

Can, and should history give ethical guidance? Swedish and Finnish Grade 9 students on moral judgment-making in history

**Jan Lofström, Niklas Ammert, Heather Sharp &
Silvia Edling**



Nordidactica

- Journal of Humanities and Social Science Education

2020:4

Nordidactica – Journal of Humanities and Social Science Education

Nordidactica 2020:4

ISSN 2000-9879

The online version of this paper can be found at: www.kau.se/nordidactica

Can, and should history give ethical guidance? Swedish and Finnish Grade 9 students on moral judgment-making in history

Jan Löfström, Niklas Ammert, Heather Sharp & Silvia Edling

University of Turku, Linnaeus University, University of Newcastle (Australia),
University of Gävle

Abstract: History is often invested with moral messages. When asked what history for them is, 15-year-old Europeans have strongly supported the option that history is instructive stories of good and evil, right and wrong. But what do they actually think of the potential of history as a moral guide? Do they think history can communicate what was, or would have been, the morally good choice of action in specific historic circumstances? Do they think moral questions should be discussed in a History classroom? Do young people in different countries answer these questions in the same way, and if there are differences, what are they? This paper aims to give some answers to these questions, using Swedish and Finnish Year 9 students' responses from a survey and interviews that focused on their reasoning on moral questions in relation to history, and their ability to deal with moral dilemmas situated in a historical context. The focus is on how the students see historical knowledge as different from, or related to, moral judgment and what patterns are discernable in this respect. This is done by analysing what functions the students give to history and what arguments they use in justifying the answer. The data provides an opportunity to locate similarities and differences between Finnish and Swedish students' responses. Tentative conclusions on the basis of the findings are discussed.

KEYWORDS: HISTORY TEACHING, MORAL EDUCATION, MORAL JUDGMENT, ETHICS, FINLAND, SWEDEN, HOLOCAUST, LOWER SECONDARY SCHOOL

About the authors:

Jan Löfström, Associate Professor in History and Social Studies Education at the University of Turku, Visiting Professor in History Education at the Linnaeus University. email: jan.lofstrom@utu.fi

Niklas Ammert, Professor in History at the Linnaeus University. email: niklas.ammert@lnu.se

Heather Sharp, Associate Professor in History Curriculum at the University of Newcastle, Australia. email: heather.sharp@newcastle.edu.au

Silvia Edling, Professor in Curriculum Studies at the University of Gävle. email: silvia.edling@hig.se

*Artikeln är skriven inom ramen för projektet "Möten mellan historia och moralisk reflektion: Teoretiska och empiriska skärningspunkter mellan historiemedvetande och moraliskt medvetande ur ett historiedidaktiskt perspektiv (2017-03509)". Projektet finansieras av Vetenskapsrådet 2018-2021.

History is often invested with moral messages. The notion of history as activity that produces value-free accounts of the past was prominent for most of the 20th century, then in the 1980s and into the 1990s a *moral turn* took place in history scholarship (Ankersmit, 1983; Wilschut, 2012) continuing and gaining momentum more recently as researchers have become increasingly aware of the moral aspects and implications of their work (Cotkin, 2008; Kalela, 2012). Translated to the education sphere, this paradigm shift includes being aware of various ways of understanding morality in relation to history as well as openly discussing moral issues and topics of concern with students. The moral turn can be understood as taking place due to aspects in society considered as harmful for humans, thus being loaded with specific frames and values while at the same time creating a space for open discussions about the notion of morality in relation to history (Edling et al, 2020b).

The challenge of teaching morally loaded topics in history has been addressed in numerous studies and learning materials, and for example teaching about genocides, especially the Holocaust, is stipulated in the school curricula in many countries. A UNESCO report by Carrier, Fuchs and Messinger (2015) showed that 111 countries out of the 135 studied either had direct reference (57 countries), partial reference (8 countries), or context only content (46 countries) to the Holocaust. There are also specific organizations that produce learning material and education for teachers. For example, in the United States the organization *Facing History and Ourselves*, uses history to educate teachers and students to reflect on the moral meaning of history and thereby, ideally, for students to be more equipped to stand up against racism and intolerance – however complicated the connection between knowledge and oppression might be. The *Forum för levande historia (The Living History Forum)* in Sweden, is a public authority tasked with educating people about historic cases of crimes against humanity and to foster in young people democratic citizenship by making them reflect on links between the past, the present, and the future.

In a 1995 all-European survey of 15-year-old students' relationship with history, participants were asked what is history for them. One of the most strongly supported alternative answers was that history is instructive stories of good and evil, right and wrong (Angvik & Borries, 1997). But the question of what do young people actually think of the potential of historical knowledge, or *history*, to serve as a moral guide remains an unexplored area. The published survey analysis did not delve into this line of thinking. The concerns posed here are, do young people think that history can communicate what was good or evil in the past or what would have been the morally good or best choice of action in a specific historic situation? And do they think moral questions should, or should not, be discussed in the History classroom? Do young people in different countries answer these questions in the same way, and if there are differences, what are they and how can they be explained?

Using as the empirical basis Swedish and Finnish Grade 9 students' responses from a survey and interviews that focused on their historical and moral consciousness, this paper aims to answer these wide-ranging questions. Drawing from a wider study, an analysis is undertaken of participants' reasoning on moral questions in relation to history, and their ability to deal with moral dilemmas situated in a historical context.

The focus here is on how the students see historical knowledge as different from, or related to, moral judgment and what patterns are discernable in this respect. This is done by analysing what functions the students give to history and what arguments they use in justifying their answer. The material gives an opportunity to find out similarities and differences between the Finnish and Swedish students' responses and to draw tentative conclusions.

Students are inspired by questions that have a moral dimension, and among students there can also be reservations concerning discussing moral questions in the History classroom (Silfver-Kuhlampi et al, in print). This paper focuses on this duality, and two questions relating to this are addressed: First, how are students' views on the value of historical knowledge to moral judgment and the place of moral questions in the history classroom dispersed? Second, what kind of notions of historical knowledge and, indirectly, moral judgment is expressed in their answers?

Finland and Sweden are interesting to compare because in the public history culture of these countries there seems to be some difference in how history is used. Using history for nation-building purposes has been more visible in Finland than in Sweden, and in Sweden the state has sponsored research on morally difficult topics (Aronsson, 2002; Aronsson, 2005). In Finland, state-sponsored research on such topics is a less prominent and a more recent phenomenon. In Finland there is no counterpart to the Swedish authority, *The Living History Forum*. It is also noteworthy that in a 2007 survey with Nordic history teachers, Swedish teachers were not overly supportive of conveying values in History textbooks, but the Finnish teachers found the idea even less appealing (Gullberg, 2010). Finnish and Swedish students' views on relations between history and morals were mapped in the survey in 1995 (Angvik & Borries, 1997). The students were presented with questions that they answered in the Likert Scale, 1 to 5. In the items they were asked how much they agree with the statements that history is, i) a number of instructive examples of what is right or wrong, good or bad; ii) a chance to learn from failures and successes of others; iii) a school subject and no more; iv) an accumulation of cruelties and disasters. The Finnish students' scores for the items were, respectively, 3,50; 3,17; 2,70; and 2,63. The Swedish students' scores were 3,48; 3,26; 2,53; and 2,94. Both the Finnish and the Swedish students considered the potential of History to moral instruction – item i) – very high, and the difference between the two countries' students was not statistically significant. In the items ii), iii), and iv) can the difference be seen as statistically significant. The figures above serve as a backdrop to the results in this paper. Explanations to differences is a complex question, however, and it can only be discussed tentatively in the space of this paper.

This study is part of an in-progress larger research project investigating intersections of historical consciousness and moral consciousness, with more than 300 Grade 9 students in Finland and Sweden. It addresses aspects relevant to the conceptions of historical and moral consciousness: temporal orientation; historical empathy; moral sensitivity and moral judgment; and the relevance of moral claims in history (Ammert et al, 2020; Edling et al, 2020a; Edling et al, 2020b; Silfver-Kuhlampi et al, in print). This paper focuses on the last aspect, the relevance of moral claims in history. The central questions centre on what students think of the claim that on the basis of historical

knowledge it can be concluded, what was good or evil (right or wrong) in the past, and what students think of the claim that questions of good and evil (right and wrong) should be discussed in the History classroom.

Theoretical background

In the typology of the uses of history, constructed by Klas-Göran Karlsson (1999; 2008), *moral use* is one of the functions of history. It is visible when a contemporary morally charged issue is commented upon or judged with reference to the past. It is also activated when memories or expressions from the past are activated for present contexts and petition for a redress of a historic wrong. Such situations may serve political purposes, but nevertheless, relations between the past, the present, and the future are often invested with moral meaning so as to justify or criticize the current state of affairs, the interpretations of the past, or the goals for the future.

In line with such use of history, beginning from the Ancient times, history has been seen as an instructor in good life and morals, which has also extended to learning history in formal education settings. This aspect of history teaching has arguably faded in the latter half of the 20th century in countries where the aim of developing students' skills of historical reasoning and understanding of the uses of history has come into focus in History curriculum (Peterson, 2017). Using the categories of aims of history teaching that David Rosenlund (2016) has constructed, it can be argued that *Method* (learning methods of historical reasoning) has got more space in the aims; and *Content* (learning historical content), and *Orientation* (using history as support in existential or identity questions) have less space than before (see, Erdmann & Hasberg, 2011; on Sweden and Finland specifically, Jarhall, 2020; and Rantala et al, 2020). Still, narratives of progress, but also suffering, often prevail in history teaching, and they stimulate morally loaded responses, like admiration and condemnation (Barton & Levstik, 2004; Seixas & Morton, 2012). A History teacher could also evaluate more positively the content and argument in a student's exam paper when it makes favorable moral judgments that follow the socially accepted values and norms of the time (Alvén, 2017). This can be interpreted as a reflection of an underlying assumption that good historical thinking and good historical knowledge coincide with high ethical standards in the person, and can also lead to the presentism, an ongoing concern in the history classroom.

Incorporating a *moral turn* (Cotkin, 2008) in history teaching and learning should not be misunderstood as replacing an intellectually rigorous approach. While moral issues often affect (and reflect) emotions, in the History classroom these strong emotions should not outweigh contextualised historical analysis and reflection. The concern of emotions overriding the discipline context of history is aptly characterized by British journalist Polly Toynbee's (2001, p. 16) statement, 'I want my children and their children's children to know in detail what happened under the Nazis, but I want it taught as hard-headed history with cause and effect, with parallels drawn, with meaning.' However, it has been pointed out that historical facts and figures without an accompanying narrative (Hoepper & Quanchi, 2000) are not sufficient as they overlook

the fact that historical content is morally loaded and says something substantial about what matters and does not matter (Edling et al, 2020b). Through a narrative approach, teachers can raise ethical questions and explore – with their students – the human capacity for good and evil (Rittner, 2004; Chinnery, 2013). As Seixas and Morton have explained, moral questions simply cannot be avoided in History teaching, nor is there reason for that because understanding historical actors necessitates openness to a moral evaluation of their conduct. But, as they note, there is a narrow line between impossibility of reading about perpetrators of historical wrongs without ethical judgments, and, on the other hand, avoiding judging the past against values and beliefs of today (Seixas & Morton, 2013). The History classroom can be a stimulating context for moral reflection when, with support of perspectives of moral philosophy, the past is encountered from diverse perspectives (Milligan et al, 2018). Moreover, by studying what pasts are remembered or suppressed, a better understanding of connections between the present, the past, and the future may be achieved (Salmons, 2010). Constructing these connections is the essence of historical consciousness (Rüsen, 2004).

The interesting question is the bridge between historical consciousness, that is, the ability to temporal orientation and meta-historical skills, on the one hand, and – what is here called – moral consciousness, that is, ability to recognize the moral dimension of social situations and process the dilemmas in it (Ammert et al, 2017). The connection is still largely unexplored, but it has been suggested that moral evaluations and the constructions of temporal interrelations between the past, the present, and the future are closely, even intrinsically, connected (Rüsen, 2004). Hence, for example, people's views on repairing historical injustices can be analysed as reflections of their historical consciousness (Ammert, 2015; Löfström, 2014). Moral aspects touch upon fundamental human values, and, accordingly, they often stimulate people's interest in history and their perceptions of what is relevant. Moral issues provide meaning in encounters with the past, as often observed in the history classroom: students generally find most interesting the topics that invite moral questioning. These questions also inspire students to elaborate reflections on historical development: moral issues are like a prism that historical continuity and change is seen through (Ammert, 2015). For example, issues of historical moral responsibility and guilt is a topic where the potential and the challenge of using this prism in history education is visible (Löfström, 2014).

In studying people's moral reasoning, it must be noted that their reasoning cannot be isolated to the specific situation and there are other aspects to take into account. The first is a cognitive-developmental aspect. Moral perceptions develop as the child matures and the focus on the self broadens towards understanding other people and their views. The *moral atmosphere* of a community has an important effect on perceptions of moral decision making (Kohlberg, 1981; Rest et al, 1999). The second important aspect is, then, the contextual and cultural prerequisites of moral perception. As Helen Haste has aptly noted, morality cannot be understood unless we take full account of the social, cultural and historical context (Haste, 1996). These aspects intertwine so that, for example, social division and fear can cause developmental delay in moral reasoning during childhood and adolescence (Darby, 1986). While this is not elaborated further in

this paper, it is relevant to keep in mind as a wider context for analyses of how people process moral dilemmas in contemporary and historical contexts.

Method

The survey from which the material in this paper is derived was administered electronically during autumn, 2018. It was answered by 156 Grade 9 students in seven schools in Finland, and 189 Grade 9 students in five schools in Sweden. The Finnish schools were in the metropolitan area (one school), in towns of 50–80 000 inhabitants (three schools), and in rural municipal centers (three schools). The classes were mixed-gender, with no dominant majority of any gender in the classes. Two of the schools were Swedish-speaking schools. The socio-economic label of one of the rural area schools' was more lower middle class and working class, compared to the other schools. In the classes that participated in the survey there were, in sum, less than five students with a migrant background. In Sweden, students from five schools participated in the study. One of the schools is located in the metropolitan area, three schools in three different towns of 50-100 000 inhabitants, and one school in a town of 20-25 000 inhabitants. The socio-economic structure was mixed between lower middle class and working class in the smaller town and more diversified in middle-size towns with two upper middle class-schools and one characterized as working class and a relatively high percentage of unemployed immigrants. The metropolitan school has students mainly from working class families and a majority of them are not born in Sweden or have parents not born in Sweden. Considering the average grade points of these schools in the Swedish statistics (Skolverket, 2019), and the assessment results showing very small differences between Finnish schools in History (Ouakrim-Soivio & Kuusela, 2012), there is no reason to assume a systematic bias in the academic level in the two student populations in the study.

The survey provided to student participants focused on an authentic historical case that involved questions relating to moral dilemmas in a historical context and the moral dimension of history. Confronting people with moral dilemmas can be expected to challenge and stimulate their cognitive and affective perception beyond just asking them questions (Lind, 2010).

The set of activities which formed the survey, included an edited excerpt from Christopher Browning's study, *Ordinary Men: Reserve Police Battalion 101 and the Final Solution in Poland* (2017, p. 55–57), accompanied by eight open questions – six of them relating directly to the excerpt and two addressing more generally the place of moral reflection in history as a field of knowledge. Whether or not students see history and knowledge of history as something helpful for interpreting moral issues and dilemmas was the focus of investigation, rather than studying whether or not they had particular historical content knowledge. Accordingly, a text about a situation and a context that is well-known for students was required, to lessen the risk of students saying they do not know anything about the situation or do not understand the context. Given the coverage of World War II and the Holocaust in the general public sphere, in popular

culture, and inclusion in the History curriculum, it can be assumed to be a well-known history topic to students in most Western countries, including Sweden and Finland.

The excerpt tells about the first time the Reserve Police Battalion 101 were involved in directly killing Jewish people. The Commander of the Battalion was given orders to destroy a Polish village, but he offered the men an opportunity, which some took, not to take part in direct action. This part in Browning's book has been used also by Ammert (2015) and Nilsen (2016) in their studies that discuss students' ability to deal with moral dilemmas in a historical setting or take historical perspective. It is a fruitful prompt material because it presents the readers with a historical narrative where all actors do not neatly fit into the default picture of WWII German soldiers that is most familiar from popular history culture. It has been found that unfamiliar scenes such as this one, is challenging for students to interpret because students cannot easily lean back on a familiar interpretative frame when making sense of the narrative (van den Berg, 2012). In their answers to the questions about the excerpt, the students in this study constructed multiple explanations to the sequence of events. Important to note, the excerpt does not suggest a stand in the so-called Browning–Goldhagen controversy on how to explain the perpetrators' conduct in the Holocaust (see Deak, 1997).

Student participants were asked to first read the excerpt that described the actions of this police battalion, and second, to answer the questions that followed. To enable a qualitative analysis of the data, survey questions were set up as activities which consisted of open-ended questions. Relevant to this paper, are the following questions:

Question 7 (Q7): *Can you, with the help or support of historical knowledge, judge what has been morally good or bad? Why or why not?*

Question 8 (Q8): *Should issues of what is morally good or bad be discussed or processed in the school subject of History? Why or why not?*

Q7 invites students to describe and justify their view on whether knowledge about history can give support or tools to interpret and understand moral issues and dilemmas. It is possible to answer the first part of the question with a Yes or a No, and it might be easier for respondents to commence the answer by taking a stand. This part is followed by instruction to justify the response. This open-ended part of the question is aimed at encouraging students to present arguments and examples of their view on the range and scope of history in relation to moral issues.

In Q8 students are asked to make a substantiated normative statement on whether or not moral issues should be included in the History classroom. Here, students' opinions are sought on why or why not history should be used as guidance in moral issues.

In total, 345 students answered the survey: 291 of them answered Q7 and Q8; twenty-eight answered neither of the two questions; twelve answered Q8 but not Q7; and fourteen answered Q7 but not Q8. These numbers suggest that Q7 and Q8 were not seen as different in terms of difficulty or sensitivity. Sixteen of the students who self-selected for further participation, were interviewed in order to get more developed answers from those students who had expressed arguments or examples that were either very typical, atypical, or who had made particularly elaborate arguments in comparison to the total student population.

The analysis of student participants' responses was inspired by grounded theory. A close reading was undertaken of each response and coded in regard to the view of the function of history that was expressed and what the arguments were regarding whether history teaching should or should not address moral questions. In adhering to the principles of grounded theory, no typology or categories for organizing responses were constructed in advance; rather they were formulated in an inductive process where patterns and differences in the material were identified (Charmaz, 2006, p. 57–58). The analysis was closely focused on the context, the message and the argument in the answer. Set as open-ended questions, analysis has been conducted regarding responses as contextual word units. Dividing them, or focusing on specific words, would have risked fragmenting the material and losing sight of the context (Coffey & Atkinson, 1996).

Findings from the students' answers and interview responses are presented in the following section. First, observations are made of students' answers to Q7 and Q8. Focus is on how the students have reasoned for or against the view that history can help tell what has been *good* or *bad* in the past, and that moral questions should be discussed in the History classroom. The answers are categorised according to what kind of function of history and what kind of arguments are expressed in them. Second, four types of combinations of answers that resulted from student responses to Q7 and Q8 are presented. Third, the dispersion of functions and arguments, and some qualitative and quantitative differences in the Swedish and Finnish students' answers are discussed.

Findings I: Functions of history and arguments on moral discussion in the classroom

Responses to Q7 and Q8 were analysed qualitatively, with focus on the arguments students used as justification in their answer. Most students (84%) answered both Q7 and Q8. The students were asked to explain their answer, and in most cases they did that, with examples relating to the different functions and arguments presented here.

Regarding the answers to the question whether historical knowledge can provide an answer to what was morally *right* or *wrong* in the past, answers were analysed for how the scope of history was described in them, as part of the argument, and as expression of how they conceived the function of history. Three functions were identified in the answers, in affirmative or as a counter-argument:

- History can/cannot contribute reliable factual (content) knowledge about the past;
- History can/cannot contribute competence to review the narratives of the past and interpret them by using source criticism, for example; and
- History can/cannot contribute to ethical fostering by giving moral lessons or presenting moral problems to reflect and discuss.

On this basis, three functions of history were inductively constructed, called the *knowledge-based function*, the *competence-based function*, and the *fostering function*.

This is a close parallel to how the aims of History teaching have been categorised by Rosenlund (2016).

Regarding the answers to whether History should be used as a platform for processing what is morally right or wrong, the key point is how, and why, history could or could not contribute to ethical fostering, according to the students. Responses were analysed for where the potential or the risk of History, as a platform of ethical education, was located. Four different foci were identified in the answers, and in each there is a positive and a negative alternative justification for why moral questions should, or should not, be discussed in the History classroom. The foci and the justifications are following:

- The subject History: are historical thinking and moral judgment-making linked? The justification for a positive answer is that the History classroom is a particularly suitable context to learn about moral right and wrong, or that considering moral questions in the History classroom is important because it also supports better understanding of history and historical thinking. The justification for a negative answer is that moral questions are not a proper part of the subject History or historical thinking, or at least there are other school subjects that are a more appropriate context for such questions.
- Society: is it important to society's development that moral questions are part of the subject History? The justification for a positive answer is that all citizens should learn and embrace certain moral norms and values and learning to consider moral questions is important to avoid conflicts and war. The justification for a negative answer is that discussions on moral questions are not society's responsibility.
- Individual student: is discussing moral questions in the History classroom important for developing individual student competencies, or autonomy in forming one's opinion? The justification for a positive answer is that collective processing of moral questions develops students as responsible and critical citizens. The justification for a negative answer is that collective processing of moral questions entails the risk of the teacher indoctrinating students or the student conforming to external pressure from others.
- Moral order and universal moral norms: do they have to be taught? The justification for a positive answer is that there are (universal) norms stipulating moral right and wrong, and it is important to learn them. The justification for a negative answer is that moral questions either need not be discussed in the History classroom because it is already obvious what is right and wrong, or that there is no permanent moral order because morality and moral values are constantly changing.

On this basis, four types of arguments regarding the need to address moral questions in History were constructed, called here the *subject-related argument*, the *society-related argument*, the *individual-related argument*, and the *moral order-related argument*.

In the following, examples are given of students' responses that are categorised as representing the different functions with accompanying arguments and justifications. The *functions* have been expressed primarily in connection with Q7, and the *arguments and justifications* primarily in connection with Q8. In some cases, students' reflections on the question 'can?' and 'should?' intertwine. Individual answers have been approached as units, but it is possible to distinguish in them elements relating to function or justification.

To start, below is an example where the student's answer to Q7 and Q8 expresses the view that history has a knowledge-based function: it provides knowledge about the past, and this knowledge can help judge what is morally good or bad:

Q7: Yes, it can, no matter what people think, it is NOT okay to take another person's life, it is NOT okay to disfavor someone because of skin color, religion or sexual orientation, it is simply wrong. It's not that hard to figure out that it's not okay. Yes, I think you can.

Q8: Yes, you should, the more knowledge people have about things, the more they make better choices, thanks to the knowledge they have. (S35F)¹

The student does not explicitly explain why, or how, history can help judge if something was right or wrong in the past. It is obvious to her. She presumes moral values regarding protecting life and accepting diversity in colour, creed, and sexual orientation can be learnt from history. This is also evident in her stating that history should include moral issues and that knowledge 'about things' will lead to better choices as a direct result. This is an individual-related justification primarily as it focuses on development of people's capacity for decision-making.

The knowledge-based function is also visible in the following case:

Q7: Yes you can, by studying history and reading the narratives you can understand how they thought at that time and what was right or wrong.

Q8: No, I don't think so, it has nothing to do with history, morals change all the time even though some things survive from before. (S20M)

S20M states that by studying history it can be understood how people thought in the past and what they found right and wrong. Factual knowledge of the past is linked to interpretation and comprehension in the present. Here, history has a knowledge-based function, as 'reading the narratives' of the past for the purpose of understanding contemporaries' thoughts, but discussions on moral issues do not belong in History. The student adds that moral views are mostly not stable. Thus, he gives a subject-related justification and a moral order-related justification: historical knowledge does not allow moral judgments on the past, and anyway morality is judged differently at different times. He understands Q7 more narrowly than S35F; it concerns the epistemic limits of history, and not its potential for moral arbitration.

¹ The student is identified with an alpha-numeric code acting as a pseudonym where the letters indicate if the student is Swedish (S), Finnish-speaking Finnish (FF), Swedish-speaking Finnish (SF), male (M) or female (F). The number is the students' identification number in the survey answers file.

In the next example, the function of history and the justification in the answer to Q8 differ from the previous two:

Q7: Many things have happened in history that nowadays are bad things, but because of that it's easy to think, with the help of history, how some things have been managed in the wrong way in the past and what would be the right way.

Q8: Maybe to some extent yes, because it is war, murders and such things that are talked about [in the History classroom], therefore everyone must be made to understand if it's morally good or evil. (FF99F)

The student expresses the view that History guides people to choose the right way of action by showing what wrong – by currently accepted standards – was committed in the past. The fostering function of History is central. It is also expressed further in the student's explanation that everyone should be taught about historical morals. While FF99F's answer does not preclude that this learning is an autonomous process, the words 'must be made to understand', imply a view of inculcating moral norms on people. This could be interpreted as a moral order-related justification, but her view of the historical situatedness of moral judgments in Q7 suggests that she thinks there is no universal moral order. In her view people nevertheless must be taught about morals which seems to say there is a society-related justification embedded.

In the following case the function of history is as in the previous example, but the justification is constructed differently:

Q7: Yes, it can. How people treated each other already tells that in history there is a lot of evil, but also instruction, because now, after the horrors of history, we can conclude that the same need not be repeated.

Q8: I think it's not really needed. The heart and the mind tell what is morally right and wrong, if you are sane. (FF70F)

The student expresses the view that history instructs what moral evils should not be let happen again. History has a fostering function. FF70F's answer to Q8 presents a more unequivocal moral order-related justification than in FF99F's answer, but now the conclusion is different. She argues that all people – if they are 'sane' – know the answer to moral questions anyway, thus these do not need to be discussed in the History classroom.

In the following example the knowledge-based function and individual-related justification are expressed, but with a different conclusion than in the previous examples:

Q7: No, I do not think so. Technically, there is no evil, just what is perceived as evil. Anyone who does something that is perceived as evil actually thinks they are doing something good. Those who some may perceive as evil may perceive themselves as good and all others as good. So there is really no good or evil because it is really a matter of taste from individual to individual. Then there are some who are perceived as evil by the majority of the world, but they see themselves as good.

Q8: No, I do not think so. I think it's something to learn at home. I think it belongs to upbringing and should not be taken care of at school but by the

parents at home. As I wrote before, it is also different from individual to individual, what you think is good or bad, and the teaching at school should not shape your opinions from what they think. Then I think some opinions can be very bad and then it would at least be good to discuss, but as I have said it should be addressed at home. (S196M)

The student expresses the view that moral judgments are relative, there is no universal standard for evil, for example. Thus, history cannot give moral guidance, rather it is seen to have a knowledge-based function, but it does not allow moral judgments on the past. The student was interviewed later, and he then variegated his prior answer, saying that what the supporters of the Islamic State, or Daesh, were doing could be interpreted as wrong, but ‘they (maybe) don’t look back at World War II saying: Oh, we are doing wrong! They are in their own bubble’ (Interview 28 May, 2019). He posited some criteria for moral evil, but those who commit the evil may fail to perceive their actions that way. In his answer to Q8 he considers the aim of ethical fostering, but he suggests it should be taken care of at home. His negative stand on school shaping students’ opinions can be seen to express an individual-related justification.

Across the responses received, more than one function of history, or one justification regarding presence of moral questions in history, is visible in some answers. It is, however, possible to speak of typical combinations of function and justification in the students’ answers. These combinations are discussed in the next section.

Findings 2: Combinations of answers in Types

The combinations of students’ positive and negative answers to Q7 and Q8 (see Table 1) form four types: both questions are answered positively (Type I); both questions are answered negatively (Type IV); or one question is answered positively and one negatively (Type II and Type III). Some answers have elements of more than one Type, they have been categorised according to what element is the most prominent. Categorising the answers jointly was done to establish a shared view of the categorisation criteria. Cases where the student has answered, ‘I don’t know,’ or has left the question unanswered, have not been included. Apart from these cases, each student is categorised as one specific Type. The number of students included in Table 1 are 291 (135 Finnish and 156 Swedish students). The total number of students in the study is 345 (156 Finnish and 189 Swedish students), thus the fallout in this analysis is 16% (in Finland 13% and in Sweden 17%).

TABLE 1

The combinations of positive and negative answer to Q7 and Q8 in the questionnaire, the number of students in each combination, and the percentage of students in each combination (total N=291).

	Issues of what is morally good or bad should be discussed in the History classroom	Issues of what is morally good or bad should not be discussed in the History classroom
History can help judge what has been morally good or bad	Type I N=169 (58%)	Type II N=46 (16%)
History cannot help judge what has been morally good or bad	Type III N=38 (13%)	Type IV N=38 (13%)

Type I is the most common combination in the material: 58% of students answered positively to both Q7 and Q8, and the remaining three Types occur almost as equally as each other. The distribution of answers in the Types among the Swedish and Finnish students is slightly different, and this will be discussed. In the following, answers in each Type are described and examples are given.

Type I

Type I answers assert that history can help judge what has been morally good or evil, and that moral questions should be addressed in the History classroom. In the main, two kinds of functions of history, and two kinds of arguments regarding moral discussions in the History classroom are identified. Knowledge-based function is the common – that history can provide important knowledge about the past. It can be seen in this example:

Q7: Both yes and no. I myself, after all, experience Nazism and racism today as something incomprehensible precisely because of history. But I would say killing innocent people is morally wrong, irrespective of what history is like, but this may be because it is what I grew up with. If I had been raised in a different way, I might have had other types of opinions. (S76F)

The student asserts history can help her judge what has been morally good or bad, and she refers to history and her knowledge of it as the frame for her reaction to racism and Nazism in the present. The knowledge-based function of history is clearly visible. However, she adds that her view on killing innocent people is probably not derived from historical knowledge but based on the moral values she has been raised to have. Her answer to Q8 gives two justifications for why moral questions definitely should be discussed in the History classroom:

Q8: Yes, definitely! I really think this should be talked about more and one should not be so afraid to teach students what is right and wrong. Young people joke about the Swedish Democrats as if they did not see the seriousness

of it, and can make jokes about the Holocaust and Nazism as if they did not know what happened. What happened in the 1940s WAS wrong, and today's young people must understand that we can avoid similar things from happening again. I think you need to talk more about good and evil also in other subjects, but history can be the most important precisely because people should be able to take a position on the repeating history and perhaps make sure it doesn't repeat itself again. When discussing why this should NOT be done in school, it is often argued that the school should present a neutral message, etc., which I can partly understand. But the school has a tremendous opportunity to influence the children, our future. Therefore I think it's a shame, almost disrespectful, not to talk about what is actually good and evil. I feel we rarely talk about the unrest in the world from a perspective where the student gets a chance to take a stand on it. It means in fact that we just accept what happens and become more privileged than we already are, as we may feel it does not concern us. If we become more ignorant, this means that the vulnerable become even more vulnerable and there are even fewer people who are willing to stand up for them. (S76F)

The student voices that the evil that has happened in the past, the Holocaust in particular, must not be repeated, and furthermore that social inequalities are bound to remain and grow if moral questions are not raised in the school context. There is a concern for future consequences if students are not taught about what has happened in the past and what is right and wrong. This can be seen as a society-related argument. The other argument is that schools have a unique opportunity and responsibility to educate and foster in young people about what is right and wrong. S76F recognizes that school is considered a learning space that should remain neutral, writing 'it is often argued that the school should present a neutral message, etc., which I can partly understand' but she finds that the responsibility to foster in young people historical knowledge in context overrides the ideal of a probably unattainable so-called value-free, objective education. The student does not explain what is right or wrong, or what foundations her opinions are based on. Later, during the interview she elaborated. She explained that she does not mean a teacher should teach exactly what is right or wrong, but should provide factual background and plausible consequences of alternative directions and let students come to their own conclusion. The teacher is to support students' own factual and moral reflection. This is an individual-related argument. In S76F's response the aspect that a moral order should be taught in the classroom is discernable, however in the interview this argument was not expressed.

S171M gives history a function that can be characterised as a competence-based function, writing:

Q7: I would say that one can judge what has [been] good or bad to do. I can see why these people do what they do, but at the same time see how terribly wrong they act from a moral perspective. The reason you can use your historical knowledge for a deliberation like this is because I can then see the situation from different perspectives. If you would ask a five-year-old if it was okay for the Hutus (in Rwanda) to kill other people, this would probably say 'no, of course not'. But if you ask someone who is knowledgeable about the conflict, they probably say that 'It is never right to kill someone', but from a moral perspective there are several aspects to consider. You have to see the

background to the genocide before you can point out a party solely responsible for the genocide. (S171M)

This student focuses on the ability to use history and historical knowledge when discussing events in the past from different perspectives. He suggests that historical knowledge can help interpret and judge what was good and evil. He also underlines factual knowledge of specific pasts, and the fact that knowledge-based competencies make wider perspectives possible on the events in the past and what responsibilities were present in those events. Deeper knowledge opens more facets in interpretations. In Q8, he continues this line and says that History should also comprise moral aspects:

Q8: I definitely think morals must be talked about in History. The reason is that in the world history we can see what happens if one ignores moral. The genocide in Rwanda, WW II, and the war in the Balkans are conflicts where moral has not been a priority, and this has led to people being de-humanised. In order to avoid conflicts with bloody outcome such as these, people at an early age should learn about morality so as to avoid further war and genocide. (S171M)

The student's argument is twofold. First, knowledge in the subject can be used to explain what can, or will, happen when moral rules are violated. History is given a knowledge-based function which is, instantaneously, turned to a subject-based argument for why the potential of History to teach morality or moral values should be mobilised in the classroom. Second, students should learn about terrible events in the past so that they will be woken up by them which can prevent war and genocide in the future. This is a society-related argument, it is the responsibility of society, and school, to make new generations wary of processes that may lead to catastrophes in the future.

Type II

In the Type II answers it is expressed that history can help judge moral issues, but moral issues should not be discussed in History lessons. The explanation for why history can help judge what was morally good or bad in the past in most cases relates to a knowledge-based function of history, as in this example:

Q7: Yes, for example, if we take the Second World War as an example, we can see what happens when a country stirs up anger against a group of people for no reason actually. If you use this as an example (which is quite an extreme case), you can see what can happen if people only follow orders without thinking. (S165M)

A direct link between knowing the past and knowing the future, or the likely consequences of the past in the future, is suggested with the understanding that historical knowledge is applicable to present and future contexts. Historical knowledge appears as constant, and the student does not reflect on what might be changeable, different or relevant at different times. He answered Q8 negatively, however:

Q8: No because I think one must build up one's own view of what is right or wrong, with help from one's own custodian. I think that if you have a teacher who should teach you this, as part of the subject, and the teacher is extremely

right-wing, for example, it may lead to that students take the teacher's words as true and don't build up their own view of how one is supposed to behave.
(S165M)

S165M expresses the view that students must develop their moral views by themselves, supported by parents at home. This is an individual-related argument. Among the students, this was a common justification for the negative answer to Q8: moral judgments should be based on one's own thinking and personal conviction. In this statement, S165M suggests that extremist teachers could influence students, therefore history teaching should not address moral issues. It is unclear, however, why the risk of extremist influence from the teacher should be greater than from the child's custodian.

In the Type II answers to an overwhelming degree a knowledge-based function of history is expressed in answers to Q7, but in answers to Q8 there are individual-related arguments and subject-related arguments, visible in FF69F's statement:

In History lessons it would be useless to discuss topics like that [moral issues]. Lessons in religious education are for that purpose. Usually right and wrong are talked about in lessons of secular ethics [the subject alternative to religious education], but it should be part of every lesson in any religious education because it is very important to address in some form during one's life-time, because everyone should get an opportunity to reflect on one's own thoughts in different ways. (FF69F)

The student voices that the History subject is not a congenial environment for discussing moral questions. The justification for this view is unclear, nevertheless some other school subjects are seen as a more proper context for moral teaching. This subject-related argument is followed by the individual-related argument that all people should have a chance to develop their thinking about moral issues. The student recognises it is important to also discuss moral questions at school, but preferably not in the History classroom.

Type III

The Type III answers expressed that history cannot help judging what was good or evil in the past but moral questions should be discussed in the History classroom. A recurrent way of reasoning in the answers is that history cannot help judging moral questions because there are different opinions on what is good and evil, and opinions may change. This notwithstanding, moral education should be part of history teaching because learning can occur through discussion with other people, provided that students are not overwhelmed by, or coerced to adopt, a teacher's or a fellow student's perspective. This line of reasoning can be seen in SF89F's answer:

Q7: No, I wouldn't say that. As new people are being born all the time, also moral views keep changing. Not all people have the same opinions either.

Q8: Yes, maybe so, people may feel uncertain about some issues and want help, then the teacher can talk about that [moral question], and one can choose one's standpoint. (SF89F)

This student sees history mostly in terms of its fostering function. In her answer to Q8 she ponders on people's need to receive guidance and History teachers' ability to provide it, but so that students are not overwhelmed. The fostering function of history is also visible as a counterpoint in her answer to Q7: moral views are neither constant nor universal, thus history does not have a fostering function of telling us straight what to think of good and evil in the past. Her justification in Q8 is individual-related: discussing moral issues in the History classroom can support students' own judgment-making, viewing history with a competence-based function.

Type IV

The Type IV answers expressed view is that history cannot help judge moral issues in the past, and moral questions should not be discussed in the History classroom. Some answers focus on the knowledge-based function of history, suggesting there is no good or evil, merely individual perceptions of them that are not captured in historical knowledge. Some answers focus more on the implications of the epistemic limits of historical knowledge, arguing that history cannot foster people in moral matters by giving them the right answer. The epistemic and pedagogical perspectives can sometimes closely intertwine as in the following case:

Q7: I think the moral of historical events cannot be defined because it can be really personal. Defining morals varies according to situation and events. Some of them can easily be classified in terms so-called 'primary morals' that says if they are wrong or right, but there are also hundreds of various 'small morals' that are perceptions and inferences created by the person in their own head.

Q8: I think reflections and discussions on morals need not be included in History lessons because they are not necessary when events in history are being accounted. The moral side should be left to each one to conclude and think on one's own. (FF133F)

FF133F's reflections on the limits of historical knowledge in her answer to Q7 focuses on the knowledge-based function of history, and her answer to Q8 expresses an individual-related argument on why moral questions should not be discussed in the History classroom. The connection between the justifications appears logical: there is an emphasis on individual perception and judgment-making in Q7 and Q8. However, in her answer to Q8 there is also an element of subject-related argument as she excludes moral discussions from the activities that are 'necessary' in a History lesson.

In the response to Q8 there were also arguments that can be categorised as society-related. A recurrent justification there was that teaching about morals in the History classroom could be ideologically biased because of the teacher in a way that has negative consequences for some people, democracy, and human rights. An example is in S178F's response to Q8. When she answers the question negatively, she recognises that a discussion on moral questions in the History classroom may work differently from what she fears that it could do, depending on the teacher. She is afraid of what social

processes that a perverted form of moral teaching in the History classroom could unleash in the long run:

Q8: No, I don't think one should talk about what is morally right or wrong [in the History classroom]. I think so mainly because teaching can be biased depending on who is teaching. For example, if the teacher thinks that those in power did right, she/he can teach that she/he thinks it was right to kill the Jews. This, in turn, can result in that students begin to justify to themselves that it is true which then initiates hatred against Jews. Seen from the perspective of the Jews, it will turn bad for them. [...] Another reason why I do not think teaching should include questions about moral right and wrong is that all people have different opinions. To teach in that way would, in some way, 'manipulate' people's thoughts. (S178F)

Findings 3: Dispersion of functions and arguments, and the differences in the Swedish and Finnish students' answers

In the previous sections, students' answers have been described and analysed in terms of what function of history and what type of argument are expressed in support of, or against, the view that history can tell what was right and wrong in the past, and that moral questions should be addressed in the History classroom. The combinations of positive and negative answers to the questions have been presented with examples. In this section the focus is on the combinations of the functions of history and the arguments in the different Types. What functions and arguments are most frequent in students' responses in each of the Types, is presented in Table 2.

TABLE 2

The function of history and the type of argument in the students' answers, separately for each Type of answers (I–IV); in brackets indicated if majority applies to the Swedish or the Finnish students.

Combinations of answers	Functions of history	Type of argument
Type I	Knowledge-based Competence-based	Subject-related Society-related Moral order (Sweden) Individual (Finland)
Type II	Knowledge-based	Individual Subject-related
Type III	Fostering	Individual Moral order (Sweden)
Type IV	Knowledge-based Fostering (Sweden)	Individual (Sweden) Society-related (Sweden) Subject-related (Finland)

From the data presented in Table 2, the following observations can be made.

- The knowledge-based function of history is invoked in a wider range of Types than the fostering-related and competence-based function, the latter

featuring in two Types only. The knowledge-based function of history is invoked in all other Types but seldom in Type III. The competence-based function is invoked in Type I but seldom in any other Types. The fostering function is invoked in Type III, and in Sweden also in Type IV, that is to say, in the Types where the view is expressed that moral questions should not be discussed in the History classroom.

- The individual-related and subject-related arguments are invoked in a wider range of Types than the society-related and moral order-related arguments. The individual-related arguments are more common in Finland in Type I–III, and in Sweden in Type II–IV. The subject-related arguments are common in Type I–II and in Finland also in Type IV. The moral order-related arguments are invoked in Sweden in Type I and III. The society-related arguments are invoked in Type I and in Sweden in Type IV.
- In the Type I and IV answers a wider range of functions of history and a wider range of arguments is invoked than in the other Types. This is not necessarily visible at the level of individual students' answers but it is when all the answers in the Types are considered.

Putting the focus on differences between Finland and Sweden, the following can be noted.

- The fostering-based function of history is invoked slightly more often in Sweden than in Finland.
- The subject-related arguments are used in a slightly wider range of Types in Finland, society-related arguments in a slightly wider range of Types in Sweden.
- The individual-related arguments are invoked in most Types but slightly differently: in Finland they feature in Type I–III, in Sweden in Type II–IV.
- The moral order-related arguments are invoked among the Swedish students mainly.
- The diversity of arguments in the Swedish students' answers is slightly greater than in the Finnish students' answers overall, and especially in the Type IV answers.
- In Type IV there are more differences between Finland and Sweden than in the other Types. The fostering function of history and the individual-related and society-related arguments were typical for Sweden but not for Finland. The subject-related arguments, in combination with the knowledge-based function of history, were typical for Finland but not for Sweden.

Further differences between Sweden and Finland are visible also when the information in Table 1 is separated for Sweden and Finland (see Table 3 and Table 4).

CAN, AND SHOULD HISTORY GIVE ETHICAL GUIDANCE? SWEDISH AND FINNISH GRADE 9 STUDENTS ON MORAL JUDGMENT-MAKING IN HISTORY

Jan Löfström, Niklas Ammert, Heather Sharp & Silvia Edling

TABLE 3

Combinations of positive and negative answers by Swedish students to Q7 and Q8, the number (N) of students in each combination, and their percentage, calculated out of the total number of qualified answers by the Swedish students.

	Issues of what is morally good or bad should be discussed in the History classroom	Issues of what is morally good or bad should not be discussed in the History classroom
History can help judge what has been morally good or bad	Type I N=94 (60%)	Type II N=22 (14%)
History cannot help judge what has been morally good or bad	Type III N=28 (18%)	Type IV N=12 (8%)

TABLE 4

Combinations of positive and negative answers by Finnish students to Q7 and Q8, the number (N) of students in each combination, and their percentage, calculated out of the total number of qualified answers by Finnish students.

	Issues of what is morally good or bad should be discussed in the History classroom	Issues of what is morally good or bad should not be discussed in the History classroom
History can help judge what has been morally good or bad	Type I N=75 (56%)	Type II N=24 (18%)
History cannot help judge what has been morally good or bad	Type III N=10 (7%)	Type IV N=26 (19%)

In the horizontal axis of the tables the sum of percentages is the same for both countries. Three-quarters (74%) of the students both in Sweden and in Finland expressed that history can help judge what was morally good and evil in the past (Type I–II), a quarter (26%) expressed the opposite view (Type III–IV). In the vertical axis of the tables, however, there is a difference in that 78% of the Swedish students but only 63% of the Finnish students expressed that moral questions should be discussed in the History classroom (Type I and III). The opposite view is expressed by 22% of the Swedish students and 37% of the Finnish students (Type II and IV).

Type I is the most common type of answer in both countries, covering 60% of the answers in Sweden and 56% in Finland. The difference between the countries is four percentage points, similar to the Type II answers that are much less common. The difference can be considered too small for stark conclusions. The difference in Type III and IV is more noticeable. In the Swedish answers 18% are of Type III and 8% of Type IV, but in the Finnish answers it is 7% for Type III and 19% for Type IV. Type IV is the least common type in Sweden, whereas in Finland it is as common as Type II, and more common than Type III.

Conclusions and discussion

The figures in Type I–II suggest that three-quarters of Finnish students and Swedish students are inclined to think that adequate historical knowledge allows for moral judgments to be made on the past. The Type I answers are more common than all other types of answers together, thus the majority of the student participants in Finland and in Sweden find it plausible that history *can* tell what was good or evil in the past, and also that moral questions *should* be addressed in history teaching and learning. Q7 is in fact ambiguous in its formulation, but the students, with only a few exceptions, understood that it is about making moral judgments – not just factual claims – about the past.

For the minority of students who express the view that moral questions should not be discussed in the History classroom (Finland 37%, Sweden 22%), some explain this is because History, as a subject, is not the appropriate context for such discussions. Some of them also mention other subjects as a legitimate context for that purpose. Whether it means that they see the knowledge or the objectives of a subject like Religious Education as different than in History, is difficult to judge. It can be noted, however, that not only is the proportion of students in Type II and IV in Finland higher (37%) than in Sweden (22%), but the Finnish students often explicitly name the school subject(s) where moral discussions are more appropriate, whereas the Swedish students rarely do that. Thus, the Finnish students more than the Swedish demarcate clearly, even rigidly, the legitimate knowledge or objective in the different subjects.

The knowledge-based function of history is invoked in a wide range of answers, either so that historical knowledge is explained to allow moral judgments on the past, or – in the minority of cases – is denied having such potential. Common to all answers invoking the knowledge-based function is that historical knowledge is presented as something that is *out there*, waiting to be found. The knowledge-based function is combined with both positive and negative answers to the question *Should moral questions be discussed in the History classroom?* It is noteworthy that the competence-related function of history is invoked in a narrower range of answers, in the Type I answers and seldom in any other Type. These students who express a constructionist view of historical knowledge seem to think that historical knowledge gained through interpretation of sources also allows moral judgments on the past and this judgment-making should be taught. This highlights the question what similarities and dissimilarities between historical knowledge and moral judgments are visible in the student's answers in this study?

Some students express the view of historical knowledge as settled truth that enables moral judgments on the past, suggesting that also moral judgments are factual, not value statements, and the History teacher can provide the correct (or, in the case of some students' perspective, the incorrect) answers to moral questions regarding the past. This is a common view in the answers. It implies a narrow view of historical knowledge and moral judgments as simple truths. Some answers in Type III express that both historical knowledge and moral judgments are open-ended, hence moral questions can well be discussed in the History classroom. Among the Finnish students this view is very rare,

but then also the Finnish students, more often than the Swedish students, voice that moral questions can, and should be discussed in some other subject, not History. In this vein, some students voice that historical knowledge and moral judgment are of a different nature and moral discussions should not take place in the History lesson because facts matter and are prioritised in that context. Again, this implies rather a narrow view of historical knowledge as objective, whereas moral judgments appear open-ended. Finally, some students express that historical knowledge is open-ended whereas moral judgments, or some of them, are objectively true. This stand may result in moral questions becoming moved out of the History subject, like above, or seeing History as a forum for socialising students directly in certain values. Thus, relatively few students' answers in this study express a constructivist epistemology of historical knowledge and reflexivity in moral judgments. As concluded in another study of these Finnish students, the students' answers imply a vague notion of moral judgment (Silfver-Kuhlampi et al., in print). And yet constructivist historical epistemology and a reflexive approach to moral judgment have a central place in curricula in Finland and in Sweden. Considering these results, it seems justified to suggest that the nature and the dis/similarities of historical knowledge and moral judgments could be addressed with greater intensity in the History classroom, or also any other classroom.

Moral problems can be fruitfully analysed in the History classroom, and the teacher should have good command of the concepts of moral philosophy to make most of this potential (Milligan et al, 2018). But the History curricula do not necessarily support this approach. For example, in Finland the History curricula have since the 1990s emphasized learning of the skills of historical reasoning (Rantala et al, 2020). More recently also uses of history has received attention, but students' personal relation to history and its meaning remains in the margins in the curricula. This study suggests that the majority of students think that morality-related meanings of history should be discussed in the lessons. This is in harmony with the observation by Ammert (2017), that moral questions are experienced by students as inspiring to discuss. It seems pivotal that History curricula encourage teachers to raise such questions.

Regarding the differences between Finland and Sweden in this study, the Finnish students are slightly more negative than the Swedish toward moral questions being discussed in the History classroom. The Swedish and Finnish students voice equally often the view that history cannot tell what was good or evil in the past, but in Sweden the students with this view mostly express that moral questions should be discussed in the History classroom, whereas the Finnish students mostly voice they should not. The total number of students here (Type III–IV) is relatively low, hence stark conclusions cannot be made, but it is noteworthy that the Finnish students are also less inclined than the Swedish to invoke moral-related arguments, society-related arguments, and the fostering function of History (Table 2). Thus it seems that even though the majority of the students in Finland also express that moral questions should be discussed in the History classroom, it is more common in Finland than in Sweden that moral-related reflection and the fostering function is not seen, or accepted as a meaningful aspect of relating to history. As noted earlier, in the 1995 survey Finnish and Swedish students saw the potential of history to provide moral guidance in a similar way, but the Finnish

students supported more than the Swedish students the view that history is a school subject and no more, and they supported less the view that history is a chance to learn from failures and successes of others. It can be argued that this parallels the results in this paper: among the Finnish students, despite their rather strong support to the view of History as moral guide, there was slightly more than among the Swedish students reservations about bringing other elements than ‘proper’ factual history into the History classroom. It is noteworthy that the Swedish students mobilised slightly more varied types of arguments than the Finnish students, as justification for their views on History and morals (Table 2).

Giving a verifiable explanation to this difference is not simple. The difference may be connected with how history is approached in basic education in the two countries. Developing students’ skills of reflecting upon and analysing uses of history is a central objective in history teaching and a topic area in the national curriculum and in the national history exams in Sweden whereas in Finland the topic was explicitly introduced in the national curriculum for basic education in 2014, and it has got only a limited presence in the textbooks, for example. This may have some relevance here because the use of history is a morally loaded activity. But the difference may also be connected with what the use of history generally is like in Swedish and Finnish societies, respectively (see, Aronsson, 2002; 2005). As mentioned earlier in this paper, it may be argued that history has been more often mobilised for purposes of moral fostering in Sweden. As a case in point, *The Living History Forum* in Sweden is an example of using history for which there is no counterpart in Finland.

The Types constructed in this study are about student responses, not the students themselves. Still it can be considered if the expressions of the functions of history and the arguments concerning the potential of historical knowledge to give moral verdict, and the History classroom to serve as a space for moral reflection, can be viewed as manifestations of students’ historical and moral consciousness? Historical consciousness is about how history is a relevant touchpoint between the past, the present and the future; and moral consciousness here is about sensitivity to the moral dimension and moral complexities of people’s historical life-situation (cf. Rüsen, 2000; Rüsen, 2004). The inter-relations between the two are likely to be complex, but the Types constructed in this study tentatively outline some intersections of historical consciousness and moral consciousness. The relation between development of students’ historical and moral consciousness is still very much unexplored, and more research is needed on their mutual dynamics.

References

Alvén, Fredrik 2017. *Tänka rätt och tycka lämpligt: historieämnet i skärningspunkten mellan att fostra kulturbärare och förbereda kulturbyggare*. Malmö högskola.

Angvik, Magne & von Borries, Bodo (Eds.) 1997. *Youth and history. A comparative European survey on historical consciousness and political attitudes among adolescents*. Hamburg: Koerber-Stiftung.

Ammert, Niklas 2015. *History as knowledge. Ethical values and meaning in encounters with history*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Ammert, Niklas 2017. Patterns of reasoning: A tentative model to analyse historical and moral consciousness among 9th grade students. *Historical Encounters*, 4(4), 23–35.

Ammert, Niklas, Edling, Silvia, Löfström, Jan & Sharp, Heather 2017. Bridging historical and moral consciousness: promises and challenges. *Historical Encounters*, 4(1), 1–13.

Ammert, Niklas, Sharp, Heather, Löfström, Jan & Edling, Silvia 2020. Identifying aspects of temporal orientation in students' moral reflections. *History Education Research Journal*, 17(2), 132–150.

Ankersmit, Frank 1983. *Narrative logic: A semantic analysis of the historian's language*. The Hague: Nijhoff.

Aronsson, Peter 2002. Historiekultur, politik och historievetsenskap. *Historisk Tidskrift*, 122(2), 189–208.

Aronsson, Peter 2005. Bruk och missbruk av historien? *Historisk Tidskrift*, 90(1), 1–16.

Barton, Keith & Levstik, Linda 2004. *Teaching History for the Common Good*. New York: Routledge.

Berg, Marko van den 2012. ”Vastaukset historian taitojen kuvastajina – laadullinen tutkimus historian tehtävistä 149–150”, in Ouakrim-Soivio, Najat & Kuusela, Jorma, *Historian ja yhteiskuntaopin oppimistulokset perusopetuksen päättövaiheessa*. Helsinki: Opetushallitus.

Browning, Christopher 2017 (original 1992). *Ordinary Men. Reserve Police Battalion 101 and the Final Solution in Poland. Revised Edition*. New York: Harper Perennial.

Carrier, Peter, Fuchs, Eckhardt, & Messinger, Torben 2015. The international status of education about the Holocaust: A global mapping of textbooks and curricula. Paris, France: UNESCO.

Charmaz, Kathy 2006. *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative analysis*. London: Sage.

Chinnery, Ann 2013. Caring for the past: on relationality and historical consciousness. *Ethics and Education*, 8(3), 253–262.

Coffey, Amanda & Atkinson, Paul 1996. *Making sense of qualitative data: Complementary research strategies*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Cotkin, George 2008. History's moral turn. *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 69(2), 293–315.

CAN, AND SHOULD HISTORY GIVE ETHICAL GUIDANCE? SWEDISH AND FINNISH GRADE 9 STUDENTS ON MORAL JUDGMENT-MAKING IN HISTORY

Jan Löfström, Niklas Ammert, Heather Sharp & Silvia Edling

Darby, John 1986. *Intimidation and the control of conflict in Northern Ireland*. Dublin: Gill & Macmillan.

Deak, Istvan 1997. Holocaust views. The Goldhagen controversy in retrospect. *Central European History*, 30(2), 295–307.

Edling, Silvia, Sharp, Heather, Löfström, Jan & Ammert, Niklas 2020a. Why is ethics important in history education? A dialogue between the various ways of understanding the relationship between ethics and historical consciousness. *Ethics and Education*, 15(3), 336–354.

Edling, Silvia, Sharp, Heather, Löfström, Jan & Ammert, Niklas 2020b. The good citizen: Revisiting moral motivations for introducing historical consciousness in history education drawing on the writings of Gadamer. *Citizenship, Social and Economics Education*, 19(2), 133–150.

Erdmann, Elisabeth & Hasberg, Wolfgang (Eds.) 2011. *Facing, mapping, bridging diversity, I–II. Foundation of a European discourse on history education*. Frankfurt am Main: Wochenschau.

Gullberg, Tom 2010. “Facts, functions and narratives in history teaching in Finland: attitudes towards history as reflected in the use of textbooks”, in Helgason, Thorsteinn & Lässig, Simone (Eds.) *Opening the mind or drawing boundaries? History texts in Nordic schools*. Göttingen: V&R unipress.

Haste, Helen 1996. Communitarianism and the social construction of morality. *Journal of Moral Education*, 25(1), 47–55.

Hoepper, Brian & Quanchi, Max 2000. *History in years 1 to 10 Studies of Society and Environment Key Learning Area: Occasional paper prepared for the Queensland School Curriculum Council*. Brisbane, Australia: Queensland School Curriculum Council.

Jarhall, Jessica 2020. *Historia från kursplan till klassrum. Perspektiv på lärares historieundervisning från Lpo94 till Lgr 11*. Malmö University.

Kalela, Jorma 2011. *Making history. The historian and uses of the past*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Karlsson, Klas-Göran 1999. *Historia som vapen: Historiebruk och Sovjetunionens upplösning 1985-1995*. Stockholm: Natur och Kultur.

Karlsson, Klas-Göran 2008. ”Historiedidaktik: begrepp, teori och analys”, in Karlsson, Klas-Göran & Zander, Ulf (Eds.) *Historien är nu: En introduktion till historiedidaktiken*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.

Kohlberg, Lawrence 1981. *Essays on moral development. Vol. 1, The philosophy of moral development: moral stages and the idea of justice*. San Francisco: Harper & Row.

CAN, AND SHOULD HISTORY GIVE ETHICAL GUIDANCE? SWEDISH AND FINNISH GRADE 9 STUDENTS ON MORAL JUDGMENT-MAKING IN HISTORY

Jan Löfström, Niklas Ammert, Heather Sharp & Silvia Edling

Lind, Georg & Wakenhut, Roland 2010. "Testing for moral judgment competence", in Lind, Georg, Hartmann, Hans & Wakenhut, Roland (Eds.) *Moral Judgment and Social Education*. New Brunswick: Transaction, 79–103.

Löfström, Jan 2014. How Finnish upper secondary students conceive transgenerational responsibility and historical reparations: implications for the history curriculum. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 46(4), 515–539.

Milligan, Andrea, Gibson, Lindsey & Peck, Carola 2018. Enriching ethical judgment in historical education. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, 449–479.

Nilsen, Adam 2016. Navigating windows into past human minds: A framework of shifting selves in historical perspective taking. *Journal of the Learning Sciences*, 25(3), 372–410.

Ouakrim-Soivio, Najat & Kuusela, Jorma 2012. Historian ja yhteiskuntaopin oppimistulokset perusopetuksen päättövaiheessa. Helsinki: Opetushallitus.

Peterson, Andrew 2017. "Moral education, character education and history", in Davies, Ian (Ed.) *Debates in History Teaching*. Abingdon: Routledge, 191–201.

Rantala, Jukka, Puustinen, Mikko, Khawaja, Amna, van den Berg, Marko & Ouakrim-Soivio, Najat 2020. *Näinkö historiaa opitaan?* Helsinki: Gaudeamus.

Rest, James, Narvaez, Darcia, Bebeau, Muriel & Thoma, Stephen 1999. *Post-conventional moral thinking: a neo-Kohlbergian approach*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Rittner, Carol 2004. "Educating about genocide, yes: but what kind of education?", in Totten, Samuel (Ed.) *Teaching About Genocide: Issues, Approaches and Resources*. Greenwich: Information Age Publishing, 1–5.

Rosenlund, David 2016. *History education as content, methods or orientation? A study of curriculum prescriptions, teacher-made tasks and student strategies*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Rüsen, Jörn 2004. *Berättande och förnuft: Historieteoretiska texter*. Göteborg: Daidalos.

Rüsen, Jörn 2000. "Historical objectivity as a matter of social values", in Leerssen, Joep & Rigney, Ann (Eds.) *Historians and social values*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 57–69.

Salmons, Paul 2000. *Torn Apart: A student's guide to the Holocaust exhibition*. London: Imperial War Museum.

Seixas, Peter & Morton, Tom 2013. *The big six historical thinking concepts*. Toronto: Nelson.

Silfver-Kuhlampi, Mia, Löfström, Jan & Myyry, Liisa (in print) Moraalikysymykset ja historian opetus nuorten kirjoituksissa. *Psykologia*.

CAN, AND SHOULD HISTORY GIVE ETHICAL GUIDANCE? SWEDISH AND FINNISH GRADE
9 STUDENTS ON MORAL JUDGMENT-MAKING IN HISTORY

Jan Ljöfström, Niklas Ammert, Heather Sharp & Silvia Edling

Skolverket 2019, *Skolutveckling: statistik*,

<https://www.skolverket.se/skolutveckling/statistik/sok-statistik-om-forskola-skola-och-vuxenutbildning?sok=SokA>

Toynbee, Polly 2001. Opinion. *Radio Times*, 27 January, p. 16.

Wilschut, Arie 2012. *Images of time. The role of historical consciousness of time in teaching history*. Charlotte: Information Age Publishing.