

Nordidactica – Journal of Humanities and Social Science Education
Dimensions of historical empathy in upper secondary students' essays
Arja Virta & Elina Kouki
Nordidactica 2014:2
ISSN 2000-9879
The online version of this paper can be found at: www.kau.se/nordidactica

Nordidactica
- Journal of Humanities and Social
Science Education

2014:2

Dimensions of historical empathy in upper secondary students' essays

Arja Virta and Elina Kouki

Department of Teacher Education, University of Turku

Abstract: This article examines upper secondary school students' understanding of historical empathy. The focus is on how and to what degree they displayed in their essays historical contextualisation, perspective taking and affective connection. The study was based on the essays written by 96 students, using resource-material that comprised background information and historical sources. The students reflected on the controversial issue of Finnish children who were sent to Sweden during World War II. All the three dimensions of empathy were expressed at some level, but contextualisation was most often superficial. The dimension the students managed best was perspective taking, which was related to the affective dimension of the topic. They also applied psychological terminology to this historical issue. It could be concluded from the findings that students need instruments for and have interest in dealing with sensitive and affective historical issues.

KEYWORDS: HISTORICAL EMPATHY, CONTEXTUALISATION, PERSPECTIVE TAKING, AFFECTIONS IN HISTORY, HISTORY EDUCATION

About the authors: Arja Virta is Professor of History and Social Science Education in the Department of Teacher Education at the University of Turku (Assistentinkatu 5, University of Turku, 20014 Turku, Finland). Her research interests include learning and teaching history and social studies, historical literacy, multicultural education and teacher education. She has long experience of educating history and social studies teachers. She is currently the Vice-President of the International Society for History Didactics. Email: arja.virta@utu.fi

Elina Kouki is Senior Lecturer of Finnish language and Literature Education in the Department of Teacher Education, at the University of Turku, Finland. Her special research interests are concept learning, academic writing, teacher education, curriculum development, and multiliteracy. She is responsible for the education of mother tongue and literature student teachers. Furthermore, she teaches writing to future primary school teachers, as well as academic writing, also to L2 student teachers. Email: elina.kouki@utu.fi

Introduction

Understanding the controversial events of the past can be complicated. As on the level of the present, there can be a multitude of perspectives to a single phenomenon and to people's experiences. Time that has passed can complicate the situation further and making sense of it on the basis of the presentist ideas, without reference to the historical context, can probably lead to misunderstanding. Emotions and moral considerations are often involved in the consideration of controversial issues. The understanding of the multifaceted events of the past requires historical empathy: attention to the general historical context as well as to the perspectives and experience of the people living in that general context.

In the following, we will report on a case study that deals with the upper secondary school students' understanding of a sensitive issue from the years of the Second World War, the evacuation of about 80 000 children from Finland to Sweden in order to give them safe living conditions. This has been a debated issue since the war years. We are interested in the students' capacity to deal with different actors' perspectives on the basis of contradictory source materials, as well as in their understanding of the historical context. More specifically, this study focuses on the experiences of ordinary people: the children and the Finnish and Swedish parents, instead of the political decision-making processes and debates. Since the question was sensitive and dealt with human lives, it can be expected that the students would also present ethical and emotional considerations. Therefore, the data of this case study is analysed using the concept of historical empathy as a frame of reference, including both its cognitive and affective dimensions.

Historical empathy – a multifaceted concept

Historical empathy is a widely used concept in literature dealing with history education. There are various definitions of it, but shortly, it can be defined as the process of putting oneself into the position of the people in the past, understanding their motives and values, as well as seeing their decisions and actions from their own point of view. Historical empathy can be seen as a part of historical thinking, as an achievement and a skill (Ashby and Lee, 1987; Foster, 2001; Barton and Levstik, 2004; Yilmaz, 2007). Some scholars use the term 'empathetic explanation', underlining the purpose of empathy as a means of making sense of the past (Lee and Shemilt, 2011). Bellino and Selman (2012, p. 190) characterise it as 'recognition of the shared humanity among the past and present actors and understanding the differences of the situations and beliefs'. It has been emphasised in research literature that empathy is not imagination, not fantasy, but based on knowledge and analysis of evidence (Dickinson and Lee, 1984; Shemilt, 1984; Seixas, 1996; Foster, 1999). There have been debates about its suitability as an educational objective due to the ambiguity of definitions, ahistorical tasks that were used for this purpose, and the problem of

really reaching the ideas and intentions people had in the past (Jenkins, 1991; Harris and Foreman-Beck, 2004; Kitson, Husbands and Steward, 2011). However, empathy seems to have made a comeback to the research on history education (Brooks, 2008, 2009, 2011; Endacott, 2010; Lee and Shemilt, 2011; Bellino and Selman, 2012; Endacott and Brooks, 2013).

Historical empathy is not a way of thinking that either exists or not, but there can be various forms or levels of it. According to Ashby and Lee's (1987) well-known model, children first tend to think that the past cannot be explained rationally, but that people were stupid when they did not act as we do (*the 'divi' past*). Then, some kind of empathy is observed on the second level, characterised as *generalised stereotypes*, where the differences between the past and the present are explained on the basis of conventional ideas. The third step, *everyday empathy*, is an attempt to rational explanations, however projecting present feelings and ideas in the past. The fourth is *restricted historical empathy*, wherein the past action is explained (partly) on the basis of conditions, beliefs and values, but not totally combined with the general atmosphere of the period. The most challenging form is called *contextual historical empathy*, in which a clear distinction is made between what we know and what was known then. It has proved to be difficult for students to reach the level of contextual empathy, especially to understand the historical context (Lee and Shemilt, 2011).

The definitions of historical empathy differ in terms of scope and dimensions. For some authors, empathy is a way to rationally understand the people of the past and their perspectives. For instance, Foster (1999) underlines the cognitive nature of empathy as perspective taking, and as a process of explaining the decisions and actions of the past, understanding the context, seeing the difference between the past and the present and understanding the complexity of human action (Foster, 2001; Doppen, 2000; Kitson et al., 2011).

An alternative is to emphasise the emotional and affective dimensions of historical empathy. The emotional approach to the past may make it easier for adolescents to understand and gain interest about the past (Kitson et al., 2011, p. 68). This is also related to the broader issue of emotional and ethical aspects in historical understanding (Bellino and Selman, 2012; cf. von Borries, 2014, p. 31 ff.). In history education, ethical considerations or emotions have not been favoured due to the risk of enhancing moralism or uncritical and subjective attitudes instead of critical examination of evidence (Boix-Manzilla, 2000; Peterson, 2011). However, moral values and emotions cannot be avoided because history education deals with human destinies. This has become evident recently in the discussions on historical reparations and apologies – if the dark past can be judged – and how to deal with past cruelties and injustices or wrong decisions (Löfström, 2012, 2013). Although the emotional aspect is epistemologically difficult, the complexity of human action is not fully grasped without understanding that the people of the past were also emotional beings. Bellino and Selman (2012, p. 190) conclude that 'the interdisciplinary study of how human history is learned hinges on the socio-emotional dimensions of empathetic processes. Historical empathy entails recognition of the shared humanity among the past and the present actors, as well as an awareness of the often irreconcilable

differences between actors' world views and the way they interpret and exercise their agency'.

Another way of seeing empathy is to accept its dual – both objective and subjective – character, and trying to understand the context as well as the actors' position and feelings (Brooks, 2011; Endacott, 2010; Kohlmeier, 2006; Endacott and Brooks, 2013). Endacott and Brooks (2013, p. 41) define historical empathy as a dual-dimensional construct that includes both cognitive and affective dimensions. This resembles the distinction Barton and Levstik (2004) made between the approaches to empathy as perspective recognition and as caring for the people in the past. Empathy, as a general socio-psychological concept, is also dual dimensional, embracing perspective taking and understanding affections. The specific question for historical empathy is historical contextualisation, applying knowledge about the historical situation and the conditions, beliefs and values of the past (van Boxtel and van Drie, 2004; van Drie and van Boxtel, 2008; Lévesque, 2008), understanding that 'knowing the past is not like knowing the present' (Lowenthal, 2000, p. 64).

Endacott and Brooks (2013, pp. 42–45) present a conceptualisation of historical empathy that includes both cognitive and affective dimensions of empathy:

- historical contextualisation: 'a temporal sense of difference that includes a deep understanding of the social, political and cultural norms of the time period under investigation, as well as of knowledge of the events leading up to the historical situation and other relevant events that happened concurrently'
- perspective taking: 'understanding of another's prior lived experience, principles, positions, attitudes and beliefs in order to understand how that person might have thought about the situation in question'
- affective connection: 'consideration on how the historical figure's lived experiences, situations or actions may have been influenced by their affective response based on the connection made to one's own similar yet different life experiences'. (Cf. Barton and Levstik, 2004, pp. 215–218.)

These aspects are not mutually exclusive but interrelated. Combining them can provide a deeper and more holistic understanding of events or problems of the past. In our analysis of students' responses to a controversial historical issue we use this three-dimensional conceptualisation of empathy as the frame of reference. This model emphasises the crucial approaches to sensitive historical issues: understanding the context, different perspectives, and emotions.

The challenges of diagnosing historical empathy

Notwithstanding the problems and criticisms, historical empathy is a widely researched dimension of history education. Many scholars have approached it with an emphasis on cognitive perspective taking, which is closely related to the skill of historical contextualising. These studies have often dealt with crucial and contradictory historical decisions, such as Chamberlain's solution on the negotiations

in Munich (Foster, 1999), Truman and the atomic bomb (Doppen, 2000) or the decision-making behind the Cuban crisis (Rantala, 2011). When the focus is on ordinary people's destinies under challenging conditions, the interpretation of empathy becomes more affective. This line of empathy research deals for instance with women's history (Kohlmeier, 2006) or with prisoners in concentration camps (Riley, 1998). Our study belongs to the latter category.

Students' capacity for historical empathy has been tackled using versatile methods and materials. Some researchers have used written assignments (Brooks, 2008) that are often based on source materials, while some others used simulations (Rantala, 2011), combinations of classroom research, observations and interviews (Brooks, 2008, 2011), Socratic seminars (Kohlmeier, 2006), narratives (Endacott, 2010), thinking aloud sessions based on documents (Doppen, 2000), or teachers' reasoning (Cunningham, 2007).

It can be difficult to assess whether and to what degree students have reached historical empathy. Their written products may not reveal it if the students only want to present ideas which they think are expected and favoured. Differences in verbal capacity, as well as situational motivation, may obscure the findings. Furthermore, it may be easiest to assess cognitive reasoning than the affective dimensions of empathy presented in the students' outcomes (Harris & Foreman-Beck, 2004).

Language – written or spoken – is crucial in assessing and expressing historical empathy. Each school subject has specific linguistic features. Recently, researchers have paid attention to the linguistic characteristics of history (Unsworth, 2001; Coffin, 2006; Shananan and Shananan, 2008). Rantala and van den Berg (2013) define historical literacy as capacity to work with documents that deal with the past, to read and analyse and to produce effective interpretations of the documents and their purpose. Additionally, another side of literacy is the skill of writing about historical topics, not only in a 'knowledge telling' way by repeating what is in the document, but also 'transforming knowledge', interpreting the messages of sources (Scardamalia and Bereiter, 1986). Coffin (2006) has analysed students' writing in history on the basis of extensive text corpus. It is typical that the level of abstraction becomes higher with age and students move from narrative writing towards more argumentative writing. They tend to describe more historical processes and structures than individuals as actors. It is also important that students read different documents and learn to see the multiplicity of perspectives (Monte-Sano, 2011). One of the strengths of empathy-based writing is that it challenges the students to make conclusions about the historical situation and think about the individual who wrote the documents. Through the writing process, they are expected to see history as something else than just a fixed set of facts.

Conduction of the study

It has been pointed out that a good starting point for mobilising students' curiosity in empathy tasks is a mystery or an unresolved debate that they have to reflect on

(Kohlmeier, 2006; Barton and Levstik, 2004). The task and the source material used in this study fulfil this requirement because the upper secondary school students were asked to write about the child evacuations. This complicated, emotionally engaging issue is relevant for the history course, although it is not perhaps discussed in depth in ordinary lessons. Also textbooks tend to deal with it shortly, for instance using pictures of children waiting for transport or sitting in a vehicle with a name tag around their necks (Virta, 2009). Furthermore, previous research (Ahonen, 1998; Torsti, 2012) indicates that Finnish people considered the Second World War as a highly significant period in their national history.

Research Questions

On the basis of the conceptualisation of historical empathy (Endacott and Brooks, 2013), we examine how upper secondary students deal with the different components of historical empathy, contextualisation, perspective taking, and the affective connection to the topic. The study focuses on the perspectives of those people who experienced the evacuations, instead of analysing the decision making processes of politicians or authorities. The research questions are following:

1. What is the level of historical contextualisation in the upper secondary students' reflections?
2. How do they deal with a historical phenomenon that is sensitive and humane from the different actors' perspectives?
3. How and to what degree do they indicate affective connection to the topic?

A more comprehensive question that can be answered on the basis of questions 1 through 3 is to what degree and in which form the respondents express historical empathy in their essays.

The participants

The participants of this study were from one large upper secondary school in Southwestern Finland. The school also offers an International Baccalaureate (IB). The academic level of the groups ranged from very good to satisfactory.

The number of participants was 96 (58 females, 38 males). Two of the five groups consisted of IB program students. Two of the groups were in the first year. The other two were in the second year and one was comprised of third year students who were about 16–19 years old. Five students had obvious difficulties in Finnish. The school often participates in research due to its role as a university teacher training school. Consequently, parents' consent for children's participation in research is required at the beginning of school. The data was treated anonymously, and the essays were marked with codes (R1: 1, 2...; R5: 1, 2, 3...) that refer to the groups and students in alphabetical order.

The writing task and the materials

The historical topic of the students' assignment dealt with was the evacuation of Finish children to Sweden. This activity started during the Winter War in 1939–1940 on the basis of the Swedish initiative and the approval of the Finnish Social Ministry. It reached its peak in the latter part of the war, in 1941–1944. The child transports from Finland were not exceptional, but the duration of the evacuation was long and the number of children large. The repatriation of the children was not without problems, both on a political and personal level. Many of the evacuated children had good experiences during their years in Sweden. However, during the past few decades, there has been much debate about the unfavourable human and emotional consequences of child transportations. (Cf. Saffle, 2004; Korppi-Tommola, 2008; Kavén, 2010.)

The participants received a resource material that was six pages long. They were given 75 minutes to read the resource material and write their essays. The following background information about the context was given for refreshing and complementing the contents of history lessons:

Tens of thousands of children were sent from Finland to Sweden during the Second World War (1939–1944), because the Swedes wanted to help Finland that was suffering from the war. These children are called “war children”. Finnish authorities considered these transportations as a good solution under the unstable circumstances, because this would offer them safe conditions of living. Transportation was mainly organised by a specific committee for child transports in Finland.

Those children who were evacuated were to a great deal those whose fathers had died or become wounded in the war, or who had lost their homes in the bombings. However, the reasons for the evacuation were not always examined, only mother's opinion was decisive. The number of children who were sent to Sweden became far larger than was planned: approximately 80 000 children. All did not come back, because part of them were adopted or taken as foster children by Swedish families. Children were also sent to Denmark.

The evacuation of children from Finland was criticised already during the war years, and it is still a controversial issue. It has been debated, for instance, if the evacuations were ethically right or necessary.

The material consisted of affective and intimate memoirs, descriptions of the children's positive and negative experiences during the evacuation, an authentic letter from a Finnish mother to her son in Sweden during the war, a citation from a war time newspaper, an excerpt from a recent internet discussion, and a summary of a PhD thesis about war children's experiences during and after the war. The resource material was purposefully constructed with an emphasis on children and their biological and foster parents.

The writing task for the students was the following:

Consider the decision of the Finnish Government to send children to Sweden as ‘war children’. Pay attention to different stakeholders’ perspectives (children’s, the

biological parents' and Swedish foster parents') using the documents attached, according to your choice. From what point of view was it a good decision, and what problems did it cause? Justify your conclusions on the basis of the resource material. Formulate the topic for your essay (for instance: 'Finnish children sent to Sweden from the war – help and its consequences').

Data was collected during mother tongue lessons, because it was easier to adapt into the language schedule than on the history schedule, although the topic was historical. The form and contents of the resource material were relevant for the objectives of both school subjects, because the participants are used to analysing documents as well in history as mother tongue education.

Method

The student essays were in most cases fairly long (up to four hand-written pages). Analysing this open-ended data was challenging, especially because the students' approaches were quite diverse. All in all, the essay data was very rich and multi-faceted, yielding many perspectives from which they can be analysed (for instance, on the students' approach to using evidence or constructing their arguments). In this article, we will focus on one main feature of the essays: how and to which degree the students dealt with the different aspects of historical empathy. The approach of analysis is abductive by its nature, using the three-dimensional model of empathy (Endacott and Brooks, 2013) as the background.

In the beginning, the data were read several times to look for answers systematically. We examined what modes of contextualisation were expressed in the essays, how different actors' perspectives were dealt with and to what degree affective or ethical stance was visible. We also created categorisations and summarising tables, describing the various aspects of the data.

Our approach to the data was qualitative. However, frequencies were counted in some aspects to make the structure of the data more comprehensible. For instance, the levels of contextualisation, as well as how many of the students paid attention to various actors' perspectives, were counted. Students' opinions about the child transportations (negative, affirming, unresolved or just repeating facts) were also worth counting because we wanted to find out what types of statements included affective expressions.

To confirm the reliability of our analysis and interpretations, we first decided about the principles of classification after reading the essay data. Then, we categorised the data. The classifications were checked. The questions we posed pertaining to the data seemed to be fairly clear, as the classifications done by the two researchers were almost identical, with few exceptions. In such cases, the classifications were checked in accordance with the criteria.

Findings: three dimensions of empathy in students' essays

Contextualisation in the students' essays

The analysis of the student essays was started with an examination on how they contextualised the sending of the Finnish children to Sweden with the circumstances of the Second World War. The categories of contextualisation were created based on the data, focusing on how the child transportations were related to the war time circumstances. The most developed thinking is expressed in essays where the students indicate an understanding of the conditions in which the decisions were made (norms, beliefs, risk of hindsight). In the minimum, it is limited to the implicit understanding of war time.

It is obvious that all the respondents understood that the conditions were exceptional when the parents decided to send their children to Sweden. However, most of them did not pay significant attention to the context in general, but took it as a self-evident background condition and started quite promptly to describe the phenomenon from various participants' perspectives.

TABLE 1.

Contextualisation (n= 96)

How the context is expressed in the essay		Frequency
War / implicit, in the background (not mentioned)		2
War, mentioned		26
Reference to the conditions in Finland during the Second World War (shortly)		61
	The poor conditions, war time	(29)
	As above, misunderstandings, mistakes or exaggeration	(10)
	Finnish conditions described, comparison to Sweden	(22)
Understanding the decisions on the basis of the situation / seeing the difference / seeing the risks of hindsight		7

On the whole, there were only a handful of students who elaborated further the influence of the chaotic war-time conditions, under which the parents had to make their decisions about sending their children to Sweden. Some students explicated the

idea that it must be distinguished between the way in which people nowadays see the decision and how people saw the situation during the war. They tried to understand how the parents were likely to think when they were considering their alternatives. This kind of thinking, however, occurred only in very few texts (as shown in Table 1).

To criticise old decisions afterwards is strange, because now we know the progression and results of the war, but on the moment they [the parents] made their decisions, they did not know. Although, on the basis of the present knowledge, it was not obviously necessary to send children [to Sweden], at least in so great numbers, how could the parents that time have known it. All in all, being afraid of the worst and trying to protect children of it seems to have been a highly human decision. (G4:17)

Whether you are for or against that solution, it should be remembered that it was a situation of war, and decisions are made on the basis of knowledge and opportunities that were available then. (G1:7)

The quotes above belong to the most evident examples of historical contextualisation in the data. Most responses included only superficial references to the context. In the minimum, there was no direct reference to the conditions, but an implicit understanding that children were sent to Sweden because of the unsafe war time conditions in Finland. In about a fourth of the essays, the war was mentioned as a background factor and a clear majority of the respondents described shortly the conditions. As shown in Table 1, different ways were used to describe the conditions. Some only described the bad and scary conditions in Finland during the war years, while some made comparisons to Sweden, which remained neutral and wealthy and therefore was able to offer safe homes to the Finnish children. Some essays included misunderstandings or mistakes about the Finnish history in the Second World War. For instance, some thought that the 'war children' issue was limited to the period of the Winter War, the first part of the Finnish participation in the Second World War. Some students called the whole war Winter War or wrote that Finland was allied with Russia [instead of fighting against the Soviet Union]. Some essays gave the impression that the writer thought that the whole of Finland was a battlefield, although the fights directly took place in the southeastern and northern parts. Two of the essays were written in a style that could be characterised as satiric and anachronistic.

Students' perspective taking

The main task in the assignment was to examine the question of 'war children' from different perspectives, which were specified to individuals and families (children, their biological Finnish parents and Swedish foster parents). This part of the instructions was followed quite regularly from several perspectives. All three perspectives were included in the 72 essays (75%). All respondents took the perspective of the children, and this perspective was in general discussed in more breadth and depth than the two others, which was not surprising because the children were in focus. As many as 88 respondents (92%) additionally took the perspective of the biological, Finnish parents. Around 75 (78%) took the perspective of the Swedish

foster parents. In cases where there were only the perspectives of the child and one of the families, it was in most cases that of the Finns. Six essays dealt merely with the children's perspective. As a whole, there were also qualitative differences in the way the perspectives were dealt with. In some essays, however, the children's perspective was dealt somewhat superficially. Furthermore, some of the students dealt with the intentions and perspectives of the Swedish and Finnish decision-makers, who opened the opportunity to send the children to Sweden.

The following quotes are examples wherein all the perspectives, except the official one, were dealt with:

It was difficult for the children to come back [to Finland], and their attachment to their Swedish foster parents made it difficult to leave. A permanent nurse is important in childhood, and if that person is changing many times, it can be detrimental for a devoted relation. It was unfair for the child and the Swedish parents that they had to be separated, but worse still had it been for the biological parents if the child had stayed in Sweden. (G4:8)

When reading about the war children, you get a feeling that everybody was suffering. The parents lose their child, only for a moment. The foster parents lost the child that they had only for a moment. The children lose their homes and their identity and have to adopt all the time something new – even when going home. (G2:4)

Children's perspective

Quite naturally, the children's perspective was dealt with in all the essays and, in general, more thoroughly than the other perspectives. The aspects that were discussed were the children's experience, feelings and needs as well as the consequences evacuation had for them. In this discussion, the students pointed out both the problems and the benefits. The children's point of view was mainly discussed as a question of safety and care. They were saved from living in the middle of the war. They needed not be afraid of the bombings and they obtained better food, toys and care. In some cases, however, the respondents exaggerated the poverty of Finland.

Children's thoughts are simple. What they need is safety and love. Whoever they feel is giving this, children consider as the parents. Whether they were biological ones or not (G2:22)

The essays focused on the children's experiences, and their problems of adjustment, first when they arrived in Sweden and then when they returned to Finland. Furthermore, the children were not discussed as actors in this process, but as objects or victims who were obliged to encounter the decisions that others made for them.

The Finnish biological parents made the decisions about their children's destinies, and in many cases that was not good. The children were suffering when they left, they learnt to live with the Swedish culture and families, and suffered again breaking their second family. The children were suffering also when they came back to Finland, when Finnish children did not accept them as equals. For the Swedish foster families it was not good that the children were sent to Finland. (G2:11)

One of the key questions that the upper secondary students often pointed out was that the children's opinions were not asked and the children were not informed about the decision.

In the middle of all that chaos and fighting, one important question was forgotten. That is asking children about their opinions. They were treated as things that are to be sold, name tag round the neck, pushing from one train to another, and nobody asks or explains properly where you were going and for how long a time. (G1:16)

It was only the adults who decided about sending the children from one country to another and afterwards required them to come back. More than half of the respondents (54/96) mentioned that the children were not heard or informed and that their opinion was not asked. Considering this, most of them did not mention that in many cases the children were quite small. However, it is likely that many of the Finnish parents asked their children if they were willing to travel to Sweden.

Taking into consideration the age of the respondents, it is understandable that they focused on the children's perspective. They have probably discussed the Convention on the Rights of the Child in social studies or history lessons. Although this is a very crucial point of view, it is somewhat anachronistic, considering the war years, because there were no vital discussions regarding the rights of the child that time. This resembles Rantala's (2010) observation, where some of the teacher students discussed the Cuban Crisis in an empathy-based simulation, expressing opinions that echoed the ideology of peace education.

Finnish biological parents' perspective

Most respondents wrote that they understood the position of the Finnish parents and their reasons for sending their children to Sweden – on the one hand, the economic difficulties and shortage of food; on the other hand, unsafety, fear of the war and the wish to give their children better conditions for living. Some students expressed over-empathetic attitudes as if the parents had no other alternative than to send their children to Sweden (G1:10).

The parents were certain that they saved the lives of their children when they sent them to better conditions. The children's risk of dying in war decreases, but there was no guarantee that the parents could get them back. The parents did not anticipate that the children could become attached to their foster parents, get used to the language and the country and probably not want to return to Finland. Neither did they anticipate that the foster parents could become attached to the children and not want to send them back. (G2:23)

Heart breaking return – feeling that your child is a stranger when coming back. (G4:4)

Furthermore, also in the parents' perspective, the students often wrote about feelings – the relief in knowing that the children were safe, believing that their lives would be saved – and the pain the parents felt upon leaving their children. Some

respondents were, however, critical of the parents. Criticism was not only about the decision to send the children to Sweden on the basis of economic reasons, but also about requiring them to come back to Finland causing them new problems of adjustment:

I think that the biological parents lose their rights to the children at the very moment they send them away. However, I had certainly also given my child away. A strong motherly love seeks for the child's best, although it would be abandoning him/her. (G1:18)

Swedish foster parents' perspective

The comments on the Swedish parents were more sparse and shorter than those regarding the Finnish counterparts, perhaps because there was not much in the sources written directly from their point of view. Comments about them were mainly positive, more positive than those about the Finnish parents. The respondents in most cases wrote that the Swedish parents had been unselfish and open-hearted when they volunteered to take the Finnish children to their homes. They were in the position to offer the children safer and wealthier conditions for living. Life with these families was often described as idyllic and warm. Some respondents simplified the cases. The foster family was characterised as idyllic, and it was always a joy to have the child. Only few of the students remarked that all foster parents were not necessarily friendly, loving or able to offer good conditions ('Foster family is not always a paradise', G1:12). Furthermore, the Swedish foster parents were also characterised as those who suffered. Many students wrote that the situation was unfair from their point of view – when the Swedish foster parents had become fond of the children, they had to send them back to the biological parents. Only in relatively few cases, those who wanted to adopt the foster child were permitted to do it.

The official perspective

Although the instructions underlined the human actors' perspectives, some respondents also paid attention to the authorities and the governments as some kind of background factor behind the individual decision-making. This was relevant because child transportation had a Swedish initiative as a starting point and was based on the agreements between the Swedish and Finnish authorities. In the essays, there were several approaches to the official level of the issue. Some students emphasised the rational explanations behind the authorities' decision to permit child transports from Finland to Sweden. They used political justifications, such as this activity strengthened the ties between the two countries. The transports were also seen as positive on the basis of demographic reasons (population policy, according the terminology of Source 6). These rationales have been discussed in historical research as well (Kavén, 2010).

In this respect, some respondents exaggerated the situational reasons: 'By transferring the children to a safe place, the government was able to concentrate itself on the war.' (G2:1). This quote included a misunderstanding that the children were

directly living in the battlefields. Another dramatic exaggeration was the following: 'If Russia had won the war, there would have been no more Finns officially, with the exception of the children [that were sent to Sweden]' (G4:22). Another student wrote as if all the children were sent abroad. These over-rationalising explanations were interesting exceptions, as attempts to understand without much contextual knowledge.

Another line of reasoning was that the parents had to send their children because the authorities required them to do so. The parents were, however, the final decision-makers. The political decisions enabled them to send their children. Some respondents' interpretation was that the individual people were not responsible, but that it was the official level that was to be blamed.

It was the authorities who saw that transporting children to Sweden would be good, because that would enable them to get good conditions for living. Just like nowadays, the authorities' understanding of what is good can be different from the idea of "an ordinary citizen". (G4: 10)

Furthermore, there were many critical comments on the authorities' decision to permit the child transports, which was described as a major political mistake.

Students' affective connection to the topic

The respondents' way of dealing with the various perspectives was often closely related to affections. Instead of analysing the sources, they often described critically and emotionally the phenomenon as such. The affections were considered from the point of view of all the three groups of people, their experiences, feelings and the processes they went through. The emotional aspects were most powerful in the children's perspective, but visible also in those of the parents.

Styles of writing about emotions

The students' styles of writing about emotions were classified into different categories. For instance, if an emotional text has a moralising tone, it was classified as a moralising text. Each essay was classified under one category, only if they fall under the following bases of dealing with the affective connection:

- no affective expressions, only statements of facts
- emotions/emotional processes are mentioned or very shortly described
- emotions are analysed or described broadly; neutral expressions
- emotional expressions are used
- language is emotional, moral statements are included

The following short quotes exemplify the classifications:

It caused pain to all stakeholders, especially to children. (G1:5, negative opinion, neutral expression)

Sending a child to the unknown without paying attention to her/his feelings is crude. (G3:1, negative opinion, moralizing expression)

It ended up with a happy home coming. (G1:2; positive opinion, emotional expression)

Worst in all this was perhaps that they did not tell...In such a big question, having a strong influence on children's lives, they should have asked their opinions. (G2:19, negative opinion, moralising expression)

Doing this was finally an indication of the parents' immoral and indifferent attitude towards their children. (G2:23, neutral opinion in the essay, moralising expression)

We can do nothing about the past; we ought to just learn about the previous times. (G1:19, neutral opinion as to evacuation, but generally normative)

Despite the general moral attitude, the respondent G2:23 did not judge whether the decision was bad or not. Another type of moral stance was expressed when the student pondered how people in the present could learn from the past and avoid similar mistakes. In spite of this moral tone, the respondent did not articulate whether she thought that the decision was wrong or right.

The following quote indicates a thorough empathetic reflection, but without deeper historical contextualisation or contextual empathy (cf. Ashby and Lee, 1987). The student placed himself into the position of the child, as well as on the position of the biological and foster parents, elaborating the personal feelings and analysing them from a different stakeholder's point of view.

If I at the age of five had been told, or if it was left unsaid, that I will be sent to Sweden for a couple of years, away from all my friends, I had certainly resisted. But afterwards I had certainly not been bitter. It is, indeed, an early age to be separated from one's mother, but it is the mother who has power to decide. It is a hard blow to give up with your mother, but you will be on your feet soon again. -- If I as a parent should give away my child, it would not be easy. In that situation my feelings and thoughts would be contradictory. I would certainly give after to my thinking, and let my child go, if it would be better to him/her. I would be worried. I would probably be unable to sleep. (G1:9)

This example from one student's systematic reflections describes feelings, not emotionally, but rather in an analytical style. The conclusions can be seen as expressions 'shared humanity' – imagining how a person in a similar situation would feel.

Emotions and judgements

The essays were classified into four categories according to how the students judged the justification or rationality of sending the children to Sweden. One category included those who described or reflected on both the good and less favourable consequences, particularly of those who clearly described only the bad or only the good points of view and those who just repeated the facts mentioned in the text without reference at all to the justifications or consequences to the stakeholders. The last mentioned category was very small. Relatively few respondents presented only favourable and beneficial consequences and conditions, while about 40% focused on the negative sides of the phenomenon. Almost frequently, the students described both the negative and positive points of view. In this category, where the students actually

followed the instructions, most of them did not make a definite resolution on whether it was good or bad.

The 'one – other hand' category was additionally analysed into those who, after pondering the various aspects, made a final conclusion about the quality of the phenomenon. Three of them, however, after presenting various points of view, ended up with the conclusion that it was not right or rational to send children abroad during the war. Seven others made the opposite conclusion.

Table 2 is a cross-tabulation how the respondents wrote about feelings (see above), and how they judged the justification or rationality of evacuating children.

TABLE 2.

The affective dimension of empathy in the essays, including different judgements about child transportations

	ambivalent: presenting both positive and negative consequences	negative conclusion (presents negative consequences)	positive conclusion (presents benefits)	repeating facts, no reference to quality of decision	total
facts, external traits (no direct emotional expressions)	4	-	1	1	6
feelings are mentioned, shortly described	12	5	2	3	22
analysis or thorough description of feelings	15	12	5	-	32
emotional expressions	5	7	5	-	17
moralising tones connected as a rule to affective expressions	2	16	1	-	21
Total	38	40	14	4	96

The styles of dealing with emotions are represented differently across different categories of conclusions. Strong emotional expressions were observed most frequently in the essays that regarded the decision as a mistake. The analytical style or short statements of emotions were divided among different opinion categories. Surprisingly, many of these upper secondary students powerfully casted themselves into the emotional use of the language. This tone was possibly in part based on the nature of the phenomenon. It can as well be explained by the nature of the sources, some of which were affective and intimate memories. The students may have done it as unexperienced historians, relying on their sources and letting the sources and their tones guide their argumentation.

Psychological approach to the phenomenon

When the respondents described the emotional sides of the decisions, remarkably many of them used psychological concepts. There were 50 (52%) students who used one or more of these specific psychological or socio-psychological concepts, such as *trauma, traumatising, separation anxiety, anxiety, depression, panic, stress, identity, cultural shock* and *integration*. Still, more usual was the general manner of psychologising the question, also without using the aforementioned concepts. However, all essays including emotional language did not apply specific psychological concepts and the use of psychological concepts did not make the text emotional. This conceptual apparatus was often used in some analytical texts as well.

When I hear the word 'war child', another word jumps into my mind: trauma. (G1:7)

Moving alone to a foreign country was certainly a highly stressful and traumatising experience for many of them. (G1:8)

All this certainly, in some level, made the children's minds tragic. (G3:4)

Undeniably, the evacuation of the war children could be an affective, traumatising experience covered with separation anxiety. However, only one of the documents of the resource-material directly mentioned psychological terms and the mental problems the transportations caused to the children. Paradoxically, the students used their arsenal of psychological words, while the historical context was quite superficial in the essays. The high frequency of the psychological concepts could be a result of psychology education or everyday communication. The use of concepts, such as identity, integration or culture shock, could also be related to the current debates on migration and the integration of the newcomers. The students were, in a way, trying to understand a historical phenomenon, the 'war children', with an analogy to the migrant or refugee children of the present, a comparison that is in principle understandable and relevant.

Conclusions

The levels of empathy are often described holistically, for instance using Ashby and Lee's (1987) classification of empathy into different levels. These levels can be found also in the essay data of this study, although most essays obviously have some characteristics of more levels than just one. Some responses that included strong moral comments without any reference to the circumstances resembled the "*divi past*" category. There were also some obvious examples of everyday empathy. For instance, two of the respondents drew parallels between the feelings of the war children and those of the exchange students. One of the students suggested an analogy between the war children and the children who have been taken over by social workers in the present times because the parents are unable to take care of their children. This student used the negative experience of her friend as comparison. Some responses, which were obviously written by students with foreign background, saw parallels with the experience of today's migrants, for instance the lack of interpretation services. More clear-cut examples of contextual or at least limited contextual empathy can also be found in the texts where the student pointed out that the decisions were made on the premises of the war times' beliefs and conditions. This level was attained by very few respondents, most of which can be seen as a representation of more restricted historical empathy or common sense.

In this study, Endacott and Brooks' (2013) conceptualisation of the dimensions of empathy offered an alternative approach for examining the structure and different constituents of empathy, as such as they were articulated in the upper secondary students' assignments about a controversial historical issue. With this as the starting point, the purpose of the study was to examine, how the three dimensions of historical empathy (contextualisation, perspective taking, and affective connection) were expressed in the data.

In most essays, all these dimensions were expressed to some degree. The students displayed both subjective and objective approaches to historical empathy, using perspective taking and affective connection to the past. The dimension that they managed best was perspective taking, in relation to the affective dimension but most often, and they seemed to feel or express the shared humanity of the past (Bellino & Selman, 2012). Historical contextualisation of the perspectives was the weakest dimension in their reasoning, although all the respondents seemed to understand the war-time circumstances as the background of the phenomenon. Deeper contextualisation requires knowledge about the context under which the people acted and not judging them according to the present day assumptions. This approach was articulated only by few students.

This is not surprising as such, because several authors commenting on students' historical reasoning have noticed that they often lack knowledge about the historical background. As Lowenthal (2000, p. 74) wrote, 'Our hardest task as teachers is to keep antiquity accessible while stressing its ineffable strangeness'. It is important to see both the similarity and the distance of the past from the present. It may be difficult for the students to understand much on the basis of one or few pieces of evidence

without deeper knowledge of the background. Halldén (1994) refers to this with the expression learning paradox. The paradox is that the more we know, the more we can learn. There should be a framework for understanding it. The previous history lessons and the resource material perhaps formed a thin historical context only.

The assignments were written during mother tongue lessons and were not directly embedded in the context of history education. This can partly explain the weakness of contextualisation in the form of the historical framework. The task used in this study resembled material-based writing assignments that are typical of mother tongue education. Assignments in mother tongue lessons are thus not limited to writing fiction. Furthermore, the resource-material also matched the method of using evidence in history lessons, with the purpose of training the skills of critical thinking, although the material was larger. Open-ended essays, in which respondents are expected to compare contradictory evidence, are common in history education. However, more unusual is the manner of dealing with moral, ethical or emotional issues related to historical events (Löfström, 2013).

The respondents were obviously not fluent in contextualising the sources or using historical knowledge for contextualising the phenomenon, although they were accustomed to the analysis and interpretation to some degree. Instead, some of them tended to criticise past decisions using moral reasons. It was also fairly common that the respondents explained human behaviour of the past with the help of psychological and socio-psychological terms. This thinking resembles Halldén's (1994) concept 'alternative frameworks', when the students use different types of explanations than was expected. They also projected more recent lines of reasoning to the historical context. For instance, they underlined the negligence of children's opinions, which resembles the rhetoric of Children's Rights, and they referred to the current discussions on migration, identity and integration. Some of them discussed this phenomenon more as a general human question, however superficially connecting it to its historical framework. This reasoning resembles the level of everyday empathy in Ashby and Lee's (1987) categorisation, i.e. applying present ideas to the past.

Furthermore, the focus on the psychological processes may be related to a conclusion for a number of previous studies, underlining adolescents and young people's tendency to explain historical events mainly on the basis of individual activity and intentional reasons, instead of using contextual and structural explanations (e.g. Halldén 1986, 1994; Bermúdez and Yaramillo, 2001; Lee, Dickinson and Ashby, 2001). Löfström (2012, 2013) and van den Berg (2007) have also remarked this tendency.

Training historical empathy has in Finland been seen to belong more to earlier stages of school. It is not mentioned in the National Core Curriculum for Upper Secondary School in 2003. However, the findings of this study suggest that purposeful examination of the various dimensions of empathy would be relevant for upper secondary students. The empathetic and individual stance to history makes sense to upper secondary students, as well. Furthermore, these essays open a window into students' way of dealing with historical problems from the affective and humane approach. This data may also tell about everyday historical thinking or common

history-inspired attitudes, the manner by which individuals react to a historical event when they have not been prepared to analyse it on the basis of deeper studies. Their way of dealing with the topic may resemble the lay debates on history, which could be an indicator of historical atmosphere of a society (cf. Torsti, 2012).

It is possible that the students' tendency to the moral and emotional expressions was based on the fact that they began to feel for the war children instead of feeling with them. It may have been more sympathy for them than empathy for various stakeholders (Endacott and Brooks 2013, p. 46) and that they projected their own feelings to that situation instead of understanding others' feelings. Using strong emotional language does not, however, necessarily imply that the respondents loaded emotions to the text, but the conclusions about their emotions are indirect. Many of the respondents expressed an unresolved attitude as to the justification of child evacuations, but there were a large number of those who saw this as mainly a negative decision. It was also easy to agree with Bellino and Selman's (2012) conclusion that there is not a clear way to deal with historical thinking related to ethical issues. There is a clear risk regarding unhistorical conclusions and on the application of conventional everyday ethics on totally different circumstances.

What Löffström (2013) saw as implications of his study on the upper secondary school students' ideas on historical reparations are relevant as practical conclusions from this data as well. We need to pay more attention to the historical conditions and structures and focus on the skills of contextualisation, although this is not all. It is also necessary to discuss in the history lesson the moral and ethical implications of the past decisions. History is not neutral. Many questions are controversial and sensitive and the tradition of dealing with this kind of issues is not established in our schools. Issues that have human relevance should also be tackled, as they seem to make sense for the young.

Contextual historical empathy might then be an answer, combining the context and individual perspectives and beliefs. However, perspective taking and multiperspectivity should not lead to the adoption of a purely neutral relativism and understanding and accepting every perspective when dealing with for instance injustices. Therefore, history education should also include these approaches to the past and give students instruments for dealing with humane, controversial and sensitive questions.

References

Ahonen, S. (1998). *Historiaton sukupolvi. Historian vastaanotto ja historiallisen identiteetin rakentuminen 1990-luvun nuorison keskuudessa*. Helsinki: Finnish Historical Association.

Ashby, R. & Lee, P. (1987). Children's concepts of empathy and understanding in history. In C. Portal (ed.), *The History Curriculum for Teachers*. London: Falmer Press, 62–89.

Barton, K. C. & Levstik, L. S. (2004). *Teaching History for the Common Good*. Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Bellino, M. J. & Selman, R. L. (2012). The intersection of historical understanding and ethical reflection during early adolescence. In M. Carretero, M. Asensio & M. Rodríguez-Moneo (eds.), *History Education and the Construction of National Identities*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing, 189–202.

Bermúdez, A. & Jaramillo, R. (2001). Development of historical explanation in children, adolescents and adults. In A. Dickinson, P. Gordon & P. Lee (eds.), *International Review of history Education. vol. 3. Raising Standards in History Education*. London: Woburn Press, 146–167.

Boix-Manzilla, V. (2000). Historical understanding – beyond the past and into the present. In P. Stearns, P. Seixas & S. Wineburg., S. (eds.), *Knowing, Teaching and Learning History: National and International Perspectives*. New York and London: New York University Press, 390–418.

Borries, B. von (2014). *Zwischen “Genuss” und “Ekel”. Ästhetik und Emotionalität als konstitutive Momente historischen Lernens*. Schwalbach, Ts.: Wochenschau.

Brooks, S. (2008). Displaying historical empathy: what impact can a writing assignment have. *Social Studies Research and Practice*, 3 (2), 130–146.

Brooks, S. (2008). Displaying historical empathy: what impact can a writing assignment have. *Social Studies Research and Practice*, 3 (2), 130–146.

Brooks, S. (2009). Historical empathy in the social studies classroom: A review of literature. *The Journal of Social Studies Research*, 33 (2), 213–234.

Brooks, S. (2011). Historical empathy as perspective recognition and care in one secondary social studies classroom. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 39 (2), 166–202.

Coffin, C. (2006). Learning the language of school history: the role of linguistics in mapping the writing demands of the secondary curriculum. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 38 (4), 413–429.

Cunningham, D. L. (2007). Understanding pedagogical reasoning in history teaching through the cultivation of historical empathy. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 35 (4), 592–630.

Dickinson, A. K. & Lee, P. J. (1984). Making sense of history. In A. K. Dickinson, P. J. Lee & P. J. Rogers (eds.), *Learning History*. London: Heinemann, 94–120.

Doppen, F. H. (2000). Teaching and learning multiple perspectives: the atomic bomb. *The Social Studies*, 91(July/August), 159–169.

Endacott, J. L. (2010). Reconsidering affective engagement in historical empathy. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 38 (1), 6–49.

Endacott, J. & Brooks, S. (2013). An updated theoretical and practical model for promoting historical empathy. *Social Studies Research and Practice*, 8 (1), 41–58.

- Foster, S. (1999). Using historical empathy to excite students about the study of history: can you empathize with Neville Chamberlain. *The Social Studies*, 90 (January/February), 18–24.
- Foster, S. (2001). Historical empathy in theory and practice: some final thoughts. In O.L. Davis, E. A. Yeager & S.J. Foster (eds.), *Historical Empathy and perspective Taking in the Social Studies* (pp. 167–182). Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Halldén, O. (1986). Learning history. *Oxford Review of Education* 12, 53–66.
- Halldén, O. (1994). On the paradox of understanding history in an educational setting. In G. Leinhardt, I.L.Beck & C. Stainton (eds.) *Teaching and Learning History*. Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 27–46.
- Harris, R. & Foreman-Beck, L. (2004). ‘Stepping into other people’s shoes’: teaching and assessing empathy in the secondary history curriculum. *International Journal of Historical Learning, Teaching and Research*, 4 (2), 1-14.
<http://eprints.soton.ac.uk/14705/> , accessed May 25, 2014.
- Jenkins, K. (1991). *Rethinking history*. London: Routledge.
- Kaven, P. (2010). *Humanitaarisuuden varjossa. Poliittiset tekijät lastensiiroissa Ruotsin sotien aikana ja niiden jälkeen*. Helsinki: Nord Print.
- Kitson, A., Husbands, C. & Steward, S. (2011). *Teaching & Learning History 11 – 18. Understanding the Past*. Maidenhead, England: McGraw Hill & Open University Press.
- Kohlmeier, J. (2006). ”Couldn’t she just leave?”: the relationship between consistently using class discussions and the development of historical empathy in a 9th grade world history course. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 34 (1), 34–57.
- Korppi-Tommola, A. (2008). War and children in Finland during the Second World War, *Paedagogica Historica: International Journal of the History of Education*, 44 (4), 445–455.
<http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/00309230802218405#.U3cE1hBqNek>, accessed May 25, 2014.
- Lee, P., Dickinson, A. & Ashby, R. (2001). Children’s ideas about historical explanation. In A. Dickinson, P. Gordon & P. Lee (eds.), *International Review of history Education. vol. 3 Raising standards in history education*. London: Woburn Press, 97–115.
- Lee, P. & Shemilt, D. (2011). The concept that dares not speak its name: should empathy come out of the closet? *Teaching History*, 143, June 2011, 39–49.
- Lévesque, S. (2008). *Thinking historically. Educating students for the twenty-first century*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Lowenthal, D. (2000). Dilemmas and delights of learning history. In P. Stearns, P. Seixas & S. Wineburg (eds.), *Knowing, Teaching and Learning History: National and*

International Perspectives. New York and London: New York University Press, 63–82.

Löfström, J. (2012). The Finnish high school students speak on historical reparations. A note on a study on historical consciousness. *Yearbook of the International Society for History Didactics* 33, 191–206.

Löfström, J. (2013). How Finnish upper secondary students conceive transgenerational responsibility and historical reparations: implications for history curriculum. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00220272.2013.859301>, accessed April 20, 2014.

Monte-Sano, C. (2011). Beyond reading comprehension and summary: learning to read and write in history by focusing on evidence, perspective, and interpretation. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 41(2), 212–249.

Peterson, A. (2011). Moral learning in history. In I. Davies (ed.), *Debates in History Teaching*. London: Routledge, 161–171.

Rantala, J. (2011). Assessing historical empathy through simulations – how do Finnish teacher students achieve contextual historical empathy. *Nordidactica. Journal of Humanities and Social Science Education*, 1, 58–78. <http://kau.se/nordidactica>

Rantala, J. & van den Berg, M. (2013). Lukiolaisten historian tekstitaidot arvioitavina. *Kasvatus*, 44 (4), 394–407.

Riley, K. L. (1998). Historical empathy and the Holocaust. *International Journal of Social Education*, 13 (1), 32–42.

Saffle, S. (2004). Children, war, and the rhetoric of remembrance: The stories of Finland's war children. *Children in War. The International Journal of Evacuee and War Chil Studies*, 1 (4), 97–103.

<http://www.finnfaca.org/Finnish%20War%20Children.pdf> , accessed May 5, 2014.

Scardamalia, M. & Bereiter, C. (1986). Research on written composition. In R. F. Dillon & R. J. Sternberg (eds.), *Handbook of Research on Teaching*. Third edition. (New York: Macmillan), 778–803.

Seixas, P. (1996). Conceptualizing the growth of historical understanding. In D. R. Olson & N. Torrance (eds.) *The Handbook of Education and Human Development*. Oxford: Blackwell, 765–783.

Shanahan, T. & Shanahan, C. (2008). Teaching disciplinary literacy to adolescents: rethinking content-area literacy. *Harvard Educational Review*, 78 (1), 40–59.

Shemilt, D. (1984). Beauty and the philosopher: empathy in the history classroom. In A. K. Dickinson, P. J. Lee & P. J. Rogers (eds.), *Learning History*. London: Heinemann Educational Books, 39–84.

Torsti, P. (2012). *Suomalaiset ja historia*. Helsinki: Gaudeamus.

Unsworth, L. (2001). *Teaching multiliteracies across the curriculum: changing contexts of text and image in classroom practice*. Buckingham, Philadelphia: Open University Press.

van Boxtel, C. & van Drie, J. (2004). Historical reasoning: A comparison of how experts and novices contextualise historical sources. *International Journal of Historical Learning, Teaching and Research*, 89–96.

van den Berg, M. (2007). *Yksi historia monimutkaistuvassa maailmassa. Historian olemus ja historian suuret kertomukset luokanopettajaopiskelijoiden historiatietoisuudessa*. Helsinki: Research Centre for Social Studies Education, University of Helsinki.

van Drie, J. & van Boxtel, C. (2008). Historical reasoning: towards a framework for analyzing students' reasoning about the past. *Educational Psychological Review*, 20, 87–110.

Virta, A. (2009). Between history and nostalgia – History textbooks and memories about the Karelian evacuees. *Jahrbuch. Internationale Gesellschaft für Geschichtsdidaktik Geschichtsdidaktik 2008/2009*, vol. 29/30, 193–205.

Yilmaz, K. (2007). Historical Empathy and Its Implications for Classroom Practices in Schools. *The History Teacher* 40 (3). <http://www.jstor.org/stable/30036827>, accessed 17, 2014.