jm87>
- Izquierdo, A. (2019). Literacidad crítica y discurso del odio: Una investigación en educación secundaria [Critical literacy and hate speech: An investigation in secondary education]. *REIDICS. Revista de Investigación en Didáctica de las Ciencias Sociales*, (5), 42-55. <https://doi.org/10.17398/2531-0968.05.42>
- Kattari, S. K., O'Connor, A. A., & Kattari, L. (2018). Development and validation of the transgender inclusive behavior scale (TIBS). *Journal of Homosexuality*, 65(2), 181-96. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00918369.2017.1314160>
- Latorre, A., Arnal, J., & Del Rincón, D. (1994). *Bases metodológicas de la investigación educativa* [Methodological bases of educational research]. Ediciones Experiencia.
- Lingiardi, V., Carone, N., Semeraro, G., Musto, C., D'Amico, M., & Brena, S. (2020). Mapping Twitter hate speech towards social and sexual minorities: A lexicon-based approach to semantic content analysis. *Behaviour & Information Technology*, 39(7), 711-21. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0144929X.2019.1607903>
- Lomas, C. (2002). El sexismo en los libros de texto [Sexism in textbooks] In A. González & C. Lomas (Eds.), *Mujer y educación: Educar para la igualdad, educar desde la diferencia* [Women and education: Educating for equality, educating from difference] (pp. 193-222). Graó.
- Marolla, J. (2019). La inclusión de las mujeres en las clases de historia: Posibilidades y limitaciones desde las concepciones de los y las estudiantes chilenas [The inclusion of women in history classes: Possibilities and limitations from the conceptions of Chilean students]. *Revista Colombiana de Educación*, (77). <https://doi.org/10.17227/rce.num77-6549>
- Marolla-Gajardo, J. (2019). La ausencia y la discriminación de las mujeres en la formación del profesorado de historia y ciencias sociales [The absence and discrimination of women in the training of teachers of history and social sciences]. *Revista Electrónica Educare*, 23(1), 137-57. <https://doi.org/10.15359/ree.23-1.8>
- Marolla-Gajardo, J. (2020). The challenge of women's inclusion for novel teachers. Case study in a teacher educator public university. *Frontiers in Education*, (5), 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feeduc.2020.00091>
- Marolla-Gajardo, J., Castellví, J., & Mendonça, R. (2021). Chilean teacher educators' conceptions on the absence of women and their history in teacher training programmes. A collective case study. *Social Sciences*, 10(3), 1-16. <https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci10030106>
- Massip, M., & Castellví, J. (2019). Poder y diversidad. Los aportes de la Interseccionalidad a la didáctica de las ciencias sociales [Power and diversity. The contributions of Intersectionality to the didactics of social sciences]. *Clío: History and History Teaching*, (45), 139-154. <https://bit.ly/3TYehxu>
- Massip, M., García, C. R., & González-Monfort, N. (2021). Contrariar el odio: Los relatos del odio en los medios digitales y la construcción de discursos alternativos en alumnado de educación secundaria [Countering hate: Hate stories in digital media and the construction of alternative discourses in secondary education students]. *Bellaterra Journal of Teaching & Learning Language & Literature*, (14), 1-19. <https://doi.org/10.5565/rev/jtl3.909>
- Massip, M., & Santisteban, A. (2020). La educación para la ciudadanía democrática en Europa [Education for democratic citizenship in Europe]. *Revista Espaço do Currículo*, (13), 142-152. <https://doi.org/jm86>
- Molet, C., & Bernard, O. (2015). Políticas de género y formación del profesorado: Diez propuestas para un debate [Gender policies and teacher training: Ten proposals for debate]. *Temas de Educación*, 21(1), 119-119. <https://cutt.ly/AM3PLnQ>

- Müller, K., & Schwarz, C. (2020). Fanning the flames of hate: Social media and hate crime. *Journal of the European Economic Association*, 19(4), 2131–2167 <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3082972>
- Neshkovska, S., & Trajkova, Z. (2018). The essential of hate speech. *Teacher*, 14(1), 71-80.
- Ortega-Sánchez, D. (2017). *Las Mujeres en la enseñanza de la historia y de las ciencias sociales: Estudio de caso en formación inicial de maestros y maestras de educación primaria* [Women in the teaching of history and social sciences: A case study in the initial training of primary school teachers] [Doctoral Thesis, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona]. Repositorio Institucional UAB. <https://ddd.uab.cat/record/187752>
- Ortega-Sánchez, D. (2020). *Problemas sociales, identidades excluidas y género en la enseñanza de la Historia. Lección inaugural del curso académico 2020-2021* [Social problems, excluded identities and gender in the teaching of History. Inaugural lesson of the academic year 2020-2021]. Universidad de Burgos.
- Ortega-Sánchez, D., & Pagès, J. (2018). Género y formación del profesorado: Análisis de las guías docentes del área de didáctica de las ciencias sociales [Gender and teacher training: Analysis of the teaching guides in the area of didactics of social sciences]. *Contextos Educativos. Revista de Educación*, (21), 53-66. <https://doi.org/10.18172/con.3315>
- Ortega-Sánchez, D., Pagès, J., Quintana, J., Sanz de la Cal, E., & Anuncibay, R. (2021). Hate speech, emotions and gender identities: A study of social narratives on Twitter with trainee teachers. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 18(8), 1-18. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18084055>
- Ortega-Sánchez, D., & Pagès Blanch, J. (2020). The end-purpose of teaching history and the curricular inclusion of social problems from the perspective of primary education trainee teachers. *Social Sciences*, 9(2), 1-17. <https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci9020009>
- Parekh, B. C. (2006). Hate speech: Is there a case for banning? *Public policy research*, 12(4), 660-671. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1070-3535.2005.00405.x>
- Paz, M. A., Montero-Díaz, J., & Moreno-Delgado, A. (2020). Hate speech: A systematized review. *SAGE Journals*, 10(4), 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244020973022>
- Ranieri, M. (2016). *Populism, Media and Education: Challenging discrimination in contemporary digital societies*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315680903>
- Rodríguez-Gómez, G., Gil-Flores, J., & Garcia-Jimenez, E. (1996). *Metodología de la investigación cualitativa* [Qualitative research methodology]. Aljibe.
- Sakki, I., & Pettersson, K. (2016). Discursive constructions of otherness in populist radical right political blogs. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 46(2), 156-170. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2142>
- Santisteban, A. (2004). Formación de la ciudadanía y educación política [Formation of citizenship and political education] In M. I. Vera-Muñoz & D. Pérez i Pérez (Eds.), *Formación de la ciudadanía: Las TICs y los nuevos problemas* [Education for citizenship: ICT and new problems] (pp. 1-11). AUPDCS.
- Santisteban, A. (2019). La enseñanza de las Ciencias Sociales a partir de problemas sociales o temas controvertidos: Estado de la cuestión y resultados de una investigación [The teaching of social sciences from social problems or controversial topics: State of the art and results of an investigation]. *El Futuro del Pasado: Revista Electrónica de Historia*, 10, 57-79. <https://doi.org/10.14516/fdp.2019.010.001.002>
- Simons, H. (2009). *Case study research in practice*. SAGE. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446268322>
- Sponholz, L. (2016). Islamophobic hate speech: What is the point of counter-speech? the case of Oriana Fallaci and the rage and the pride. *Journal of Muslim Minority Affairs*, 36(4), 502-522. <https://doi.org/jm88>
- Stanley, W. B. (1991). Teacher competence in social studies. In J. P. Shaver (Ed.), *Handbook of research on social studies teaching and learning* (pp. 249-262). MacMillan.
- Triviño, L., & Chaves, E. (2020). Cuando la Postmodernidad es un metarrelato más, ¿en qué educación ciudadana formar al profesorado? [When postmodernity is one more metanarrative, in what citizen education should teachers be trained?] *Revista de Investigación en Didáctica de las Ciencias Sociales*, (7), 82-96. <https://doi.org/10.17398/2531-0968.07.82>
- VanSledright, B. A. (2013). *Assessing historical thinking and understanding: Innovative designs for new standards*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203464632>
- Wineburg, S. (2001). *Historical thinking and other unnatural acts: Charting the future of teaching the past*. Temple University Press. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/20439490>