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Abstract

Ethical judgments about controversial events in history are an important part of the discipline of history, history education, and the way the public interacts with the past. This study focuses on history teachers’ beliefs about ethical judgments in the discipline of history and history education, the factors that influence their beliefs, and the relationship between teachers’ approaches to ethical issues, questions, and judgments and their students' approaches to ethical judgments. The research was conducted in two parts; in the first part sixteen Grade 11 Social Studies teachers completed a survey that asked questions about their beliefs about ethical judgments in the discipline of history and history teaching, the factors that influenced their beliefs, and the classroom practices they regularly employed. In the second part, case studies were conducted with four Grade 11 Social Studies teachers as they taught about Japanese Canadian internment, an ethically controversial event in Canadian history. Data collected during the classroom observations included field notes, audio and video recordings, resources teachers used during their lessons, and completed student assignments (n=102). Among the sample I studied, the majority of teachers have sophisticated views about the place of ethical judgments in the discipline of history and history education. Yet, the teachers were not aware of the various ways ethical judgments were present in the activities and resources they used, and the extent to which they brought their own ethical judgments into the classroom. Furthermore, the teachers did not teach students how to identify ethical judgments in different accounts or to make their own reasoned ethical judgments. In other words, there was a large gap between what teachers believed about ethical judgments, and how they actually approached ethical judgments in the classroom. The main influences on the sophistication of students' written responses appear to be
the amount of time students focused on the historical topic, the amount and quality of instruction
students received about making reasonable ethical judgments, and the type of question asked.
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Chapter 1: INTRODUCTION

Canadians interact with history in a variety of ways. They watch serialized historical period dramas, documentaries, films, and television shows; they visit museums, art galleries, and historic sites; they learn about history in school, college, and university; they attend historical re-enactments and commemorations; they play historically themed video games; they read popular history and historical fiction books, and they research their family ancestry and genealogy, amongst others (Conrad et al., 2013). In these visits and viewings, Canadians frequently encounter an ethical dimension; these historical narratives take an ethical stance and include ethical judgments about controversial events, groups, people, or institutions in Canadian history. Ethical judgments in history are defined by Oldfield (1981) as "statements of praise or blame based on standards of good or evil, right and wrong, and virtue or vice, that comment on the behavior, or character of individuals or groups after the consideration of their intentions, actions and consequences" (p. 260).

One way that historical ethical judgments are present in Canadians' lives is through government apologies and commemorations of ethically unjust events in the past. In the last twenty-five years, the Canadian government has apologized on behalf of the Canadian government and people for four historical injustices. In 1988, Prime Minister Brian Mulroney apologized to Japanese Canadians on behalf of the Canadian government and offered compensation for wrongful incarceration, seizure of property, and the disenfranchisement Japanese Canadians experienced during World War Two. In 2005, a Private Member's Bill was passed acknowledging that persons of Ukrainian origin were interned in Canada during the First World War and in 2008 established a $10 million endowment to commemorate and educate Canadians about Canada's first national internment operations of 1914 to 1920. In 2006, Prime
Minister Stephen Harper apologized on behalf of the Canadian government and all Canadians to Chinese Canadians for the head tax imposed on Chinese immigrants in between 1885 and 1903 and offered financial compensation to living head taxpayers, or their spouses. Lastly, in 2008 Prime Minister Stephen Harper apologized on behalf of the Canadian government and all Canadians for both the creation of the system of Indian Residential Schools that lasted from the 1870s to the 1990s, as well as the government's policy of forced assimilation.

In addition to the ethical judgments made in government apologies for past injustices, there has also been vigorous debate about ethical judgments made in publicly funded institutions. In 2005 the Canadian War Museum opened a display in the Second World War gallery focused on the Combined Bomber Offensive and the controversial decision to launch the bomber offensive on Germany. The central text panel in the display was entitled An Enduring Controversy, and it reflected on the effectiveness and morality of the bombing campaign. The text that appeared on the panel said,

The value and morality of the strategic bomber offensive against Germany remain bitterly contested. Bomber Command's aim was to crush civilian morale and force Germany to surrender by destroying its cities and industrial installations. Although Bomber Command and American attacks left 600,000 Germans dead, and more than five million homeless, the raids resulted in only small reductions in German war production until the end of the war (Dean, 2009, p. 4).

According to historian Margaret MacMillan (2008) veterans were offended by the wording on the text panel because they felt it portrayed the 20,000 Canadians who participated in the Allied Bombing campaign (of whom 10,000 died) as ethically suspect war criminals. Veterans called for a boycott of the War Museum, and launched a media campaign to change the wording of the text panel. In response the Museum commissioned four prominent historians to write reports about the display. Two of the historians recognized that there is controversy about the bombing
campaign, but felt that the text panel was unbalanced, while the other two historians (including MacMillan) took the position that museums are places of learning and, "when there are controversies, museums ought to say so" (p. 138). After receiving the historians' reports, the Museum concluded that no further changes were necessary and veterans groups had to accept the exhibit as it was (Dean, 2009). After veterans' groups launched another media campaign against the display, the issue was brought before the Senate Subcommittee on Veterans Affairs who held a series of televised hearings and published a report in June 2007. The report recommended the War Museum should,

consider alternative ways of presenting an equally historically accurate version of its material, in a manner which eliminates the sense of insult felt by aircrew veterans and removes potential for further misrepresentation by the public (MacMillan, 2008, p. 139). According to Dean, the Senate sub-committee's report forced the Canadian War Museum to change the text on the panel (it is now three times longer than the original) which led the Canadian War Museum CEO to resign.

The four government apologies and the debate about the Allied Bombing campaign highlight the importance that ethical judgments play in Canadians' engagement with the past. Ethical judgments are an important part of people's engagement with history for a number of reasons. Seixas and Morton (2013) argue that making historical ethical judgments helps imbue the study of history with meaning, and expands individuals' historical consciousness by helping them learn from ethical transgressions in the past, and better handle ethical dilemmas in the present and future. Furthermore, making ethical judgments can help people "make the past right" and offer reasoned arguments for commemoration, redress, or recognition. Barton and Levstik (2004) also maintain that ethical judgments are a central part of participatory democracy because
the ethical decisions we make about the past are about our vision of the common good, and what we hope to achieve as a society (p. 91-92).

It has long been accepted that one of the purposes of teaching history in schools is to prepare students to be knowledgeable, active citizens (Barton & Levstik, 2004). One aspect of being an active citizen involves participating in debates about controversial issues in the present and the past. If this is the case, then one of the expectations of school history and social studies curricula is to invite students to participate in debates about ethically controversial historical issues and teach them how to make justifiable and reasoned arguments about these issues. In Canada, ethical judgments are a significant part of one of the six historical thinking concepts included in the conception of historical thinking outlined by Seixas (1996; Seixas & Peck, 2004; 2008; Seixas & Morton, 2013) for the pan-Canadian Historical Thinking Project, and have been incorporated into several provinces' history and social studies curricula. Despite the importance of historical thinking in both the public realm and history education, history education researchers have paid little attention to ethical judgments in school history, whether it be ethical judgments present in history curricula and resources, teachers’ approaches to ethical judgments, or students' approaches to ethical judgment. My dissertation research focuses on teachers’ beliefs about ethical judgments in the discipline of history and history education, how they approach ethically controversial issues in their classroom practice, and students' approaches to ethical issues, questions, and judgments.

1.1 Research Questions and Brief Outline of Study

This study examines history teachers' beliefs about ethical judgments in history and history education, the factors that influence their beliefs, and the relationship between teachers’
approaches to ethical issues, questions, and judgments and their students' approaches to ethical judgments. The three research questions that frame the study are thus:

1. What do history teachers believe about including ethical judgments in their teaching, and what factors influence their beliefs?

2. What are the different ways that teachers approach ethical issues, questions and judgments in their history classes?

3. How do students in history classes approach ethical judgments?

I conducted this research in six secondary schools (three grade 8-12 schools, two grade 10-12 schools, and one alternative school) in the fifth largest public school district in a province in Western Canada that serves 180,000 people living in four largely English-speaking (95.5%) municipalities. The research study includes two parts; in the first part sixteen Grade 11 Social Studies teachers completed a survey that asked questions about their beliefs about ethical judgments in the discipline of history and history teaching, the factors that influenced their beliefs, and the classroom practices they regularly employed.

In the second part, I conducted case studies with four Grade 11 Social Studies teachers as they taught about five ethically controversial events in Canadian history (Conscription Crisis in World War One, The Winnipeg General Strike, The On to Ottawa Trek, Japanese Canadian Internment, and the October Crisis of 1970) in order to gain a deeper understanding of the different ways that teachers brought ethical issues, questions, and judgments to their history classes, and how their students approached these topics in their written responses. Although I observed four teachers' lessons about all five ethically controversial events, the analysis for this study focuses specifically on their approaches to Japanese Canadian Internment (hereafter JCI) because it was the only one of the five topics where all four teachers assigned and collected
students' work, which allowed me to compare students' written responses. Different types of data were collected during the classroom observations including field notes, audio and video recordings of classroom observations, collection of resources teachers used during their lessons: textbooks, background information sheets, articles, documentary films, and primary sources, and completed student assignments (n=102).

Before discussing the significance of the study I provide a brief chronology and brief description of JCI that has been synthesized from a variety of secondary sources. A basic understanding of JCI is important for understanding what historians have said about JCI as well as the students’ and teachers' approaches.

1.2 Chronology of Japanese Canadian Internment: Removal to Redress

All of the wartime regulations passed by the Canadian government concerning Japanese Canadians were Orders in Council that originated in the federal cabinet and were authorized under the War Measures Act that was proclaimed on September 1, 1939. The War Measures Act permitted the government to waive habeas corpus and the right to trial, intern enemy aliens, ban political and religious groups, restrict free speech including banning certain publications, and confiscate property. In March 1941 all people of Japanese nationality in Canada aged 16 and older were required to register with the RCMP, and were photographed, fingerprinted, and issued numbered and colour-coded identity cards (white for Canadian born, pink for naturalized citizens, and yellow for aliens) that had to be carried at all times (Daniels, 1981). By December

---

1 Throughout the chapter Japanese Canadian Internment is used as a general term to describe the Japanese Canadian experience from 1941-1947 including the removal, relocation, dispossession, dispersal, and deportation of Japanese in Canada.
1941, 23,224 Japanese lived in Canada, including 6,141 Issei (immigrants from Japan), 3,159 Issei naturalized as Canadian citizens, and 14,119 Nisei (second-generation Japanese) Canadian-born citizens of whom only 5,000 were over twenty years old (Adachi, 1976; Sunahara, 2000).

Within hours of the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor and other locations in the Pacific on December 7-8, 1941, Canada declared war on Japan. Thirty-eight Japanese nationals previously investigated by the RCMP or identified by informants in the Japanese Canadian community were immediately taken into custody and sent to a prisoner-of-war camp in Kananaskis, Alberta (Sunahara, 2000; Taylor, 2004; W. P. Ward, 1976). The federal Cabinet also passed an Order in Council requiring all Japanese nationals and those naturalized after 1922 to register with the Registrar of Enemy Aliens. Beginning on December 8, 1941 the Royal Canadian Navy began impounding 1,200 Japanese Canadian fishing boats by escorting them to assembly points at ports along the B.C. coast (Sunahara, 2000).

On January 14, 1942 an Order in Council was passed that prohibited Japanese Canadians from fishing for the rest of the war, placed restrictions on the purchase of gasoline and explosives, and prohibited the use of radios and cameras (Roy, Granatstein, Iino, & Takamura, 1990). This order also authorized the RCMP to search without warrant, enforce a dawn to dusk curfew, confiscate automobiles, radios, cameras and firearms. On February 24, 1942 an Order in Council was passed that designated that all persons of Japanese origin, whether Japanese nationals or Canadian born, were excluded from the "protected area", a 100-mile wide coastal strip along the British Columbia coast (Taylor, 2004). On March 4, 1942 the Cabinet established the British Columbia Security Commission (BCSC) to administer and carry out the evacuation of the Japanese from the BC coast (Sunahara, 2000).
On March 16 the first of 4,000 people from towns in northern B.C., the Queen Charlotte Islands and Vancouver Island were rounded up and sent to Hastings Park in Vancouver, which had been converted from animal to human shelter in seven days. Each adult was allowed to bring 150 pounds of clothing, bedding and cooking utensils, while children were allowed 75 pounds. Excess property and belongings had to be turned over to the Custodian of Enemy Alien Property, who was authorized to hold all land and property in trust (Sunahara, 2000; Taylor, 2004).

Between March 16 and September 30, 1942 about 8,000 Japanese Canadians passed through Hastings Park in Vancouver (Roy et al., 1990; Taylor, 2004). At the end of March, trains began taking men to road camps throughout B.C. and Ontario, and by the end of June 1942, 2,233 men were employed in road camps (Roy et al., 1990; Sunahara, 2000; Taylor, 2004).

Entire communities of Japanese Canadian families volunteered for beet work in Alberta and Manitoba after being promised placement on farms in close proximity to one another. By April 11, 1942 2,664 Japanese Canadians moved to Alberta, and another 1,053 moved to Manitoba (Sunahara, 2000; Taylor, 2004). A small group of 1,400 Japanese Canadians received permission from the BCSC to go to four different “self-supporting projects” where they paid for their own transportation, accommodation, and living expenses in exchange for keeping their families together.

In late April 1942, the BCSC began moving women and children from Hastings Park into five hastily constructed housing camps located in abandoned mining towns in the B.C. interior as well as two planned towns that were built specifically for the Japanese Canadians. By November 1942 approximately 21,000 Japanese Canadians had been relocated from their homes; 12,029 persons were in housing settlements in the interior of British Columbia, 945 men were in road camps, 3,991 were working as labourers on sugar beet farms in the Prairies, 1,161 were in self-
supporting projects, 1,359 were given special work permits to work east of the Rockies, 699 were interned in prisoner-of-war camps in Ontario, and approximately 2,000 were permitted to continue living in communities located outside the protected area (Sunahara, 2000).

On January 23, 1943 an Order in Council was passed granting the Custodian of Enemy Property the right to dispose of Japanese Canadian property in his care without the owners' consent (Roy et al., 1990). Real estate and possessions were sold in a flooded market for less than market prices. By 1947 an estimated $11.5 million of Japanese Canadian property and possessions had been sold for only $5,373,317.64 (Sunahara, 2000).

In mid-March 1945 the Canadian government presented Japanese Canadians with two options: they could apply for voluntary repatriation to Japan, or if they wanted to remain in Canada they had to permanently move east of the Rockies (Roy et al., 1990; Roy, 2002). In April 1945, the RCMP began interviewing Japanese Canadians in the interior housing camps to register their decisions. When the RCMP finished registering Japanese Canadians' decisions on May 11, 1945, 10,347, or 43% of the Japanese population in Canada (3,503 were dependents under sixteen years of age) chose repatriation to Japan (Roy et al., 1990; Sunahara, 2000; Taylor, 2004). By December 31, 1945, 4,720 people, the majority Canadian born, applied to cancel their decision (Roy et al., 1990; Sunahara, 2000).

On December 17, 1945, the Canadian government passed three Orders in Council that extended the deportation orders for another year, a decision that was protested by private citizens, Japanese Canadian groups, and civil liberties and church groups (Roy et al., 1990; Taylor, 2004). Deportations began on May 31, 1946, and by August 1946, almost 3,964 Japanese Canadians had been sent to Japan: 1,355 Japanese nationals, 630 naturalized Canadians, and 1,979 Canadian born, over one-third of whom were under the age of 16 (Roy et al., 1990;
Sunahara, 2000; Taylor, 2004). By January 1947, over 13,000 Japanese Canadians had resettled east of British Columbia, and only 6,776 Japanese Canadians remained in B.C., which was less than one-third of the 1942 population (Sunahara, 2000).

In June 1948, the federal Elections Act was amended, and Japanese Canadians were granted the right to vote (Roy, 2002; Taylor, 2004). In the spring of 1949, the B.C. Elections Act was amended and Japanese Canadians could also vote provincially (Roy, 2002). On August 17, 1988, the National Association of Japanese Canadians (NAJC) and the federal government reached an agreement on redress. Each person of Japanese ancestry who suffered from internment, relocation, deportation, or loss of property would receive $21,000; $12 million would be given to the Japanese community to undertake cultural and educational activities; $24 million was set aside for the creation of a Canadian Race Relations Foundation; pardons were offered for those convicted of disobeying the Orders in Council made under the War Measures Act; and Canadian citizenship was provided for those wrongfully deported to Japan and their descendants (Hickman & Fukawa, 2011; Sunahara, 2000; Taylor, 2004). On September 22, 1988, Prime Minister Brian Mulroney acknowledged the wartime wrongs experienced by Japanese Canadians, and announced the agreement and its terms (Sunahara, 2000).

Despite the closure that seemingly comes with government recognition of JCI as a historical injustice, JCI still remains controversial. Some Canadians, including former Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau have argued that current governments should not apologize for historical injustices committed by previous governments in different times and circumstances. Historians have commonly agreed that the treatment of Japanese Canadians after their removal from the B.C. coast, including the relocation, dispossession, dispersal and deportation were unjust; however, there has been disagreement about whether the Canadian government's decision to
remove Japanese Canadians was justified. Lastly, the events that took place during JCI run counter to the narrative that many Canadians would like to believe about the basic goodness of their collective identity and history, which also makes JCI an ethically controversial episode in Canadian history.

1.3 **Significance of the Study**

Despite the importance of ethical judgments for public history and history education, and the proliferation of historical thinking research in the last thirty years, there has been little focus on the second-order concept of ethical judgment. If my history education literature searches are correct, this is the first study to analyze the link between teachers' beliefs about ethical judgments, their classroom approaches to ethical judgments, and their students' responses to ethical judgment questions. Osborne (2003a) argues that the best hope for improving history education is the international research being done on the teaching and learning of history that provides, “an empirical and conceptual base that has the potential to transform a debate that to date has been strong on polemic and exhortation, but short on evidence” (p. 610). This research aims to contribute to both the empirical and conceptual base in history education by concentrating on improving the understanding of teachers' and students' approaches to ethical judgments in the classroom.

In her review of research on history teaching, Wilson (2001) calls for the need to link studies of teaching to studies of learning so that we might better understand each. This research answers this call by focusing on how teachers think about and approach ethical judgments, the factors that influence these beliefs, and how these beliefs and approaches impact students' understanding of ethical judgments. Second-order historical thinking concepts, including ethical
judgments, are increasingly being adopted in curricula across Canada, the United States and Europe. If history teachers become more aware of the nature, unavoidability and importance of ethical judgments when teaching and learning history, they will focus more on teaching students how to identify, understand and make reasonable ethical judgments, and they will be better able to teach history to their students. Increased understanding of teachers’ ethical judgments thus has the potential to enrich the teaching and learning of history in Canada and internationally.

Furthermore, if students are able to understand and identify ethical judgments in others' accounts, and make their own reasoned ethical judgments, they will be better equipped to make ethical judgments about the past and may be better equipped to deal with the ethical controversies they encounter in the present and the future. Lastly, the ability to make reasoned ethical judgments might also help Canadians and other countries around the world make decisions about how to remember and respond to historical injustices that have taken place in their country's history, and about contemporary issues they currently face.

1.4 Summary

In this chapter I have outlined the purpose, context, and significance of this study. The remaining chapters are organized as follows: Chapter 2 outlines the research literature on ethical judgments, and teacher knowledge and beliefs to lay the groundwork for the data analysis and discussion chapters. The first section reviews the literature about ethical judgments in history and history education, including arguments for and against ethical judgments in the discipline of history, the characteristics of reasoned ethical judgments, and the place of ethical judgments in history education. The second section focuses on teacher knowledge and beliefs, and more
specifically, teacher's knowledge and beliefs about history teaching and controversial issues, as well as the factors that influence those beliefs.

Chapter 3 reviews the historiography of Japanese Canadian Internment during World War Two to determine how historians have interpreted the ethically controversial event. This review establishes a disciplinary context for classroom discussion of ethical issues, judgments, and questions raised by JCI: to the degree that there is enduring controversy, what are its focal points, and to the degree that there is a contemporary consensus, how did it evolve.

Chapter 4 discusses the research methods and procedures employed to address the three research questions for the study. I review the three research questions and provide a brief overview of the procedures and methods used in the study before describing the research methodology employed and outlining the rationale for selecting the chosen methodology. I then discuss the research procedures including the data collection, setting, participants, and data analysis, and conclude by outlining the ethical considerations, trustworthiness, and limitations of the study.

In Chapter 5 I discuss the research findings concerning teachers' beliefs about ethical judgments in the discipline of history and history education, and the influences on their beliefs. I also describe the different ways ethical judgments were present in the four teachers' lessons, and how teachers and students approached ethical judgments as they focused on Japanese Canadian Internment (JCI) during World War Two.

Chapter 6 presents the conclusions related to the three research questions, and discusses the implications these conclusions have for history teaching, policy and curriculum, and future research, as well as the limitations of the research.
Chapter 2: REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter reviews the research literature in two intersecting areas, ethical judgments in history, and teacher knowledge and beliefs, in order to lay the groundwork for the data analysis and discussion chapters. The first section reviews the literature about ethical judgments in history and history education, including arguments for and against ethical judgments in the discipline of history, the characteristics of reasoned ethical judgments, and the place of ethical judgments in history education. The second section focuses on teacher knowledge and beliefs, and more specifically, teacher's knowledge and beliefs about history teaching and controversial issues, as well as the factors that influence those beliefs.

2.1 Ethical Judgments in History

The invocation to historians to suppress even that minimal degree of moral or psychological evaluation which is necessarily involved in viewing human beings as creatures with purposes and motives (and not merely as causal factors in the procession of events), seems to me to rest upon a confusion of the aims and methods of the humane studies with those of natural science. It is one of the greatest and most destructive fallacies of the last hundred years (Berlin, 1955).

Historian Isaiah Berlin argues here that the suggestion that historians can and should avoid making moral evaluations when analyzing the past confuses historians' purposes and methods with those of the natural sciences. Berlin made this argument during a period when such eminent historians and philosophers of history as Lord Acton, E.H. Carr, Marc Bloch, Herbert Butterfield, and George Kitson Clark, were debating whether moral or ethical judgments were
acceptable when historians' interpreted the past. The orthodox view was that making ethical judgments was neither permissible nor desirable for historians. This view persisted in the discipline of history from the end of the Second World War to the end of the Cold War (Vann, 2004). In the last three decades, philosophers of history and historians renewed debates about the acceptability of ethical judgments to the point that the majority of historians have accepted that ethical judgments are important and inescapable when historians research, write, and teach history (Bedarida, 2000; Boobbyer, 2002; Cracraft, 2004; Gaddis, 2002; Vann, 2004).

In the following sections I explore these debates and conclude that reasoned ethical judgments are an unavoidable and acceptable part of the historical discipline. Next, I use the literature to outline the characteristics of reasoned ethical judgments, and consider the role that ethical judgments have played in history education.

2.1.1 The case against ethical judgments

As noted above, eminent historians and philosophers of history before and after World War Two argued that ethical judgments should not be an accepted part of the discipline of history for a number of reasons: ethical judgments are too subjective, ethical judgments are irrelevant to the purpose of history, it is not a historian's responsibility to make ethical judgments, it is impossible for historians to make ethical judgments about events that took place in different time periods and according to different ethical standards, historians know too little, historians know too much, and ethical judgments lead to poorly written history.

The term ethical judgment is used synonymously throughout the dissertation with other terms including moral evaluation, moral judgment and ethical dimension.
Of the different reasons historians have eschewed ethical judgments, Cracraft (2004) argues that historians' longstanding aspiration for scientific objectivity stands above all others (p. 37). Objectivity in historiography is defined by Novick (1988) as

a commitment to the reality of the past, and to truth as correspondence to that reality; a sharp separation between knower and known, between fact and value, and, above all, between history and fiction. Historical facts are seen as prior to and independent of interpretation .... Truth is one, not perspectival (p. 1-2).

Historians and philosophers who opposed ethical judgments were part of a European philosophical tradition that stressed the distinction between fact and value (Boobbyer, 2002). To these positivist historians, ethical judgments are too temporary, too subjective, and too easily manipulated. Oakeshott (1991) claimed that drawing moral lessons from the past is to make history, “into a field in which we exercise our moral and political opinions, like whippets in a meadow on a Sunday afternoon” (p. 165). According to Cracraft (2004), historians were reluctant to admit that moral judgments are inescapable in written histories because this admission would undermine history’s orientation towards objectivity and the natural sciences that was an important part of the discipline since the origins of professional history in the 19th century. Furthermore, acknowledging the inescapability of ethical judgments would deny the fully academic character of the historical discipline, which could lead to a potential loss of authority, credibility, and respectability for historians.

Throughout his career, Butterfield fought against what he saw as two fundamental errors in historical analysis: the writing of history in the service of a present-day cause, and the conversion of historical assessments into ethical judgments (Elton, 1984). He was adamant that historians should be confined to establishing what happened because, “making moral judgments are not only irrelevant to serious historical inquiry, but alien to the entire enterprise” (Cracraft,
Butterfield (1931; 1951) was emphatic that the role of the historian is “to describe,” “to stand impartial,” to provide, “history without bias, history that is partial to nobody.” As a supporter of what he called “scientific” “technical” or “specialist” history, Butterfield aimed to reach higher levels of understanding, which he distinguished from the trivial, pseudo-moral and ethically righteous narratives of “abridged”, “general” and “whiggish” interpretations of history (Cracraft, 2004, p. 31). Butterfield did not deny that historians indulge in occasional and explicit moral asides, but to him these are incidental and are not problematic unless they become an integral part of describing history (Low-Beer, 1967). "Ethical questions concern the historian in so far as they are part of the world which he has to describe…” (Cracraft, 2004, p. 31). Similarly, Marc Bloch described how scholars and judges display two different kinds of impartiality. "When the scholar has observed and explained, his task is finished. It yet remains for the judge to pass sentence” (Vann, 2004, p. 6). For Bloch, judges are expected to act impartially when passing a judgment according to the law, but there is great diversity amongst cultures in deciding what should be punishable as a crime. According to Bloch, scholars should ensure that they do not mistake themselves for judges.

More recently, Megill (2004) contended that the fundamental tasks for historians are to describe events in the past, to explain these wherever it is possible and interesting to do so, to offer arguments and justifications for the truth claims made, and to comment on the significance of what has been claimed (p. 61). In his view, making ethical judgments are not essential to the historian’s enterprise, however, he does not deny history’s ethical and moral component. For Megill, the fundamental obligation of a historian is to tell the truth after considering the strength and weight of the available evidence.
In his 1975 Presidential Address to the American Historical Association Gordon Wright (1976) also explained that making ethical judgments is not a historian's responsibility.

The idea of consciously reintroducing the moral dimension into history runs counter to the basic training of most historians, and probably to their professional instinct as well. Each of us has some strong views on the general subject of morality; each of us knows the dangers involved in making moral judgments in our work, or even suggesting a need for them (p. 2).

Similarly, Butterfield maintained that assigning, "responsibility lies altogether outside the particular world where the historian does historical thinking" (Oldfield, 1981, p. 263). Kitson Clark (1967) argued that historians describe and narrate the past after sifting sources and weighing evidence, while others with more subtlety (jurists, philosophers, theologians, or psychologists) are left to assign ethical blame or praise. As reported in Vann (2004), American historian Henry Steel Commager attempted to absolve historians from making ethical judgments by arguing that it is futile to make them because readers have their own moral values that are distinct and impermeable to historians’ judgments and influence. Carr (1962) also believed that there is no tribunal before which men of the past can be held responsible, and it is not part of the historian's task, "to pronounce moral judgments on the private lives of individuals who appear in his pages" (p. 75-76). Instead, Carr contended that historians should “turn to the more difficult but more profitable question of the passing of moral judgements not on individuals, but on events, institutions, or policies of the past” (p. 78). In his view, it is better to make ethical judgments about whole groups and societies because condemning individuals absolves society from the responsibility for producing reprehensible individuals.

One of the arguments historians most frequently used to argue against ethical judgments is the “historicist argument”—that making ethical judgments is impossible because times impose their morality upon lives and there is no point condemning individuals for the circumstances in
which they found themselves (Gaddis, 2002). E.H. Carr insisted that ethical judgments are for contemporaries, not posterity to judge (Gaddis, 2002). Sheehan (1985) contended that the greatest risk in making ethical judgments is judging the past by the standards of another age, or by standards that claim universal applicability (p. 37). Similarly Bloch (1953) posed a rhetorical question that highlighted the historicist dilemma:

Are we so sure of ourselves and of our age as to divide the company of our forefathers into the just and the damned? How absurd it is, by elevating the entirely relative criteria of one individual, one party, or one generation to the absolute, to inflict standards upon the way in which Sulla governed Rome, or Richelieu the States of the Most Christian King! Moreover, since nothing is more variable than such judgments, subject to all the fluctuations of collective opinion or personal caprice, history...has gratuitously given itself the appearance of the most uncertain of discipline (p. 140).

Geoffrey Barraclough, a supporter of the historicist argument against ethical judgments, asked what good it does to chastise figures in the past for being immoral and unethical when, “evil actions sometimes have good consequences, and there is no way to tell whether a virtuous action that was not undertaken would have turned out better” (Vann, 2004, p. 9).

Another argument made against ethical judgments is that historians know too little to make them. Butterfield claimed that no historian can understand the mind and character of a historical agent sufficiently enough to conclude that, "one man is essentially more wicked than another” and that any ethical judgment is nothing more than a failure of understanding (L. O. Ward, 1975). Butterfield, a devout Christian, argued that only God can judge moral and ethical issues, and since man’s knowledge is limited, his knowledge is always incomplete and incorrect” (Low-Beer, 1967, p. 138). George Kitson Clark’s (1967) argument mirrored that of Butterfield’s:

I ought to say that I do not myself believe that judgements on dead people can ever be satisfactory. It is not in my belief possible to know enough of the circumstances of those on whom they are to be pronounced, nor is it possible to detach oneself from the issues of any historical conflict sufficiently effectively to be capable of doing equal justice to all
the people concerned. I hold that it is desirable to stigmatize evil deeds but not to condemn people (p. 208).

Butterfield also suggested that we can know or at least claim to know too much to make ethical judgments. Butterfield believed in social physics—the idea that knowledge of the social laws governing historical development would show that the actions of historical actors could not have been other than what they were, so since they had no real choice, it is beyond the point to make any ethical criticisms of them (Vann, 2004). The obvious problem with this argument is that social physics has not become a reality and history has not been reduced to a series of universal laws. Furthermore, there is nothing in this argument about the impropriety of ethical judgments in history that does not also apply to other types of judgments. Oldfield (1981) argued that if certain courses of action appear to have been natural, then not only are ethical judgments irrelevant, so too are all historical judgments.

The last argument offered by those against ethical judgments in history is that making ethical judgments leads to poorly written history. Butterfield (1951) warned that moral indignation and snap ethical judgments can blind historical understanding, and inhibit the imaginative endeavour. Furthermore, he stated that offering repeated, occasional, or “spasmodic” ethical judgments when writing history is inadequate.

2.1.2 The case for ethical judgments

In this section I outline the arguments historians and philosophers have made to challenge the orthodox view that ethical judgments should not be made. They argue that ethical judgments are an inescapable and important part of the historical discipline, they are the end results of historical inquiry, and the historicist problem can be overcome.
This group of historians and philosophers argue that ethical judgments are an inescapable part of historical writing (Berlin, 1955; Vann, 2004). According to Megill (2004), explicit and implicit ethical judgments can be identified in all parts of the historical writing process: description, explanation, argument and justification, and interpretation (p. 53-54). Dray observed that, "the accounts we find in history books generally seem to be thoroughly value-impregnated", and notes that most historians feel it is psychologically impossible for them to avoid making moral evaluations in their writings (Dray, 1967, p. 27). Similarly, Low-Beer (1967) reasons that because history is written in everyday language that is rife with ethical connotations and implications, it is impossible to think of a narrative that is written in neutral technical language. Gaddis (2002) echoes these statements:

...no work of history that I am aware has ever been written without making some kind of statement—explicitly or implicitly, consciously or subconsciously—about where its subjects lie along the ubiquitous spectrum that separates the admirable from the abhorrent. You can’t escape thinking about history in moral terms (p. 122).

Even E. H. Carr (1962), a fervent opponent of explicit ethical judgments about the lives of individuals, accepted that, "Historical facts . . . presuppose some measure of interpretation; and historical interpretations always involve moral judgements – or, if you prefer a more neutral-sounding term, value judgements" (p. 79). Similarly, most historians recognize that their values influence their choice of topics to study, their perception of sources, their selection of relevant facts, and their hierarchies of explanatory factors (Bedarida, 2000; Boobbyer, 2002). Historian of the Shoah Raul Hilberg made an effort to avoid value-charged language in his writing by avoiding terms such as "crimes" or "murders." However, after trying to write this way he eventually gave up because, “he couldn't keep it up” (Vann, 2004, p. 13).
Oldfield (1981) argued that Carr's contention that historians should not pass moral judgments on individuals, but should make moral judgments about events, institutions, or policies of the past is illogical because it is impossible to understand how a historian can condemn a society without passing judgment on individuals. Oldfield described how a historian who asserts that slavery is wrong, and then describes an individual as a slave-owner is still making an ethical judgment about the individual. The only justifiable way that condemnatory remarks about individuals can be left out of an account is if the evidence shows that individuals were a product of their society and could not have acted differently. The contention that only society, not individuals, can be held ethically responsible runs the risk of arguing that we are all products of our society and have no agency to act differently than we do. While there are cases in which there is no point condemning individuals for the circumstances they are in, Gaddis (2002) wonders what historians should do when confronted with examples of individuals such as Hitler, Lenin, Stalin, and Mao who imposed their morality upon a particular time period. Unfortunately, neither Bloch, nor Carr provides any guidance about how to deal with such situations. According to Oldfield (1981), the arguments that attempt to absolve historians of the responsibility for making ethical judgments are unconvincing because they downplay the ability of a human being, let alone a historian, to possess ethical and moral sense and some degree of subtlety in how that sense is applied. Vann (2004) argued that rather than avoid responsibility, historians should embrace the role of ethical commentators because when they evaluate what the dead have done, they are not passing final judgment, they are communicating their ethical opinions to their readers and inviting them to enter into a dialogue about the past actions of the dead.

How can one stigmatize evil deeds without condemning people at the same time? If it is recognized that one can never understand the mind and character of a historical actor well
enough to make an ethical judgment, then one can never know enough to make any type of historical judgment or evaluation. According to Oldfield (1981) it is hindsight, the ability to know the consequences and subsequent events that followed the event under consideration that enables historians to create coherence out of “the incoherence of lived experience” (, p. 275-276). Child (1951) pointed out that when making ethical judgments historians often have access to evidence that makes their ethical judgment more plausible than those made at the time.

Although Boobbyer (2002) agreed that immediate ethical judgments inhibit historical understanding, he argued that historians and philosophers (like Butterfield) who argue that ethical judgments are unacceptable have confused moralizing with making reasoned ethical judgments. Although Butterfield is justified in criticizing the haphazard use of explicit ethical judgments in any narrative, this criticism is more of a stylistic concern than a valid reason why ethical judgments should not be permitted. Oldfield (1981) astutely pointed out that if historians litter their accounts with explicit, stentorian ethical judgments, then the likely result is a poor historical scholarship, however much attention is scrupulously paid to the historical evidence. Making ethical judgments about individuals or society is not the same as reporting one’s subjective responses to a moral or ethical issue. Oldfield (1981) summarized this position:

Any opinion, whether judgment or prejudice, which puts a stop to further inquiry offends the criteria of historical craftsmanship, one of which is scrupulous attention to evidence, and another, the use of appropriate analytical perspectives (p. 263).

Ethical judgments, like other kinds of value judgments, should be the end product of an historical inquiry, and historians who make ethical judgments before this point are guilty of shoddy practice. Oldfield (1981) also argued that the majority of historians accept that all historical judgments require constant revision because new evidence emerges and new analytical positions develop that cause them to perceive ethical dilemmas differently.
The most substantial problem historians encounter when making ethical judgments is that there may have been different ethical and moral codes in the past than the present. Historians commonly agree that it is impermissible to make presentist or anachronistic ethical judgments using ethical frameworks that do not apply to the past situation (Fischer, 1970; Oldfield, 1981). Vann (2004) argues that it is important that historians understand that like today, cultures in the past did not necessarily have consensus about their ethical values and how they should be applied. Historians understand that making, “a moral assessment of the character of an action requires one to assess it in its own moral context…” (Oldfield, 1981, p. 270). According to Barton and Levstik (2004), when historians “visit” the past they must make their best effort to understand the ethical precepts of the people they are studying, and then balance these with what would have been acceptable today. Seeking out ethical commentary made at the time an event occurred enables historians to enter the lives of people in the past and more fully appreciate their circumstances, ethical choices, and judgments.

Gaddis (2002) suggested that getting inside other people’s minds requires one to be open to their hopes and fears, their beliefs and dreams, their sense of right and wrong, their perception of the world and where they fit within it (p. 124). Similarly, Collingwood (1946) insisted that, “History cannot be scientifically written unless the historian can re-enact in his own mind the experience of the people whose actions he is narrating” (p. 73). Gaddis further proposed that historians should work through the process of getting into and back out of another person’s mind, and then argue over what they saw (p. 126). In his view, the only way to face the problem of anachronism and presentism when making ethical judgments is to accept the historian’s engagement with the morality of his or her time, but to distinguish that engagement explicitly, “from the morality of the individual, or the age the historian is writing about. We need both
angles of vision if we really are to triangulate the past” (p. 128). Negotiating the tension between ethical standards in the past and those that exist in the present is a difficult and complex intellectual feat, but it is of crucial importance for making reasoned ethical judgments. If contemporary ethical standards are universally and unthinkingly applied when making ethical judgments, then the presentist judgment is unacceptable to historians. Similarly, the historicist argument that it is impossible to make ethical judgments because ethical standards in the past are so different from the present is also untenable.

2.1.3 Characteristics of reasoned ethical judgments

After reviewing the arguments about whether ethical judgments are an important part of the discipline of history, it is clear that ethical judgments are unavoidable when historians research, write, teach, and discuss the past. The important issue is no longer whether historians should make ethical judgments, but as Gaddis (2002) wondered, how can historians make reasoned ethical judgments. Historians, historiographers, and philosophers have made several suggestions about how to evaluate the strength of ethical judgments. Vann (2004) distinguished between strong and weak ethical evaluations; “weak” ethical judgments involve criticizing other historians for making explicit ethical judgments (an ethical judgment in itself), attempting to purge language of all moral and ethical implications, evaluating historical actors’ decisions without considering the consequences of the decisions, and discussing obvious atrocities (like the Holocaust) without condemning the actions of those who authorized the massacres, or carried them out. Strong evaluations do the opposite of weak evaluations and seek out all extenuating circumstances that help explain historical actors’ actions.
Cracraft (2004) explained how two philosophers, Strauss and Fleischacker attempted to identify a universal ethical code or natural law that would protect ethical judgments against the relativistic excesses of extreme post-modernism. Although every culture is, “socially local and particular” and offers its people a guide to acceptable conduct, Sheehan (1985) believed it is possible to express a moral universality that cuts across an extended field of human differentiation. Human societies normally express a concern for life; see procreation as good; invest gender differences with social importance; set rules for governing sexual activity; place value on the education of youth; recognize that societies are wider than the nuclear family and obligations exist between persons; value common good over the interests of the individual; believe justice involves a personal relationship to property, and maintain that friendship and reciprocity prevails widely. Sheehan (1985) accepted that even if a natural law could ever be discovered, no such common code has ever been, or would be accepted amongst the world’s population.

Partington (1979) believed that it is a difficult but important job to develop criteria for ethical judgments that are not too personal, subjective, or arbitrary. Furthermore, he argued that the failure to work out explicit criteria would ensure that future judgments remain implicit, unconscious, unexamined, inconsistent, and eclectic. Despite the lack of precise agreement on the criteria for reasonable ethical judgments, there is a rough consensus among contemporary historians, historiographers and philosophers that provides direction on how to make reasoned ethical judgments. From the literature on ethical judgments in history (see Berlin, 1955; Boobbyer, 2002; Child, 1951; Cracraft, 2004; Dray, 1967; Fischer, 1970; Gaddis, 2002; Low-Beer, 1967; Oldfield, 1981; Partington, 1980; Sheehan, 1985; Vann, 2004), I have distilled eight characteristics of historians’ reasoned ethical judgments.
1. Historians accept that implicit and explicit ethical judgments are unavoidable when they write, teach, and research history.

2. Historians’ ethical judgments negatively condemn or positively acclaim the actions, beliefs, and decisions of individuals, events, institutions, and societies in the past.

3. Historians articulate the point of view and values that inform their work before making ethical judgments.

4. Historians avoid making definitive ethical judgments until evidence about the intentions, codes of behaviour, awareness of consequences, potential alternatives and options available, and the possibility of people choosing differently are fully considered.

5. Historians weigh individual actions against structural factors including social contexts, environment and social situations.

6. Historians negotiate the tension between the ethical standards and beliefs that existed in the past and those that exist in the present in order to avoid imposing presentist judgments upon the past.

7. Historians recognize that there can be multiple reasonable ethical judgments about the same event because human values are diverse.

8. Historians’ ethical judgments are always provisional because they reflect contemporary values, and cannot escape their historical context. The ultimate judges of the plausibility ethical judgments are other historians, critics, and the public audience.

These characteristics provide the disciplinary backdrop for ethical judgments in history education.
2.1.4 Ethical judgments in history education

In this section I explain why ethical judgments have been an accepted part of history education throughout the past century, discuss the relationship between ethical judgments and historical thinking, discuss research about ethical judgments in classroom practice, and review the suggestions history educators have offered for teaching students about how to make reasoned ethical judgments.

Unlike the shift that occurred in the historical discipline where ethical judgments were initially avoided and then gained acceptance in the last three decades, Diorio (1985) contended that ethical judgments have been accepted as an important part of history education since the inclusion of history in compulsory public schooling over a century ago. Ethical judgments were not just a part of history education, they were recognized as one of the most important purposes for teaching history. As Partington (1979) suggested, history has been used in most human societies to promote group solidarity and pride, or to strengthen beliefs, values or moral habits. In the United States at the beginning of the century, moral training was listed as one of the primary reasons for teaching history, while in Britain history was identified as, "the nursery of patriotism and public virtue" (Diorio, 1985, p. 71). History maintained an important position in the curriculum because it was perceived to be one of the subjects that strengthened the moral and ethical training of young people, and because it contributed to the transmission of a sense of national heritage and citizenship (L. O. Ward, 1975). Anything that could be shown to contribute to the building of the nation was described as good, anything that did not was either condemned or ignored as irrelevant (Osborne, 2008). Historical study was also seen as a means of providing exemplary models of virtuous behaviour, or in the frequently repeated words of Dionysius, "history is philosophy teaching by examples" (Nadel, 1964, p. 455). History was believed to be
practical ethics and philosophy in action, an observatory in which the consequences of various human actions could be viewed and the appropriate lessons drawn (Diorio, 1985, p. 74). Diorio also argued that the ethical purpose of teaching history provided history teachers with a strong long-term justification for their work.

According to Low-Beer (1967) ethical judgments were presented to students in the form of authoritative narratives established by experts, passed on by teachers, and passively accepted by students. There was little room for interpretation and students were expected to both learn the story and learn from the story. Butterfield, the staunch opponent of ethical judgments, ironically exemplified this view when he argued that the best way to teach history to the very young was, "the mere telling of stories...with possibly a side-glance at some moral that may be drawn from the narrative" (Vann, 2004, p. 5). Additionally, the ethical judgments presented were often conservative and offered an individualistic view of human agency in the face of historical events.

### 2.1.5 Ethical judgments and historical thinking

Many history educators in the 1970s and 1980s, influenced by changes in historiography and education, began to regard the patriotic and moralistic uses of history as unjustifiable modes of indoctrination (Partington, 1979). Social historians influenced by methods adapted from the social sciences challenged traditional history's pre-occupation with the nation and the actions of “great” individuals in history, focusing instead on history-from-below and broader social forces and structural trends that were believed to be a greater influence on the events of history. In the decades following the postmodern or “linguistic turn” in the historical discipline, the field of history was opened to cultural historians who examined how people’s language and ways of thinking shaped their understanding of the world in which they lived (Iggers, 1997). This
position denied the possibility of objectivity in history because historians were seen as prisoners of the world in which they live, and their thoughts and perceptions were conditioned by the language they use.

Alongside changes in historiography, the constructivist theories of Bruner, Piaget, and others convinced history educators that history should be taught in an “intellectually honest” manner that focused on student inquiry and the structure of the disciplines approach, described by Seixas (2000) as the disciplinary approach. Supporters of this approach posited that the disciplines embody distinctive ways of making sense of the world including unique conceptual frameworks, methods of inquiry, and standards of proof. History educators in Great Britain, the United States and Canada argued that students’ factual knowledge of the past was not enough, and needed to be accompanied by historical thinking (Dickinson & Lee, 1984; Seixas, 1996; Shemilt, 1980; Wineburg, 2001). Historical thinking required students to be taught how to utilize historians’ tools including the ability to analyze historical evidence, construct an evidence-based account, take historical perspectives, recognize the continuities and changes in the past and the present, and to approach evidence and argument in a spirit of constructive skepticism (Osborne, 2008).

Although history educators focused more and more on historical thinking, ethical judgments remained an important part of history education. Low-Beer (1967) was the first history educator to suggest a historical thinking approach to ethical judgments in history education. Low-Beer recognized that although the theoretical position of ethical judgments in history was still debatable amongst historians, it is, “difficult to remove moral judgments entirely from history.” Low-Beer argued that ethical judgments are implied in our everyday language and are part of historians’ viewpoints, interpretations, and descriptions of causes and explanations,
and as a result, they should be included in any attempt to teach students to think historically. Low-Beer's historical thinking approach to ethical judgments aimed to teach students how to recognize ethical judgments, and how to make reasoned ethical judgments. She argued that it was important for teachers to recognize that ethical judgments are unavoidable because they are influenced by what historians do, and also because there are strong reasons to suggest that ethical judgments are more ubiquitous in history education than previously thought.

Over the past thirty years multiple history education scholars have focused on understanding the development of students’ historical thinking and understanding. However, little attention has been paid to the issue of ethical judgments. Barton and Levstik (2004) confirmed this conclusion when they argued that a moral response, “forms a major component of history education in schools, although its role is generally unacknowledged and unanalyzed” (p. 104). Of the different conceptions and theories of historical thinking developed during the last three decades very few included an explicit focus on ethical judgments, except for the 1996 U.S National Standards for History in the Schools (http://www.nchs.ucla.edu/Standards/), the work of Barton and Levstik, and the historical thinking framework outlined by Seixas (1996; 2006) for the Historical Thinking Project.

The 1996 National Standards for History in the Schools developed history standards for Historical Thinking, U.S. History Content, World History Content and grades K-4. The standards for historical thinking included five benchmarks, one of which, “Standard 5: Historical Issues-Analysis and Decision-Making” mentions moral judgments in its description, and discusses the moral dimension in the explicit wording of the standard itself. For Barton and Levstik (2004) ethical judgments occupy a central place in the four “actions” or “stances” students are expected to perform when they learn history: identify, analyze, respond morally, and display (p. 107). The
moral response stance includes three purposes: remembrance, condemnation and admiration. For Barton and Levstik, the purposes for making ethical judgments are to appraise the actions of others, to affect the behaviour of those whom we judge (if they are still alive), or to change the behaviour of others by either encouraging or dissuading them from taking a particular course of action. In their view, ethical judgments are a central part of participatory democracy because, “our hopes for the future are rooted in our moral visions, and history applies those visions to the real world of human action” (p. 103).

Influenced by developments in international research on history education, Seixas’ Historical Thinking Project (hereafter HTP) (http://historybenchmarks.ca/) was established on the premise that historical thinking is central to history instruction and the goal of history education is to help students become more competent as historical thinkers as they move throughout their school years. Seixas developed a framework of six historical thinking concepts influenced by the international research of historians and history educators to help teachers encourage and assess students’ historical thinking. One of the six historical thinking concepts included in the HTP framework focuses on helping students understand the, “Ethical Dimension” of history which includes the making of ethical judgments about historical actions, and taking responsibility for the legacies of historical crimes, and sacrifices that the past imposes upon society today.

2.1.6 Teachers' and students' approaches to ethical judgments

There has been little research or theorizing about teachers' and students' approaches to ethical judgments. Seixas and Ercikan (2010) conducted a validation study with 56 teachers and 96 students to pilot two questionnaires that examined students' and teachers' approaches to
historical thinking. Their research showed that teachers claim not to focus on the ethical dimension of history very often when they teach. Fewer than 20% of the teachers reported telling students what was good or bad, right or wrong in history often or very often. Of the six historical thinking concepts focused on in the study, the smallest percentage of teachers (69%) believed the ethical dimension was important or very important, and only 46% of teachers reported teaching about the ethical dimension at least monthly, which was the lowest of all the six concepts. Also, the lowest percentage of teachers (43%) reported including the ethical dimension in assignments and tests.

There have likewise been very few studies of students' ethical judgments in history. Borries' (1994) study provided a glimpse into the difficulties students face when making ethical judgments, and his study suggested that students’ ethical judgments are rooted in the present, empathy with the historical “other” did not take place, and students rarely distinguished history-based arguments from grossly anachronistic statements (p. 344). The students based their judgments on primitive understandings such as, “those people were all criminals/fools,” or “those people didn’t know what we know”, and dismissed alternative answers such as, “Times were different then”, or “Different times—different practices” (p. 346).

Bellino and Selman (2011; 2012) and Selman and Barr (2009) have conducted three different studies that focused on students' ethical judgments. Bellino and Selman (2011) explored the relationship between historical thinking and ethical reflection and found that adolescents struggled to coordinate their evaluative ethical responses and their explanatory historical responses to a case of personal betrayal set in a historical context. Although no ethical judgment was required in the task students were asked to complete, the researchers identified three distinct types of moral responses in students' responses. Students made explicit negative or positive
judgments, neutral responses that took no ethical position, or unresolved responses that either included implicit judgments or acknowledged both positive and negative aspects of the historical decision. The researchers found that students were inclined to respond morally to the question, and that their ethical reflections of historical actions did not preclude historical thinking. Furthermore, they found that students' responses were not always presentist, especially when they expressed their ethical beliefs in historical context and articulated ethical complexity and uncertainty.

One of the problems Bellino and Selman (2012) encountered was that no previous researchers had articulated what adequate historical thinking about ethical issues looks like. Lowenthal (2000), discussed how students' ethical responses swing between two ahistorical poles, presentism and postmodernist scepticism. In presentist responses students imposed conventional ethical norms on the past, while postmodernist sceptical responses dismissed the possibility of ethical judgments altogether because they are too closely tied to one's psychology, values, and historical context. Despite this problem, Bellino and Selman (2012) were convinced that ethical reflection and historical analysis, "implicitly intersect in the concentric circles of individual, social, and historical context" (p. 197). They argued that historical rigor and ethical reflection in early adolescence develops in separate but intersecting pathways that are best supported by a pedagogy that allows them the space and time to work out for themselves why people made the choices they did. Bellino and Selman (2011) also highlighted the importance of perspective taking when making reasonable ethical judgments, and conclude that until students can put human events into historical perspective, they are not able to ethically and morally distance themselves from decisions made in the past that do not fit with their conventional sense of right and wrong.
2.1.7 Teaching students to make ethical judgments

History educators have made several suggestions about how teachers should teach students to make reasoned ethical judgments. Low-Beer (1967) said that students should be taught how to identify implicit and explicit ethical judgments in ordinary language and learn the moral meanings of the words regularly used in history, including the subtle and varied moral connotations of tone of voice, word choice, and analogies. Furthermore, Low-Beer argued that teachers should invite students to make ethical judgments after they consider a variety of primary and secondary sources, as well as investigate and evaluate other people's ethical judgments including historians, teachers and classmates. Seixas (1996) highlighted the importance for teachers to help students identify the difference between the values and climate of moral opinion in the past and present; otherwise students will impose presentist notions upon the past. Lastly, Seixas argued that students should understand how to use and interpret primary and secondary source evidence as the basis for making ethical judgments about the past. To Seixas, evidence is the anchor that keeps ethical judgments from slipping into relativism and students need to be able to analyze evidence to strengthen unsubstantiated ethical judgments.

Recently Seixas and Morton (2013) expanded upon their conception of the ethical dimension and offered several suggestions for teaching students about making ethical judgments. They argued that the ethical dimension is important because it imbues the study of history with meaning, helps students learn from the past in order to move into the future, and helps students learn to judge the past fairly. They outlined five “guideposts” to help students develop powerful understandings of the ethical dimension.
1. *Authors make implicit and explicit ethical judgments.* Students must understand the interpretive nature of historical accounts before being taught how to recognize and analyze the ethical judgments present in different accounts.

2. *Reasoned ethical judgments of past actions are made by taking into account the historical context of the actors in question.* Students should consider the historical context within which a historical action took place in order to identify limitations on choices, possibilities that may have restricted people's actions, or alternative choices that historical actors had.

3. *When making ethical judgments, it is important to be cautious about imposing contemporary standards of right and wrong on the past.* Students should consider whether the historical actors' beliefs about right and wrong are the same or different than their contemporary beliefs before making an ethical judgment.

4. *A fair assessment of the ethical implications of history can inform us of our responsibilities to remember and respond to contributions, sacrifices, and injustices of the past.*

5. *Our understanding of history can help us make informed judgments about contemporary issues, but only if we recognize the limitations of any direct lessons from the past.* Students should be discouraged from trying to draw any direct lessons from the past because of the differences between the past and the present.

In the first part of this chapter, I have argued that ethical judgments are an important and unavoidable part of the historical discipline and history education. In the second part, I review the research literature about teacher knowledge and beliefs about teaching history and about controversial issues, and the influences on their beliefs.
2.2 Teacher Knowledge and Beliefs

Although the amount of research on teacher knowledge and beliefs is growing, no research has been conducted on teachers' knowledge, beliefs, attitudes, or approaches to ethical judgments in history. Despite the dearth of research on teachers' beliefs about ethical judgments, the research literature about history teachers' knowledge and beliefs informs my understanding of the factors that influence teachers' knowledge and beliefs about history teaching and controversial issues, as well as the different types of research methodologies that have been utilized to study teachers' knowledge and beliefs about teaching history. I begin by providing a brief overview of the general research conducted on teachers' knowledge and beliefs, and then focus more specifically on research that has concentrated on teachers' knowledge and beliefs about teaching history.

Research on teachers' knowledge and beliefs began in the 1980s, and today it is only beginning to be understood by the current generation of researchers in teaching and teacher education (Munby, Russell, & Martin, 2001). Despite the "immeasurable growth" in the number of studies conducted in this area, the field of research has little coherence because of disagreements between scholars about almost every aspect of research about teachers' knowledge and beliefs. For example, they disagree about what counts as teacher knowledge, whether teacher knowledge is invented or acquired, whether teacher knowledge is the same as teacher beliefs, how teacher knowledge is best conceptualized, how teacher knowledge develops, and how teacher knowledge is best represented. One of the major problems scholars have encountered when conceptualizing the nature of teacher knowledge has been the epistemological tension between the high ground of theory, and the "swampy lowlands" of practice (Munby et al., 2001).
Until the 1980s most of the research in the field was conducted by researchers influenced by information-processing studies who believed that teachers' knowledge was best conceptualized using traditional experimental research focused on the cognitive processes that teachers use when thinking about teaching. Since that time, researchers have increasingly used a variety of qualitative and interpretive methods to understand the knowledge teachers possess, and how this knowledge is acquired, modified, and, elaborated through experience (Munby et al., 2001).

Another debate amongst researchers centres on whether teacher beliefs are the same as teacher knowledge, and the degree to which beliefs influence teacher thinking and action. Although Richardson (1996) recognizes that most of the research literature does not make the distinction between teachers' beliefs and teachers' knowledge, she distinguishes between beliefs and knowledge in her review of research on teacher thinking, stating that beliefs are propositional and do not have to satisfy a "truth condition", whereas knowledge does. According to Munby et al., (2001) many of the studies use terms such as attitudes, conceptions, theories, understandings, practical knowledge, and values synonymously and interchangeably. In Calderhead's (1996) review of literature on teacher thinking, he noted that terms such as values, predispositions, attitudes, opinions, perceptions, and personal ideologies have overlapping meanings and are used synonymously by researchers. Like many of the researchers, I use the terms teacher knowledge and beliefs synonymously throughout the literature review.

In his review of research on teacher knowledge Carter (1990) identified three dominant research approaches and programs that have influenced the conceptualization of teacher knowledge as a field of research: information processing, practical knowledge, and pedagogical content knowledge. Information-processing researchers focus on teacher planning and decision making, the context of teaching and planning, and expert-novice studies that have built on
cognitive psychologists' attempt to identify the differences between beginning and experienced teachers. Practical knowledge research aims to provide a theory of how teachers use their knowledge and learn by teaching, and highlights the complexities of teaching and thinking-in-action. Unlike the information-processing research, this research is conducted in real classroom settings and focuses on teachers' personal and practical knowledge, including the personal understandings teachers have of the practical realities they work within, and the classroom knowledge situated in classroom events. The third approach, pedagogical content knowledge, has been influenced by the work of Shulman (1986) who developed “The Knowledge Growth in Teaching Project” at Stanford University to address the lack of focus on teachers’ subject matter knowledge in teacher research programs, which he referred to as the “missing paradigm”. Like Bruner (1960) and Schwab (1962; 1964a; 1978), Shulman (1987) argued that academic disciplines provide the frame of reference for defining and delineating what classroom teachers need to know about the subject matter, or as Grossman et al. (1989) state, “the subject-matter knowledge that is central to teaching is also knowledge that is central to ‘knowing’ a discipline” (p. 24).

According to Shulman (1987), teachers’ understanding of the parent intellectual discipline is the foundation for the transformation of the, “knowledge, understanding, skill, and dispositions that are to be learned by school children” (p. 8-9). Shulman and his associates argued that there is a knowledge base for teaching that includes knowledge, understanding, skills, and dispositions. According to Deng’s (2007) critical review, the essence of Shulman's belief is that teaching can be boiled down to understanding how to transform the subject matter of an academic discipline into forms that are appropriate for teaching and learning in the classroom. Shulman (1987) identified four sources of teachers' knowledge base including: (1)
scholarship in the content disciplines, (2) the materials and settings of the institutionalized educational process (curricula, tests and testing materials, institutions and their hierarchies, the system of rules and roles, professional teacher organizations and unions, government agencies, mechanisms of government and finance), (3) research on schooling, social organizations, human learning, teaching and development, and the other social and cultural phenomena that influence what teachers do, and (4) the wisdom of practice and experience (p. 8).

Initially, Shulman (1986) conceptualized teachers’ subject-matter knowledge in terms of three types of knowledge: content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge (PCK), and curricular knowledge. In later work, Shulman (1987) expanded the categorization of teacher knowledge to include seven categories: (a) content knowledge, (b) general pedagogical knowledge, (c) curriculum knowledge, (d) pedagogical content knowledge, (e) knowledge of learners and their characteristics, (f) knowledge of educational contexts, (g) knowledge of educational ends, purposes, and values. “Content knowledge” refers to “the amount and organization of knowledge per se in the mind of the teacher”, an understanding of the substantive structure, or explanatory framework of a discipline, and the syntactic structure or ways in which new knowledge is generated in the discipline (Shulman, 1986, p. 9). “Pedagogical content knowledge” differentiates classroom teachers from subject-matter specialists and scholars because it, “goes beyond knowledge of subject matter per se to the dimension of subject-matter knowledge for teaching” (p. 9). This kind of knowledge includes the most useful and powerful ways of representing, formulating, and making the subject comprehensible to students; an understanding of what makes learning specific topics easy or hard; the conceptions and preconceptions that students of different ages and backgrounds bring to learning; and effective strategies that are likely to be helpful in reorganizing the misunderstanding of learners (p. 9-10).
When taken together, pedagogical content knowledge enables teachers to transform their knowledge of the academic discipline into knowledge that considers the varied interests, backgrounds, and capacities of school students (Wilson, Shulman, & Richert, 1987). Of the different categories of subject matter knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge is of special interest to Shulman because it identifies the distinctive bodies of knowledge for teaching and distinguishes the understanding of a content specialist from that of a pedagogue. Pedagogical content knowledge is, "that special amalgam of content and pedagogy that is uniquely the province of the teacher, their own special form of professional understanding" that involves, "the blending of content and pedagogy into an understanding of how particular topics, problems, or issues are organized, represented, and adapted to the diverse abilities of learners, and presented for instruction" (Shulman, 1987, p. 8). Shulman's work on pedagogical content knowledge inspired the creation of a research program whose central feature "was the argument that excellent teachers transform their own content knowledge into pedagogical representations that connect with the prior knowledge and dispositions of the learner" (Shulman & Quinlan, 1996, p. 409).

2.2.1 Teacher knowledge in history education

Shulman and his colleagues' conceptualization of teachers’ specialized subject-matter knowledge influenced a substantial number of empirical studies in history education (see Leinhardt, 1993; 2000; McDiarmid, 1994; 2000; Wineburg & Wilson, 1988; 1991) that focus on teacher knowledge and beliefs about history teaching—although VanSledright and Limon (2006) point out that in the North American context this research is not nearly as extensive as the research focused on students’ learning and thinking.
According to Wineburg (1996) the research on history teachers' knowledge up until the mid-1990s has been a significant departure from previous research on history teaching in that researchers have abandoned low inference observations and large samples for intensive interviews and focused observations of a small number of unrepresentative teachers (pre-service, beginning teachers, or exemplary teachers) in an intensive unit of study. Wineburg also maintained that much of this work has featured new methodologies (such as case study, action-research, narrative inquiry, and ethnography) that have been borrowed and modified from sociology and anthropology rather than psychology. He also suggested that the goal of this research has not been to formulate a generalizable theory of instruction for all subjects, but to generate narrower and more provisional theories for teaching a particular subject (p. 432).

Classifying research about teacher knowledge and beliefs in history education is a difficult task because many of the research studies are methodologically diverse and feature research questions that cross into one or more categories. Wineburg organized the literature on teacher knowledge in history into three categories: expert-novice research, teachers' pedagogical content knowledge, and influences on teachers' practice.

Research in the expert-novice research category focuses on the subject-matter knowledge that expert or novice (or both) history teachers bring to the classroom, how teachers' subject-matter knowledge influences their practice, descriptions of what "best practice" is for history teachers, and the qualities, practices and habits of exemplary teachers. Although I conduct case studies with four exemplary history teachers', my purpose is not to contrast expert and novice teachers' approaches to ethical judgments, nor is it to describe teachers' exemplary practices in regards to ethical judgments. Instead, my purpose is to understand the different ways that four accomplished teachers approached ethical issues, questions, and judgments in their classes. As a
result, the literature from expert-novice research in history education is not particularly germane to this study.

*Teachers’ pedagogical content knowledge* research focuses on the nature of pre-service and in-service teachers' pedagogical representations and the specific instructional strategies they utilize, as well as the teachers’ knowledge about students' conceptions and misconceptions about history. This research is pertinent for my study because my second research question focuses on the different ways that teachers bring ethical issues, questions and judgments to their history classes, including their pedagogical representations, specific instructional strategies, and knowledge about students' responses to ethical issues.

Research on the *influences on teachers' practice* concentrates on the various personal, organizational, and policy influences that influence history teachers' beliefs, decision making, and classroom instructional practices. The literature from this research is important for my study because the first research question focuses on what history teachers believe about ethical judgments in the discipline of history and history education, and the factors that influence their beliefs.

### 2.2.2 History teachers' pedagogical content knowledge

One of the important questions researchers have asked about history teaching is: what do history teachers need to know in order to teach history using a disciplinary approach? Research focused on teachers’ content knowledge has too often focused on determining the kind of subject matter knowledge history teachers possess, but not how teachers relate this knowledge to the context of teaching a topic to a particular group of students. According to Wineburg (1996), research focused on pedagogical content knowledge, the “nexus between what teachers know
and what they do”, investigates the nature of teachers’ knowledge of pedagogical representations, the specific instructional strategies they utilize, and their knowledge of students’ preconceptions or misconceptions of history. The concept of pedagogical content knowledge provides the theoretical framework for my study, which focuses on the nexus among what teachers believe about ethical judgments, the factors that influenced those beliefs, and the different ways that teachers approach ethical issues, questions and judgments in their history classes.

Wineburg and Wilson (1991) focused on what Shulman (1987) referred to as the "wisdom of practice", the practical pedagogical wisdom that teachers develop over the course of their careers (p. 11). While Wineburg and Wilson claimed that teachers represent the subject matter in ways that attend to the ways of knowing history as well as specific concepts, ideas, and events, they also argued that these representations are shaped by teachers’ other kinds of knowledge and beliefs—what students know and care about, and what curricular resources are available. Similarly, Husbands, Kitson and Pendry (2003) worked closely with four different British teachers from different grade levels to understand the types of knowledge teachers described themselves using as they planned and then taught their history lessons. Husbands et al. noticed that when teachers planned and taught they drew upon first and second order ideas and procedures for doing history, knowledge of a variety of resources, and knowledge of students’ learning processes that they utilized to anticipate the problems students might face and the strategies for helping them deal with them.

Recently, there have been several studies that have explored how beginning history teachers navigate the transition from teacher education programs to the history classroom. This research aims to explain how teachers’ knowledge of engaging their students in disciplinary-
based historical thinking practices learned in teacher education programs are applied once

McDiarmid (1994; McDiarmid & Vinten-Johansen, 2000) investigated pre-service
teachers' learning and thinking about history in an undergraduate historiography seminar. At the
beginning of the course they found that students had a cynical view of historical knowledge, and
by the end of the course many of the students' views of historical knowledge had changed, and
they acknowledged the constructed and tentative nature of history. Despite this transformative
experience in their historiography class, the pre-service teachers' views of history teaching and
learning remained unchanged, and many believed that history students needed to be taught
historical content first before they could do any in-depth thinking about it.

McDiarmid's (1994; McDiarmid & Vinten-Johansen, 2000) findings were echoed by
Hartzler-Miller (2001) who focused on a third-year teacher who excelled as an undergraduate
history student and as a pre-service teacher in history education. In interviews he discussed the
importance of students questioning stories and narrative accounts of the past, but the classroom
observation data showed that he spent most of his time lecturing and story-telling, and did not
ask students to interpret evidence and build their own interpretations. Hartzler-Miller attributed
the discrepancy between what the teacher believed and did in history class to his belief that
before students could begin inquiring into history they first had to understand the historical
content. Like, Hartzler-Miller, Fallace (2007; 2009) conducted two studies on an experimental
class of pre-service teachers taught by a historian and a social studies educator. The purpose of
the two studies was to narrow the gap between the disciplinary thinking of pre-service teachers
and historians, and to overcome the pre-service teachers' compartmentalized thinking about the nature of history and how historical content should be taught. Fallace (2009) concluded that increasing the amount of courses in history or historiography will not help pre-service or in-service teachers improve how they teach history unless they are provided with the opportunity and intellectual support to forge pedagogical content knowledge from historical content and pedagogical skill.

The research on history teachers' pedagogical content knowledge reveals that there is a discrepancy between teachers' disciplinary knowledge and how they enact this knowledge in the classroom, and there are a variety of factors that influence what teachers believe and do when teaching history. This research suggests that it is entirely possible that teachers have sophisticated beliefs about the historical discipline, but cannot embody these beliefs in their classroom practice.

2.2.3 Teachers' beliefs about controversial issues

According to Hess (2008), the majority of research on teachers’ beliefs about controversial issues has focused on the reasons middle and secondary school teachers included controversial issues in their teaching, the criteria they used to select issues, and on the teachers’ beliefs about their role in teaching controversial issues. The majority of the research on controversial issues has focused on different subject areas within social studies including history, civics and politics, and geography.

There are several important findings in this research about how teachers approach controversial issues when teaching history. Hess (2002; 2004; 2005; 2008; 2009) discovered there is disagreement amongst teachers about what a controversial issue is, and concluded that
there were four ways in which teachers’ political views influenced their understanding of what constitutes a controversial issue. Some teachers believe an issue is non-controversial if a “right answer” exists and there is no possibly of other interpretations. Others believe controversial issues can be interpreted in a number of ways, but there is still only one correct answer. In both of these situations teachers believe it is their job to help students arrive at pre-determined conclusions that they believe are correct (see also Camicia, 2008; Cornbleth, 2008). Some teachers believe they should avoid controversial issues altogether because they worry their personal opinions will inappropriately influence students’ thinking and conclusions. Hess also found that some teachers avoid teaching controversial issues for fear of creating controversy in the school and/or community, and others do so because they believe that such issues might negatively impact some students in their class. The last group of teachers believes that controversial issues are difficult to resolve and open to multiple interpretations. They believe that the purpose of teaching controversial issues is to teach students to investigate and understand different perspectives on an issue, and then come to a defensible and reasoned conclusion about their own position.

Deciding what roles teachers should take during class discussions of controversial issues and whether teachers should share their opinions about an issue is a perennial debate in the research on teaching controversial issues. Kelly (1986) identified four roles teachers take during discussions and concluded that the most defensible teacher role is "committed impartiality." Miller-Lane, Denton, and May (2006) found that the majority of rural social studies teachers in their study believed they should not reveal their opinions to students because they feared a negative community reaction. The teachers stated that they preferred taking an impartial position and facilitated discussion amongst students. Washington and Humphries (2011) found that it was
difficult for teachers to maintain a neutral stance during class discussions of controversial issues. Barton and McCully (2007) argued that teachers who take a neutral stance on controversial issues because they believe their opinions will influence their students' conclusions over-estimate the influence their opinions have on students. They found that, “students consider themselves to be capable of developing positions on controversial issues without being influenced by their teachers”, and that “students can generally infer their teachers’ positions through body language” (p. 15).

Teachers' beliefs about controversial issues are important for this study because of my focus on how teachers approached the ethically controversial issue of JCI. Furthermore, their beliefs about controversial events and how to approach them, generally, may have been a significant influence on how they approached this topic with their students.

2.2.4 Influences on history teachers' practice

According to Grant (2003), determining what counts as an influence on teachers' practice is difficult because there are many influences on teachers, the influences come from multiple directions, and influences often interact in ways that are difficult to untangle. Grant found that some teachers were influenced by one factor, "but there is no evidence that any one factor influences the majority of teachers, or influences all teachers in the same way (p. 152). Grant (1996; 2003) identifies three categories of influences on teachers' instructional decision making: personal influences, organizational influences, and policy influences.
2.2.4.1 **Personal influences**

Personal influences include personal knowledge and beliefs, professional experiences, personal history and narrative, and the function of subject matter knowledge. There have been several surveys of teachers' beliefs (Rutter, 1986; Seixas & Ercikan, 2010; Vinson, 1998) that have shown that teachers hold a wide array of ideas about teaching and learning in history and social studies. Grant (2003) argues that while survey results are useful for mapping an array of beliefs, teacher interviews and classroom observations are better methods for showing the impact of teachers' beliefs on their practices.

Lortie (1975) was one of the first researchers to focus on the significant influence of teachers' experiences as learners on their specific teaching practices. Sturtevant's (1996) study showed how two veteran teachers' experiences as students in history classrooms influenced their own practices as teachers. Several studies (Grant, 1996; Heilman, 2001; Romanowski, 1996; Sturtevant, 1996) found that teachers did not cite their pre-service education as significant influence on their daily practice. What this research suggests is that history teachers' instructional practices can be influenced by their experiences as students in school and university as much, or more than their experiences in teacher education programs.

After Shulman's (1986; 1987) call for increased attention to the importance of subject matter, researchers became increasingly interested in teachers' beliefs about history as a school subject (Evans, 1989; 1990; Gudmundsdottir, 1990; Wilson & Wineburg, 1993; Wineburg & Wilson, 1991). VanSledright (1996) portrayed a high school teacher who believed that teaching and remembering historical facts belong to one dimension of learning history, whereas the act of interpretation lies in another. Grant (2003) conducted a comparative case study to explore how
two New York history teachers taught a unit on the American Civil Rights era and how they responded to the state's standards and Regent's Exam expectations. In his findings Grant noted that the teachers' personal commitments and visions about what history teaching should look like, and their individual repertoires of first-order historical knowledge had more influence on their teaching practices than the exam.

In his field study of three high school history teachers, Cornett (1990) showed how teachers' epistemological beliefs contribute to their "personal action theories" of teaching and learning, which in turn influenced their teaching. Several other research studies (Grossman & Stodolsky, 1994; Maggioni, VanSledright, & Alexander, 2009; Mayer, 2006; Sawyer & Laguardia, 2010; VanSledright, Kelly, & Meuwissen, 2006) discovered that teachers' epistemological beliefs about history influences how they understand history, how they work with and interpret history, how they fit new epistemological or historiographical developments into their practice, and perhaps most significantly, how they teach history.

Other research has shown that teachers' epistemic beliefs about history are often resistant to change without sustained professional development (de la Paz, Malkus, Monte-Sano, & Montanaro, 2011; Ragland, 2007; Sawyer & Laguardia, 2010). For example, Ragland (2007) conducted a study that documented a three-year professional development program that aimed to change teachers' teaching practices in secondary history classrooms. She concluded that changing teaching practices requires teachers to change their attitudes and views towards teaching history first before any substantive changes can be made.

The research on the personal influences on history teachers suggests that their experiences as learners, their personal values and lived experiences, their beliefs about teaching
and learning in general, their beliefs about history as a school subject, and their epistemological beliefs about history greatly influence their classroom practices.

2.2.4.2 Organizational influences

There is minimal research in history education focused on the influence of organizational norms and structures on teachers' practices. Grant (2003) identified two types of organizational influences; one type includes the influence of teachers' relationships with individuals and groups such as teaching colleagues, students, principals, and district administrators, while the second type focuses on the context of schooling including organizational norms and structures, the impact of institutional cultures, organizational structures and norms, and the nature of schools as bureaucratic organizations.

Several research studies reported that teachers do not have much interaction or influence on each other. Stodolsky and Grossman (1995) reported that social studies teachers display little consensus or coordination of the content they teach, while Rutter (1986) found that social studies teachers spent little time talking and collaborating with their teaching colleagues, and they rarely visited other teachers' classrooms or planned lessons together. Teachers frequently reported that students are far more important influences on their instructional decisions than colleagues or administrators, which makes sense considering how often teachers interact with students during a typical school day. Several researchers (Cornett, 1990; Sturtevant, 1996) found that teachers often accommodate students directly or indirectly in response to their understanding of what students need, and Onosko (1991) found that teachers identified the influence of students as reasons for not teaching ambitiously. Romanowski (1996) described how he avoided controversial topics in his teaching after facing increased pressure from students and parents for
constructing learning activities that advanced his antinuclear beliefs in a geographical area where many of the parents were employed at a nuclear power plant.

Onosko (1991) found that one of the main effects of the norm of teacher isolation was an atmosphere of individualism, non-communication, and competition which undercut efforts to increase teacher collaboration and develop ambitious instructional strategies. Ladwig and King (1992) focused on structural changes in the social studies departments of four high schools (including teaming social studies teachers with English teachers, creating an integrated humanities block, instituting a block schedule, organizing a systematic schedule of professional development, creating grade level social studies teams to plan courses and assessment practices, and providing teachers with common planning time during the school day) and analyzed the impact of those changes on students' higher order thinking. The authors found that changing organizational structures was relatively easy, but it did not lead to more ambitious classroom practices. When they found evidence of more ambitious teaching practices, they concluded that the change was a result of a change in departmental culture rather than structural changes.

2.2.4.3 Policy influences

In terms of policy influences, history education researchers have focused primarily on the influence of textbooks, curriculum standards, and testing on teachers' instructional decisions. According to Grant (2003), many researchers believe that textbooks have a strong influence on teachers' decisions (Armento, 1986; Garcia, Powell, & Sanchez, 1991; Sewall, 1988). These researchers, however, do not make a distinction between the frequency that textbooks are being used and the influence that textbooks actually have on teachers' decisions. Although Tyson-Bernstein (1988) claims that textbooks often serve as the de facto curriculum in most public
schools, Romanowski (1996) disagrees because his observations of teachers shows that textbooks are more often used as a supplemental source to provide relevant background knowledge or in-class activities for students. The teachers Romanowski focused on recognized that an important aspect of good teaching was to move beyond the textbook and use additional sources. Grant (2003) agreed with Romanowski and cited several research studies that indicate teachers often push beyond textbook teaching (Grant, 1996; Gudmundsdottir, 1990; Wineburg & Wilson, 1991), which leads him to conclude that as bad as textbooks are, they are more of a common fixture in classrooms than they are a powerful influence on teachers’ decisions.

Although advocates of curriculum reform claim that new curriculum standards and frameworks are an important first step to improving teachers’ instructional practices, Grant (2003) argued that the research literature specific to history teaching offers little support for this conclusion. One of the potential reasons why curriculum reform has had little influence on teachers’ instructional practice is because curriculum frameworks and guidelines in the United States often focus on what to teach—chronological lists of people, places, events, and documents—rather than how to teach—the instructional practices and pedagogy that teachers should use to help students understand the content. Stodolsky and Grossman’s (1995) research aligns with Grant’s conclusions because the teachers they studied felt as if they had almost total control of the teaching techniques they utilized in their classroom, as well as a high degree of curricular control and autonomy. Grant and his colleagues (Grant et al., 2001a; Grant et al., 2002; Grant, Gradwell et al., 2002) studied changes in the New York world history curriculum and found that the curricular change had little impact on teachers' practice.

Alongside curriculum reform and standards-based education, high-stakes testing has become increasingly common in the United States. Grant has argued that the increased focus on
testing in the American education system has redefined the nature of schooling and imparted significant influence on teachers' decision making. The little research that has been conducted in this area indicates that although testing may be a more powerful policy influence than either textbooks or curriculum reform, many teachers see it as merely one more influence on their practice (Cimbricz, 2002). Grant (2003) pointed out that although textbooks, curriculum standards, and tests have the potential to influence teachers' instruction, there are no guarantees that they do so. The ubiquity of high-stakes testing in different states throughout the United States is not replicated in Canadian provinces and territories, although it has been part of the policy discussion.

2.2.5 **Summary of teachers' knowledge and beliefs**

The research conducted on history teachers' knowledge and beliefs has several important implications for my study. The methodologies employed in many of the studies have influenced the methods and research design selected (see Chapter 3), and the findings from this research have also helped to frame the implications of my study. The research on the influences on history teachers' beliefs has helped me identify the different factors that might have influenced teachers' knowledge and beliefs about ethical judgments. Grant's categorization and description of the different influences on teachers' practice provides a framework that helped to identify different factors that might influence teachers' attitudes towards ethical judgments. Additionally, the research on teachers' beliefs and approaches to controversial issues has provided some insights as to how teachers might approach ethically controversial historical events and ethical judgments in their classrooms.
In her review of research on history teaching, Wilson (2001) contended that if researchers do not explore a wider range of factors that shape teaching, the connection between teaching and teacher beliefs and learning and student beliefs will remain a "black hole in our teaching landscape" (p. 540). VanSledright and Limon (2006) and Wineburg (1996) also discussed the lack of research conducted on teacher knowledge and beliefs in North American history education, and the lack of research explicitly focused on teachers' thinking and beliefs about ethical judgments confirm this conclusion. Wilson (2001) also emphasized the need to link studies of teaching to studies of learning so that researchers can understand the mechanisms by which instructional choices increase students' learning, or how particular kinds of teacher knowledge might improve practice (p. 539). My research study is a response to Wilson’s call. It focuses on linking history teachers' beliefs about ethical judgments and the factors that influence their beliefs with the ways teachers bring ethical issues, questions, and judgments to their history classes, and the impact this has on how students approach ethical judgments.
Chapter 3: HISTORIOGRAPHY OF JAPANESE CANADIAN INTERNMENT

3.1 Introduction

In this chapter I review the historiography of Japanese Canadian internment (hereafter JCI) to understand the different ways historians interpreted the events that took place. Understanding the historiography of JCI shows how historians who are experts in the discipline of history and about JCI approached ethical issues, judgments, and questions. The questions historians ask about JCI, the way they handle ethical issues, questions, and judgments in their accounts, and the historical conclusions they arrive at set the standard for analyzing teachers' and students' approaches. An understanding of the historiography of JCI also enables me to assess the currency and accuracy of the resources teachers used, the credibility of what teachers said when they described and explained JCI to students, and the plausibility of students’ conclusions about JCI in their written assignments.

The historiography of JCI can be organized into four periods: the early years following the end of World War Two when the first book on the topic was published, the mid-1970s to the mid-1980s when popular and academic historians published books and articles that informed and shaped Canadians' understanding, the late 1980s and early 1990s when academic historians challenged the accepted view that the removal of Japanese Canadians was unjustified, and from the mid-1990s to present, when historians have written fewer general histories of JCI, but focused specifically on particular aspects of the Japanese Canadian experience during the war.

3 Throughout the chapter Japanese Canadian Internment is used as a general term to describe the Japanese Canadian experience from 1941-1947 including the removal, relocation, dispossession, dispersal, and deportation of Japanese in Canada.
3.2 The Early Years

Forrest E. La Violette (1948), a sociologist at McGill University, wrote the first academic book that focused on JCI. He first began conducting fieldwork on the Japanese in North America in 1934, and during World War Two he worked at the Heart Mountain Relocation Center, a Japanese American Internment camp in Wyoming. Near the end of the war he was commissioned to conduct research on Japanese Canadian experiences during the war, and soon after visited interior housing settlements in B.C., sugar beet farms in Alberta, and resettled communities in Quebec, Ontario and the Maritimes. La Violette aimed to write, "a sociological and psychological account" that describes the Canadian government's policy towards Japanese Canadians, how the policy was put into practice, and the consequences the policy had for Japanese Canadians. In doing so, the book traces the wartime experience of Japanese Canadians' history from the arrival of the Japanese immigrants in B.C. at the end of the nineteenth century through every aspect of their treatment during the war including their removal, relocation to various areas, dispossession of property, and dispersal across Canada; it concludes with the cancellation of the Japanese deportation policy in 1947.

The preface to the book was written by H.F. Angus, an economics professor at the University of British Columbia who served as the Special Assistant to the Secretary of State for External Affairs from 1941 to 1945, and was known for being one of the few government officials who championed full civil rights for second generation Japanese Canadians (W. P. Ward, 2002). In the preface, Angus claimed that La Violette made no attempt, "to pass judgment on the wartime policy of the Canadian government which required the removal from a Defence Zone in British Columbia of all persons of Japanese race…", nor did he pass judgment on the
government's decision at the end of the war to force Japanese Canadians to disperse east of the Rockies, or be deported back to Japan (La Violette, 1948, p. v). He also commended La Violette for explaining behavior without justifying or condemning it, and for examining the consequences of JCI, "without insisting, as does the harsh logic of British law, that men are presumed to intend the natural and probable consequences of their acts" (La Violette, 1948, p. v). Simply put, Angus argued that people cannot be held responsible for making policy decisions because they cannot predict what the consequences of their actions will be. Furthermore, Angus lauded La Violette for leaving it up to the reader with a sense of civic responsibility, "to supplement the sociological and psychological account of what has happened with an ethical judgment of his own" (p. vi). In Angus' mind La Violette provided an objective description of JCI in the book, and left it up to readers to make their own ethical judgments.

Although Angus claimed that La Violette described and explained JCI without making ethical judgments, as was discussed in Chapter 2, the majority of historiographers, philosophers and historians have agreed that ethical judgments are an inescapable part of historical writing (Berlin, 1955; Dray, 1967; Vann, 2004). Bedarida (2000) and Boobbyer (2002) described how historians' values influence their choice of topics to study, their perception of sources, their selection of relevant facts, and their hierarchies of explanatory factors. Every chapter in La Violette's book offers examples of implicit ethical judgments that suggested the treatment of Japanese Canadians before, during and immediately after the war was unjust. In the final chapter La Violette said that although the majority of Canadians accepted that the evacuation was sensible,

the handling of the properties and particularly the long delay in the decision of the Exchequer Court, the long imposition of restrictions on travel and purchase of homes and farms and businesses in resettlement areas, the handling of the question of loyalty and
repatriation, the demand of British Columbia that no Japanese be permitted within the boundaries of that province, thus setting up a ghetto arrangement, and the insistence of Alberta that even though the war is over, the Japanese should be moved again—all of these are shocking (p. 275).

In outlining examples of the mistreatment Japanese Canadians experienced and describing them as "shocking", La Violette made implicit ethical judgments.

La Violette provided a thorough description of the wartime policy of the Canadian government towards Japanese Canadians from someone who witnessed some of the events firsthand and had considerable knowledge and understanding of the experiences of Japanese communities in Canada and the United States during World War Two. One of the major limitations of the book is that it was written at the end of the war when censorship limited his access to many of the government documents and official records required to develop a deeper understanding of the policies enacted during the war. Although the book did not immediately inspire further scholarship on the topic, the thorough and accurate description of the policies of the Canadian government and the consequences they had for Japanese Canadians during and after the war provide an important reference for anyone interested in deepening their understanding of JCI. Furthermore, the book has become an invaluable historical source on its own because it was written while the events were taking place or had just occurred, and provides valuable insight into the attitudes, values, and worldviews of the people who experienced them firsthand.

3.3 Establishing the Accepted Interpretation

From the mid-1970s to the early-1980s five popular and academic historians published books and articles about JCI: Adachi (1976), Broadfoot (1977), Ward (1976; 1978), Daniel
There are a number of reasons why many Canadian historians turned their attention in this direction. In the late-1960s and 1970s government documents and official records classified since World War Two were finally declassified. Secondly, a new wave of social historians influenced by profound changes in the discipline of history embraced social history “from below,” focusing on segments of the population traditionally ignored, including women, working class people and ethnic minorities. Thirdly, by the 1970s many Canadians were still unaware of JCI and for both personal and professional reasons many historians felt compelled to provide the public with informative and reliable histories of what they believed was an important event in Canadian history, especially considering that the War Measures Act was used for the first time since the end of World War Two during the October Crisis of 1970. Lastly, by the late-1970s the redress campaign for JCI was gathering momentum, and the Japanese Canadian community sought a more complete and accurate understanding of what had occurred so they could make the case for redress to the Canadian government and public.

In each of the publications, these historians concluded explicitly that the policies enacted by the Canadian government during World War Two were unjust. Their conclusions not only influenced other historians’ ethical conclusions about JCI, and but also helped make the general public more aware of JCI. In the section below, I describe the five historians’ articles and books, discuss their strengths and limitations, and describe the ethical judgments made in each of them.

3.3.1 Ken Adachi

Adachi was born in B.C. in 1928, grew up in Vancouver, and during the war he and his family were relocated to an interior housing settlement in Slocan City, B.C. In 1959 the National
Japanese Canadians Citizens Association (NJCCA) commissioned Adachi to write a comprehensive history of the Japanese Canadians in Canada because they felt that only a Japanese Canadian would be able to capture the true meaning of the Japanese Canadian experience (Ken Adachi 1928 - 1989). Although Adachi’s (1976) book focused on the history of Japanese Canadians from 1877-1975, he never intended to write a general history of the Japanese in Canada. Instead, he felt compelled to write the book because the treatment of Japanese Canadians during the war, "has been ignored in major Canadian historical texts" as if a, "conspiracy of silence has hidden the facts from Canadians" (1976, preface). Thus, his two purposes for writing the book were to, "reveal and perhaps exorcise" a "particularly violent strain of racism in all its scaly ugliness" that had victimized him since childhood, and, to record the nearly century old story of the Japanese in Canada within the context of the age (1976, preface). The title of Adachi's book *The Enemy that Never Was* and his two purposes for writing the book revealed his ethical stance on JCI; that despite being labeled enemies by the Canadian government, Japanese Canadians were never a security threat to Canada during the war.

Although the book's first few chapters explored the themes of immigration and racism prior to the start of World War Two, Adachi's central focus was to prove that every aspect of JCI was unjustifiable. In the preface Adachi said that the wartime evacuation and detention of Japanese Canadians disturbed him for reasons more complicated than just a reaction to the "suspect morality" of the acts of a nation supposedly fighting to uphold democratic ideals. The Canadian government claimed that it took action against Japanese Canadians out of the need to maintain national security following Japan's attack on Pearl Harbor, but Adachi argued that these reasons for rounding up Japanese Canadians from their homes on the west coast of Canada, incarcerating them in detention and labour camps, confiscating and selling their property, and
then threatening to deport them unless they dispersed themselves across Canada "were threadbare" by the time the deportations ended in 1947.

According to Ward (1977) and Sunahara (2000), Adachi relied too much on personal recollections, published memoirs, newspapers, the proceedings of inquiries and royal commissions, and other records held in the public domain, and overlooked some of the major manuscript collections and government document collections that became available to researchers in the early 1970s, when Adachi was completing his research. Adachi's superficial research impeded his ability to validate the claims made throughout the book. Although he refused to accept the government's official justification for its actions during the war, Adachi could not prove that public statements made by the government did not match its private actions because he did not consult the documents required to make this claim.

Another criticism was that Adachi's preconceptions and negative experiences as a Japanese Canadian child interned during the war overly prejudiced his purposes for writing the book, and the ethical judgments and ethical position he took throughout the book. Although his personal experiences increased the credibility of his claims and the authenticity of his writing, his stated goal of exposing racism led him to concentrate too much on condemning and judging historical actors and their actions, and not enough attention was given to describing and analyzing what occurred and why it occurred. Ward (1977) argued that Adachi's analysis of the topic could have been strengthened if he considered the degree to which prejudice and racism shaped immigrants' lives, or contemplated how other social, cultural, political and economic factors impacted Japanese immigrants in Canada. Although Adachi can be criticized for being too emotionally invested in the topic, he very clearly outlined his ethical stance on JCI in the preface and introduction to the book. Sunahara (2000) praised Adachi's book for the contribution
it made to enlarging the Japanese Canadian side of JCI and for challenging the depiction of Japanese Canadians in La Violette's account and popular myth as victims who passively accepted the policies of the Canadian government. One cannot read a history of JCI or the Japanese Canadian experience in Canada without finding Adachi’s book in the list of references. Adachi also accomplished exactly what he was commissioned to do; to tell the story of the Japanese Canadian experience in Canada from 1877-1975.

3.3.2 Barry Broadfoot

Broadfoot (1977) wrote the first major book about the wartime experiences of Japanese Canadians using what he described as the "oral history method." Prior to writing Years of Sorrow, Years of Shame, Broadfoot had completed three books about different topics in Canadian history after travelling across Canada with a tape recorder and a notebook to conduct interviews with people who experienced historical events or time periods firsthand. Like Adachi, the title of Broadfoot's book reveals the ethical stance that he took throughout the book. Broadfoot did not attempt to analyze the reasons or causes of JCI. Instead, he told the story of what happened during JCI through the voices of the people involved in the events, including the Issei (first generation Japanese Canadians), the Nisei (second generation), the Sansei (third generation), as well as Caucasians, "who knew the Japanese, observed them, administered them, taught them and helped them."

The book was organized into chapters that addressed the important aspects of the Japanese Canadian experience before, during and after World War Two, including Japanese immigration to Canada, registration after Pearl Harbor, removal from their homes on the B.C. coast, incarceration at Hastings Park and POW camps, relocation to road camps, interior housing
camps and sugar beet farms, dispossession of property, dispersal across Canada, and the deportation to Japan after the war was over. In the preface, Broadfoot said that he did not want the book to be blatantly pro-Japanese, but after transcribing interviews, researching, and writing, he realized that this would be the case. Broadfoot introduced each chapter with a one or two-page description of the historical context, and then provided excerpts from interviews conducted with people who experienced the events discussed in the chapter. The descriptions of the historical context at the start of each chapter contain numerous ethical judgments. For example, in the chapter entitled "Home Was Never Like This" Broadfoot said that government reports from those days, "appear to present too glowing a picture" of life in the camps, and the reality was that for the older people, "their past labours were down the drain", and for the younger ones, "their hopes and dreams for the future had vanished and in the present they were essentially prisoners" (1977, p. 182).

The book is useful for both historians and history teachers because it provides them with access to the thoughts, words, and recollections of many different Canadians who experienced the events firsthand. The main limitation of the book is an issue more of research methodology than of writing. Broadfoot did not preserve the original tape recordings, nor did he record the biographical information of the people he interviewed, thus making it difficult for historians to identify who was being interviewed and anything about their background. Furthermore, many of the interviews were conducted decades after the war was over, and many of the people interviewed shared stories that had significant historical inaccuracies, revealing the frailty of the human memory, and a limitation of using oral history methods.
3.3.3 Roger Daniels

In 1970, Roger Daniels, an academic historian of immigration and Asian American history, completed a book about Japanese American experiences during the Second World War entitled *Concentration Camps: USA*. He later republished the book under a new title, *Concentration Camps: North America* that included eight chapters from the previous book, plus one new chapter, "The Japanese Canadian Experience." Daniels (1981) was the first historian to compare the Japanese Canadian and Japanese American experiences, an approach that was not employed again until Bangarth (2008). The chapter focused on all aspects of JCI from early Japanese Canadian immigration to deportation and dispersal. Throughout the chapter Daniels consulted the most recent and important sources available, including government documents and official reports, personal memoirs, and recently published books from Adachi (1976), Broadfoot (1977) and Ward (1978).

Daniels concluded that there were more similarities than differences in the two country's internment experiences, and as a result decided it was best to analyze the two events from a North American perspective, rather than distinct Canadian or American perspectives. Daniels asked a number of questions: Were the similarities real, or coincidence? Was there evidence of joint preplanning between Canada and the United States? Did one country's government imitate the other? Were basic attitudes and institutions in Canada and the United States so similar and related that it led to similar events occurring? These questions formed the basis of Daniels' (1982) article in which he argued that the Canadian and American governments had taken some preliminary steps towards preplanning their decisions; however, there was no evidence of diplomatic consultation about the removal of the Japanese in February 1942 and thereafter. As a result, Daniels (1982) concluded that North American society during World War Two was
predisposed to treat enemies of another race differently than enemies who were white, a clear implicit judgment that internment in both countries was unjust.

Like the previous works discussed, Daniels (1981; 1982) made several explicit ethical judgments by suggesting that the Canadian government was wrong for its treatment of Japanese Canadians. In comparing Canada and the United States, Daniels stated that, "In each country the use of war powers to mistreat a minority has been a loaded gun pointed at groups deemed deviant." Daniels also argued that the temptation to claim that the Canadian, or the American government treated the Japanese better or worse than the other country are of little use because, "There is enough disgrace to go around."

### 3.3.4 W. Peter Ward

Ward, a historian of Asian immigration history at the University of British Columbia, first published *White Man's Country* in 1978 to examine the attitudes, behaviour, and policies of the politically dominant white race toward Asians in B.C. from 1870-1950. The book is divided into three sections: the first includes four chapters on anti-Chinese discrimination, the second consists of one chapter focused on anti-South Asian sentiments and the Komagata Maru incident, and the third comprises three chapters on anti-Japanese sentiment. The first two chapters in the anti-Japanese section concentrate on the arrival of Japanese immigrants, B.C. residents' views about Japanese immigrants, an examination of Japanese life in Canada, and a description of the economic, political and social exclusion that Japanese experienced before World War Two. The third chapter is similar to Ward's (1976) article that investigates the causes of the removal of Japanese Canadians from the B.C. coast.
Many social and ethnic historians influenced by the "social turn" in the historical discipline during the 1960s and 1970s, adapted theories borrowed from social scientists and applied them to improve their understanding of historical topics. Ward applied Smelser's (1963) *Theory of Collective Behavior* throughout the chapter on JCI to understand the psychological forces that caused public outbursts and mass hostility towards Japanese Canadians, and the eventual removal of Japanese Canadians from the B.C. coast. Ward conducted exhaustive research and utilized innumerable newspapers, magazines, reports from Royal Commissions and government committees, politicians' correspondence, military reports and records, letters, memoirs, memos, minutes from meetings, and personal papers of those involved. Despite this thoroughness, he made no reference to the parallel treatment of Japanese people in the United States and Australia. Additionally, the three chapters focused almost entirely on the decision to remove Japanese Canadians in February 1942, but only briefly mentioned events that took place after this, events that are important for making a decision about whether JCI was justified.

In terms of ethical judgments, Ward concluded that the removal of Japanese Canadians from the B.C. coast was not justified. Ward described three waves of anti-Orientalism that swept across B.C., one in 1937-38, another in 1940, and the last one in 1941-42 after the attack on Pearl Harbor, which was ultimately responsible for convincing the government to remove Japanese Canadians from the B.C. coast.

This sudden, dramatic attack roused the racial fear and hostilities of white British Columbians to heights never before attained. In turn they loosed a torrent of racialism which surged across the province for the next eleven weeks. This outbreak of popular feeling demanded an immediate response from the King government. In attempting to placate white opinion it offered a succession of policies, each one aimed at further restricting the civil liberties of the west coast Japanese. As it proved, nothing short of total evacuation could quiet the public outcry (W. P. Ward, 2002, p. 148).
The central point that Ward was making was that the attack on Pearl Harbor and subsequent Japanese victories increased the white community's feelings of vulnerability, isolation, and insecurity and when combined with deep-rooted racial fears and hostilities, it raised anti-Japanese sentiments to a new level. Although Ward pointed out that these sentiments, "had virtually no foundation in fact", it did not stop the government from creating numerous policies that restricted Japanese Canadians' rights in order to appease the white population and reduce the possibility of racial violence. When these policies did little to satisfy the white population's demands, Ward claimed that the government acceded to their requests and introduced total evacuation of Japanese Canadians from the BC coast. The implied ethical judgment present in this interpretation was that the government decision to remove Japanese Canadians from the coast was not justified because it was done to appease the white population's irrational racial fears about Japanese Canadian subversion, rather than for legitimate security concerns.

3.3.5 Ann Gomer Sunahara

In 1973 Sunahara enrolled as a history graduate student to examine why her Japanese Canadian husband and his family had been sent to interior housing camps during World War Two. Sunahara's (1981) book The Politics of Racism was the end result of this investigation. Sunahara was among the first historians to use classified government and cabinet records previously unavailable to historians. Throughout the book Sunahara combined this new evidence with the recollections of individuals who experienced the events firsthand.

Sunahara traced the evolution of the government's "harsh policies" from the rhetoric of B.C. politicians in the wartime government to their implementation under the War Measures Act. The book also described how Japanese Canadians, individually and collectively, resisted,
influenced, altered, and defeated the unjust policies of the Canadian government to achieve the provincial and federal franchise and full citizenship. Additionally, the second edition (Sunahara, 2000) included an afterword that described the successful redress movement that culminated in the 1988 government apology and compensation for Japanese Canadians who suffered. Barrett (1984) criticized Sunahara's book for the absence of theoretical analysis of the role that the Canadian state played in the development of institutional and structural racism, which left readers to wonder whether the racist treatment of Japanese Canadians was the result of powerful personalities like Prime Minister Mackenzie King or Cabinet Minister and Member of Parliament Ian Mackenzie, or broader influences such as the nature of Canadian institutions and society.

In the introduction Sunahara (2000) said her purpose for writing the book was not to, "arouse bad memories or to make accusations", but to clearly and frankly tell Canadians what, "the record showed" about an "unhappy" event in Canadian history that is, "an event inconsistent with the public image most Canadians hold of their society" (p. vii). Furthermore, throughout the introduction Sunahara said things like, "the documents revealed that", or "the documents showed that" to suggest that the documents spoke for themselves without any interpretation or analysis. In reality the documents did not speak for themselves, but were interpreted and analyzed by Sunahara who brought her perspectives, values, attitudes, and worldviews to the analysis of each document. Despite claims to objectivity, Sunahara made numerous implicit ethical judgments throughout the book that suggested JCI was unjustified.

In the introduction, Sunahara described the wartime treatment of Japanese Canadians as an "unhappy event," an ethical judgment through word choice, and that the treatment of Japanese Canadians was, "inconsistent with the public image most Canadians hold of their society", 
implying that JCI was unjust because many Canadians believe their society is tolerant, fair and just. Sunahara also suggested that JCI was unjust through her use of historical detail. She argued that the documents showed that at no point were Japanese Canadians ever a threat to national security, and that almost every measure taken against Japanese Canadians was strongly opposed by senior officers of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, the military, and the Department of External Affairs. Sunahara also showed how Cabinet sided with the prejudiced and politically biased opinions of B.C.’s politicians over the educated and factually based expert opinion. In her view, JCI occurred not only because B.C. politicians demanded it, but also because no one in the Cabinet, "could be bothered to question those demands" (p. 3).

Sunahara also made several implied ethical judgments through comparison. In the introduction she compared the trauma experienced by Japanese Canadians to that experienced by victims of rape: Japanese Canadians were conscious of the fact they were innocent victims, but felt humiliated by their experiences and the knowledge that the general public held them partly responsible for what happened. Sunahara also compared the JCI to the Holocaust, although she recognized that JCI was relatively minor in comparison. One of the key differences between the two events according to Sunahara was that Canada, in a "cruelly" hypocritical manner imposed repressive policies on a racial minority while supposedly fighting for justice and equality for all. Thus, according to Sunahara, the Canadian government made, “a mockery of the principles for which they were fighting and dying" (p. 3). All of the ethical judgments included in her book clearly indicate that Sunahara was not merely trying to reveal what the record showed, but was arguing that the treatment of Japanese Canadians before, during and after the war was unjust.

In each of the accounts discussed in this section, the five historians' described how the Canadian government's policies towards Japanese Canadians during World War Two were
unjust. By the mid-1980s, these conclusions about JCI were widely accepted and rarely challenged by the public or the Canadian historical community.

### 3.4 Challenging the Accepted Interpretation

This section discusses two publications written by prominent Canadian historian Jack Granatstein and other historians (Granatstein & Johnson, 1988; Roy et al., 1990) that challenged the accepted interpretation about whether the Canadian government was justified for removing Japanese Canadians from the B.C. coast. These historians re-examined old evidence, and a variety of official documents, newspapers, political speeches, and correspondence newly released from national archives (Kobayashi, 1992). Granatstein and Johnson (1988) wrote an article that challenged the commonly accepted conclusion that the Canadian government was not justified in removing Japanese Canadians from the B.C. coast during the war. Two years later, Granatstein, Roy et al. (1990) published *Mutual Hostages* to "re-examine the subject of Japanese and Canadians during the Second World War." In his review of the book Kobayashi (1992) commended the authors for skilfully interweaving material from official documents, newspapers, political speeches, and personal correspondence, but highlighted the need for interviews with survivors about the government's actions in order to point out the contradictions between the written and verbal record. The book focused on a variety of topics: early immigration to Canada, Canadians living in Japan and Japanese occupied territories, the removal and resettlement of Japanese Canadians, the dispersal and deportation of Japanese Canadians at the end of the war, and a comparison of the treatment of internees and POWs in both Japan and Canada. The authors arrived at three conclusions. Firstly, both Canada and Japan generally treated "mutual hostages" (interned citizens and prisoners of war under their control) better than they might have otherwise
because they knew that harsh actions would endanger the lives of their citizens living in the enemy's country. Secondly, the Canadian government acted out of ignorance and in response to public fear. Thirdly, there was a mixture of loyalties within the Japanese Canadian community.

In the introduction, Roy et al. (1990) revealed their beliefs about the importance that historians remain objective, value-neutral, and avoid making ethical judgments. They were trying to distinguish themselves from historians like Adachi (1976) and Sunahara (1981) whom they criticized for seeing issues in black and white, while ignoring, "the shades of grey that often cloud history" (p. xi). The authors' recognized they chose an emotional and controversial subject, and tried to examine the war's events, "as dispassionately as possible" (p. xi). Their goal for the book was not "to condemn or condone", or to blame historical actors, but to engage in the, "historian's traditional task", of describing and explaining what happened and why. The authors maintained that, "understanding the past is hard at the best of times", but the, "truth can be found" by accepting the complexity of motivation, and the context and attitudes of a half century ago (p. xii). Roy et al. (1990) did not understand the degree to which their quest for objectivity was illusory. As we have seen, the vast preponderance of philosophers of history acknowledge that objectivity cannot overcome the values embedded in historians' choice of topics to study, their perception and analysis of sources and evidence, their selection of relevant facts, and their hierarchies of explanatory factors. The four authors also stated that, "the truth can be arrived at", an epistemological position that would be contested by many historians, historiographers and philosophers.

Whereas historians from the mid-1970s to the mid-1980s concluded that all aspects of JCI were unjust, both Granatstein and Johnson (1988) and Roy et al. (1990) offered several arguments why "evacuating" Japanese Canadians from the B.C. coast was justified. It is
interesting to note that Granatstein and Johnson (1988) and Roy et al. (1990) were the only historians who used the word "evacuation" to describe the removal of Japanese Canadians from B.C. rather than the word "removal" or "relocation." Use of "evacuation" suggested Japanese Canadians were removed from a dangerous situation, whereas "removal" suggested they were forcibly removed.

The authors argued that by 1942 Canada and its Allies were losing the war in Europe and the Pacific, and senior officers and planners of all three armed forces were concerned that the Imperial Japanese forces presented a credible military threat to North America. Granatstein and Johnson (1988) uncovered evidence that suggested the Japanese community in Canada had varying degrees of loyalty to Japan, and the Japanese Consulate in Vancouver had orders from the Japanese Foreign Ministry to employ Nisei in B.C. to collect information and spy on Canada. There was also widespread support amongst the Japanese community for Japan's war with China, which raised concerns about their loyalty amongst the Canadian intelligence community.

Despite the fact that some members of the military and RCMP argued against the removal of Japanese Canadians from the B.C. coast, Roy et al. (1990) contended that few people took the RCMP intelligence gathering capabilities seriously, and the majority of military commanders and political leaders were unanimous that the Japanese should be removed for military and public safety reasons. Furthermore, Granatstein and Johnson (1988) pointed out that politicians were sceptical of the claims made by military planners that an attack was unlikely. After all, the same planners had recently offered assurances about the impregnability of Pearl Harbor and Singapore. Granatstein and Johnson also argued that in 1941–42 the Canadian government lacked the capacity to assess intelligence properly, and did not have access to the information and intelligence that emerged more recently. They suggested that even if the
government had access to the intelligence we now have, and had the capacity to assess it accurately, they would have had stronger arguments for the removal of Japanese Canadians than they already had. Furthermore, they argued that no one in B.C. or elsewhere in Canada, except Japanese Canadians themselves, opposed their removal or treatment during the war, and that it was not until after the war that Christian churches and civil liberties groups opposed the continued deportation of Japanese Canadians.

Roy et al. (1990) also reminded readers that Mackenzie King's government had the difficult job of listening to public demands for removing Japanese Canadians, while also protecting Japanese Canadians from potential citizen attacks. Had Japan launched a military invasion on the B.C. coast, the authors claimed that the Canadian government might not have been able to protect Japanese Canadians from civilian attacks because of the shortage of trained troops in Canada at the time, and the questionable reliability of the police and military in B.C. Simply put, Japanese Canadians were removed for their own protection.

Lastly, while Roy et al. (1990) recognized that Japanese Canadians were treated very harshly during the war, they argued that they were much better treated than Canadian soldiers and civilians living under Japanese control. This argument does not justify the Canadian government's actions because many Japanese Canadians were citizens of Canada, whereas most of the Canadians under Japanese control were POW's, not citizens of Japan. The authors also pointed out that less than ten percent of the adult male Japanese Canadians (roughly 800 men) were actually "interned" under military guard at POW camps in Northern Ontario. The authors argued that their internment was justified because they were loyal to Imperial Japan and the most determined opponents of their removal from the coast and the separation of their families. The remaining 22,000 were "resettled" in different locations throughout Canada, and the Canadian
government ensured that they received the bare necessities of food, health care, shelter and education.

Despite concluding that the removal of Japanese Canadians was justified, Granatstein and Johnson (1988) and Roy et al. (1990) suggested that every other aspect of the treatment of Japanese Canadians was unjust. They recognized that long-simmering anti-Japanese racial animosity escalated from a boil to panic after the Imperial Japanese army and navy swept through the Pacific in the weeks after Pearl Harbor, and as a result the Canadian government "caved into the racist fears" and demanded the evacuation of all persons of Japanese origin (Roy et al., 1990, p. 215). They maintained that sending men to work camps, separating them from their families, seizing Japanese Canadians' property and selling it for bargain-basement prices, and forcing Japanese Canadians to disperse east of the Rockies, or be deported to Japan was unjust. They also made it clear that there was no connection between the reasons for the removal given in 1942, and the decision to confiscate Japanese Canadian property, and deport or disperse Japanese Canadians at the end of the war. Although the authors believed that the removal of Japanese Canadians from the west coast was a "tragic" consequence of war, they argued that the Canadian government's attempts to deport Japanese Canadians, "smack of vengeance unworthy of a democratic government" (Roy et al., 1990, p. 217). Lastly, Granatstein and Johnson (1988) argued that Japanese Canadians were undoubtedly victims of racism and an uncaring government that failed to defend the ideals of democracy and freedom for which its leaders claimed to have taken Canada to war.

Granatstein and Johnson (1988) and Roy et al. (1990) believed that if historians accept the complexity of motivation, and understand the context, values, and attitudes that existed half a century ago they can arrive at the truth. According to their version, the removal of Japanese
Canadians was justified, but every other aspect of Japanese Canadians' treatment after this moment was not. The strength of their interpretation was that it presented new evidence and interpretations that challenged previously accepted conclusions, increased knowledge of the history of the Japanese in Canada, and led to broader interpretations of the topic. Nevertheless, it is easy to see the ethical judgments laced throughout their works: they were no more ethically “neutral” than the historians who preceded them.

3.5 JCI Since 1990

Since Granatstein and Johnson (1988) and Roy et al. (1990), no academic historians have re-examined the ethical debate about whether JCI was justified. The different articles and books written about JCI since 1990 can be categorized into two groups, popular histories that synthesize previous historical accounts (Boyko, 1995; Taylor, 2004), and books and articles that focus on specific aspects of the treatment of Japanese Canadians during and after the Second World War (Bangarth, 2008; Day, 2010; Roy, 2002; Sugiman, 2009).

Taylor's (2004) popular history of Japanese Canadians in World War Two synthesized previously written books, memoirs, and articles in order to trace the Japanese Canadian experience from their arrival in Canada, through the war years, to their battle for redress. Taylor wanted to make sure that people know about this period in history in order, "to avoid making similar mistakes in the future" (p. 7). Throughout the book Taylor took the ethical position that JCI was unjust. The book title, "A Black Mark: The Japanese-Canadians in World War II", is an explicit ethical judgment as is Taylor's claim that Canadians of Japanese origin were, "the victims of a grave injustice", and that the only explanation for their mistreatment was that it was motivated by racial prejudice (p. 7). Taylor consulted a varied list of sources on the Japanese
Canadian experience, but she did not consider several important books and articles (Daniels, 1981; Daniels, 1982; Granatstein & Johnson, 1988; Roy et al., 1990; W. P. Ward, 1976; W. P. Ward, 1978), nor did she include any footnotes or citations, which made it difficult to determine which sources were utilized at different points in the book. Overall, the book provided a detailed, accurate, and readable description of JCI, but it did not offer any new analysis or evidence about the treatment of Japanese Canadians.

Since 1990, several academic historians have written about particular aspects of the Japanese experience during and after World War Two, including civil rights and citizenship, women's and men's narratives about removal and resettlement, and transnational history. The topics chosen and the methods utilized to write these accounts reflect the profound changes that occurred in the historical discipline since the 1970s. Historians influenced by the cultural, literary or social turn became interested in more specialized topics and methodologies adapted from the social sciences.

Roy (2002) wrote about the intertwining postwar debates about the rights of Japanese citizens and the Canadian Citizenship Act of 1947. Contrary to popular myth, Roy argued that the delayed return of Japanese Canadians to the B.C. coast in 1949 was caused by the anti-Japanese prejudices of B.C. Members of Parliament, and not because of strong anti-Japanese feelings amongst the B.C. population. The B.C. MPs convinced the government that the people of B.C. did not want to see a return of Japanese people to the B.C. coast, when in fact it was they who did not want the Japanese to return.

Sugiman (2009) examined 75 Japanese Canadian Nisei women's and men's narratives of wartime events from interviews in which the participants described their experiences, "as filled with hardship, turmoil, and racial injustice, but also of happy times, kindness, and the sweetness
of life" (p. 189). Sugiman found that when using life history interviews, individuals did not just share information about their lives; they told stories with moral messages that defined their life experiences. This explains why interviewees highlighted the good times and the goodness of people, while also describing cruelty, hostility, and oppression. Throughout the article Sugiman also explored ways in which the researcher and narrator work towards a “shared authority” of how the complex memories are presented and interpreted.

Day (2010), an English professor, took a comparative view of the round up, removal, and incarceration of Japanese "enemy aliens" in concentration camps in Canada, the United States, and Australia to show that the treatment of people of Japanese origin in these three countries was part of a transnational phenomenon in Pacific settler colonies. Day argued that Japanese internment in Canada, the U.S., and Australia was part of a broader settler colonial inheritance that was embedded in western liberal democracy and established on the basis of indigenous dispossession that still remains a condition of possibility in these countries today. Day conducted a comparative analysis of fictional and autobiographical cultural productions from the United States, Canada and Australia including a memoir documentary, a novel, and a multimedia slide show to prove that anti-Japanese sentiment was transnational across the Pacific nations.

Since Daniels (1981; 1982), no scholars have taken a comparative approach to examining the experiences of Japanese Americans and Canadians during World War Two until Bangarth (2008) conducted a comparative review of "the incarceration policies of the United States and the deportation/expatriation policies in Canada ", and more specifically, the overlooked individuals and groups who disagreed with the policies of the governments, and the nature and meaning of the opposition to these policies. Bangarth compared the Japanese American incarceration with the Canadian deportation and expatriation because there was virtually no
public opposition to the relocation of Japanese Canadians in 1942. It was not until the end of the war in Canada that support was mobilized against the deportation of Japanese Canadians, an event that represented Canada's earliest, "significant involvement with the discourse on human rights" (p. 2). Bangarth (2008) argued that it is important to highlight the comparative experiences of Canada and the United States because their experiences were similar, and because the fights against deportations in Canada and incarceration in the United States are important for understanding the "sense of the evolution of human rights on a global scale" (p. 1).

Bangarth (2008) did not consider whether the policies of the Canadian and American government towards people of Japanese origin were just or unjust, but she made several implicit ethical judgments. Bangrath's stated intention was to highlight, "the comparative experience of both governments who followed similar paths when it came to the persecution of persons of Japanese ancestry" (p. 1). Describing the two government's treatment of Japanese Canadians as "persecution" suggested the event was unjust. Her choice of words consistently conveyed her ethical stance about the treatment of Japanese Canadians and Japanese American. Prior to the war they were "subjected to discriminatory treatment upon arrival" and were "objects of suspicion, fear and envy" (p. 3). Following Pearl Harbor both countries evacuated Japanese national, naturalized citizens and their North American children and relocated them to inland camps on the basis of "military necessity" which Bangarth argued was an example of, "historic racist animus" (p. 3). Both countries also developed policies to "defraud" people of their property and possessions, while also encouraging a "dispersal" of the Japanese populations throughout the two countries. At this point the American and Canadian policies diverged. The Americans deported only those who renounced their United States' citizenship, no Japanese Americans born in the United States were disenfranchised and Japanese Americans were permitted to enlist to
fight in the war, whereas Canada expatriated citizens of Japanese ancestry and deported Japanese nationals who did not agree to disperse east of the Rockies.

Bangarth did not portray the Japanese in Canada and the United States as victims who accepted the actions of the oppressor. Instead she utilized a "subjects of history" methodology that focused on what people did to fight injustice. Bangarth argued that highlighting the groups and individuals who promoted the rights of Japanese Americans and Japanese Canadians did not minimize the nature of the racism or the meaning of the incarceration and expatriation, but emphasized the failure of democracy in North America. Furthermore, it showed that there were public debates and individuals who were appalled by their government's policies, weakening the explanation that the political leaders of each country had no alternatives to the policies they enacted.

There are a number of potential reasons historians moved away from discussing whether JCI was justified or not in the books and articles they wrote since 1990. It is possible they became interested in other topics after being influenced by changes in the historical discipline, or perhaps because they realized there was little left to contribute to the debate. Although Adachi, Sunahara, Ward and others disagreed with the revisionist accounts offered by Granatstein, Roy, et al. about whether the Canadian government was justified in removing Japanese Canadians from the B.C. coast in 1942, they all agreed the government’s actions after the removal, including relocation, dispossession of property and possessions, deportation, and dispersal across Canada were unjust.
3.6 Conclusion

Understanding the historiography of JCI highlights how historians approached ethical issues, judgments, and questions, setting the standard for analyzing teachers' and students' approaches. The historians' accounts discussed in this chapter featured two different approaches to ethical judgments. Some of the historians (Granatstein & Johnson, 1988; La Violette, 1948; Roy et al., 1990) believed they described and explained the Japanese Canadian experience during the war dispassionately, objectively, and without making ethical judgments. The other group of historians (Adachi, 1976; Broadfoot, 1977; Sunahara, 1981; W. P. Ward, 1978) also provided accurate and reliable descriptions and explanations of the wartime Japanese Canadian experience, but they were explicit that the Canadian government's treatment of Japanese Canadians was unjust, and about the ethical values, beliefs, and attitudes that informed their conclusions. Regardless of whether the historians recognized they made ethical judgments when writing about JCI, there were numerous ethical judgments present in each historian's account. It will be interesting to see if teachers in the study believe they can describe and explain JCI without making ethical judgments, and to what degree their belief conforms to what they actually do and say in their classes.

Understanding the historiography of JCI also helps locate the classroom discourse in relation to the historiography. Although historians agreed that everything that happened after the removal of Japanese Canadians in 1942 were unjust, there was debate about whether the Canadian government's decision to remove Japanese Canadians was justified or not. Are teachers aware that historians disagreed about whether the removal of Japanese Canadians was justified? Do the teachers believe that the decision to remove Japanese Canadians was justified? Do they ask questions that invite students to discuss or debate whether the removal of Japanese
Canadians was justified? Having an understanding of the historiography of JCI also enables me to assess the currency and accuracy of the various resources teachers used to teach about JCI, the credibility of what teachers said when they described and explained JCI to students, and the plausibility of students’ conclusions about JCI in their written assignments.
Chapter 4: RESEARCH METHODS AND PROCEDURES

4.1 Overview

In this chapter I discuss the research methods and procedures employed to address the three research questions for the study. I start by reviewing the research questions and provide a brief overview of the procedures and methods used in the study, before describing the research methods employed and providing a rationale for selecting them. I then describe the research procedures including the data collection, setting, participants, and data analysis, and conclude by outlining the ethical considerations and trustworthiness of the study. The three research questions that frame the study are primarily descriptive and explanatory in that they aim to understand what has happened and how it happened:

1. What do history teachers believe about including ethical judgments in their teaching, and what factors influence their beliefs?
2. What are the different ways that teachers approach ethical issues, questions and judgments to their history classes?
3. How do students in history classes approach ethical judgments?

I used a case study method to address the research questions and purposes for my dissertation, including a variety of data collection methods including surveys, observations, interviews, and artefact analysis. The data collection took place in two parts; in the first part sixteen Grade 11 Social Studies teachers completed a survey that included questions about their beliefs about ethical judgments in the discipline of history and history teaching, the factors that influenced their beliefs, and the classroom practices they regularly employed. The goal of the survey was to gain an understanding of teachers' attitudes about ethical judgments in the discipline of history and history education, to identify the factors that influenced their beliefs,
and to ascertain their self-understanding of their teaching practices in regards to ethical judgments. I also used the survey to identify four teachers to take part in the case studies, which I discuss in more detail later in the chapter. In the second part, case studies were conducted with four Grade 11 Social Studies classes as they focused on JCI in order to gain a deeper understanding of the different ways that teachers brought ethical issues, questions, and judgments to their history classes, and how their students responded to ethical judgment questions in their written responses.

A variety of data was collected throughout the study in order to triangulate data, clarify meanings, assess frequencies, and validate interpretations. I used field notes from classroom observations, audio and video recordings of classroom activities, and the resources teachers used during their lessons: textbooks, PowerPoint presentations, background information sheets, articles, documentary films, and primary source handouts. Finally, I used student surveys and completed student assignments (n=102).

In the next section I briefly describe case study research and provide a rationale for selecting a multiple case study research design, discuss the data collection and analysis procedures employed in case study research, and explain why the chosen research methodology is appropriate given the study's goals and research questions.

4.2 Case Study Research

During the late 1970s and 1980s, Stake (1978), Yin (1981) and Merriam (1988) delineated case study research as a specific type of research, and Yin (2006) argued that by 2000, “the case study method has attained routine status as a viable method for doing education research” (p. 111). Furthermore, case studies have frequently been used by history education
researchers to study both students and teachers.\textsuperscript{4} According to Stake (2005), case study is hard to specify or define because it is both a process of inquiry about a case, and the product of that inquiry. Some researchers do not consider case study to be a research methodology because it does not shape a researcher's choice about which methods to utilize; rather the case or cases being considered determine the most appropriate methods for addressing the research questions. Regardless of whether case study is a research methodology or method, the main concern of case study research is to study “the case” using whatever methods necessary to achieve the purposes of the research and answer the research questions (Stake, 2005). Following this line of thought, choosing to conduct a case study is not a methodological choice, but a choice of what is to be studied and how it is going to be studied. My research utilizes a variety of methods including surveys, observations, interviews, and artifact analysis because collectively they provide a variety of data that help address the research questions from different perspectives.

Stake (1995; 2005) identified three types of case study designs: intrinsic, instrumental and multiple. Intrinsic case studies focus on achieving a better understanding of a particular case because of its particularity and ordinariness. An instrumental case study focuses on a particular case to provide insights into an issue, to redraw a generalization, or because it facilitates understanding of a more universal phenomenon (Stake, 1995). According to Johnson and Christensen (2012), instrumental cases are selected to develop or test a theory, to understand an important issue better, or to make conclusions that apply beyond a particular case.

Multiple case study (or collective case study) is an instrumental study extended to other cases, and is usually chosen because, "it can lead to better understanding of a research topic and

\textsuperscript{4} For numerous descriptions of studies in history education that utilize case study see (VanSledright & Limon, 2006; Wineburg, 1996).
perhaps better theorizing about a larger collection of cases" (Stake, 2005, p. 445). According to Miles and Huberman (1994) and Borman, Clarke, Cotner and Lee (2006) an interpretation based on evidence from several cases provides a detailed understanding of a phenomenon and can be more compelling than results from a single case, and allow for greater opportunity to generalize across several representations of the phenomenon. Multiple cases can be chosen as replications of each other, as deliberate and contrasting comparisons, or as hypothesized variations to help strengthen the findings from the entire study (Yin, 2006). My study focuses on multiple instrumental cases to deepen my understanding of an important issue, ethical judgments in history classrooms, in order to make conclusions that go beyond a particular set of cases.

(Yin, 2006; 2009) argues that one of the difficulties with conducting multiple case study research is that data collection and data analysis are conducted simultaneously and the researcher must grasp the complexities of the study’s substantive issues, while also being able to collect data carefully and fairly. In order to provide “thick description” of what is perceived to be the case’s particular issues, contexts, and interpretations, Stake (2005) argues that case study researchers collect and analyze multiple sources of subjective data including direct observations, participant interviews, the researcher's critical observations, and interview data. Triangulation is the process of using multiple perceptions to clarify meaning and verify the repeatability of an observation or interpretation, and case study research methodologists (Stake, 1995; 2000; Yin, 2006; 2009) advocate the use of multiple methods of data collection and multiple data sources in order to triangulate the data to help them make empirical data less subjective, to deepen the understanding of the cases, and to address the research questions.

Yin (2006) believes data analysis is the most troublesome step in conducting multiple case studies because researchers often mistakenly believe the data will speak for itself and
findings will be produced with little analysis. Yin highlights the importance of starting with the research questions first, rather than the data, and identifying the evidence that addresses each question. While there are no agreed upon approaches for conducting data analysis in multiple case studies, it is recognized that it is an iterative, multistage process of organizing, categorizing, synthesizing, analyzing, and writing about the data. One of the features of case study data analysis is the repeated and ongoing movement back and forth between raw data, codes, categories, and plausible explanations (Hancock & Algozzine, 2006).

4.3 Rationale for Choosing Multiple Case Study

My purpose in conducting this research is to gain a deeper understanding of ethical judgments by focusing on instrumental cases to see what they reveal about ethical judgments in history classes. More specifically, multiple case study design helped me understand the complex inter-relationships between teachers' beliefs about ethical judgments, the factors that influenced their beliefs, their actual classroom practices, and the impact their practices have on students' responses to ethical judgment questions. Multiple case studies also help highlight the processes involved in causal relationships, such as the relationship between teachers' beliefs about the place of ethical judgments in history education, and the presence of ethical judgments in their classes, or the relationship between teachers' approaches to ethical judgments and students' responses. Similarly, data analysis for multiple case study focuses on the significant similarities and differences between and among cases, which helps strengthen the transferability of my findings to other contexts.

There are several other reasons why case study and more specifically, a multiple case study research design is the most appropriate method of research for this study. The strength of
case study research lies in its ability to, "develop an in-depth understanding of cases within their real-world contexts" (Yin, 2006, p. 111). A case is a "bounded system" that can be a person, program, group, movement, organization, event, concept or a project. For my study, the "cases" are the four Grade 11 Social Studies classes that included teachers and students.

Another reason for choosing a multiple case study design is that they are grounded in "lived reality" and are useful for investigating cases within their "real-life" context. Although I use a survey for the first research question in the study, the majority of the research focuses on analyzing students and teachers in their real world contexts because conducting research in a naturalistic setting is the most appropriate method for understanding the ways that ethical issues, questions and judgments are approached by teachers and students. Focusing on teachers' and students' ethical judgments isolated from the realities of the classroom would provide an artificial sense of teachers' and students approaches.

Multiple case studies are relevant for researchers pursuing descriptive questions that investigate what happened, and explanatory questions that investigate how or why something happened, and my three research questions focus on understanding teachers' beliefs about ethical judgments in the discipline of history and history education, the factors that influenced their beliefs, and the different ways that teachers bring ethical issues, questions and judgments to their history classes, and how students approach ethical judgments in history classrooms.

Case studies are often criticized for being too unique, too idiosyncratic, and for having a limited value beyond a single case. Researchers who use multiple case study are interested in making conclusions beyond a particular case, and this case study design is helpful in facilitating conceptual and theoretical development that can be used to better generalize the results from multiple cases rather than from a single case (Hodkinson & Hodkinson, December 5-7, 2001;
Johnson & Christensen, 2012). Although my small sample size does not allow me to generalize to all history teachers outside of this context, it does allow me to make claims about ethical judgments that are more generalizable than single case studies.

4.4 Procedures

4.4.1 Data collection methods for the case studies

A variety of data was collected for each research question in order to match the appropriate data collection methods with each question, as well as to triangulate as many data sources as possible to clarify meaning and verify the validity of the interpretation.

For the first research question "What do history teachers believe about including ethical judgments in their teaching, and what factors influence their beliefs?" I conducted a survey (see Appendix D) where I invited all twenty teachers in the school district who were teaching the Grade 11 Social Studies course the semester I was conducting research to take the survey. Sixteen teachers completed the survey (80% completion rate), including at least one teacher from each of the six public secondary schools in the school district. The goal of the survey was to gain an understanding of their attitudes about ethical judgments in the discipline of history and history education, to identify the factors that influenced their beliefs, and to ascertain their self-understanding of their teaching practices in regards to ethical judgments. I also used the survey to identify and select four teachers to take part in the case studies, which I discuss later in this chapter. The survey includes 41 questions in a variety of formats including multiple choice, agree/disagree statements, and constructed response. The questions were organized in six categories: Teacher Background, School Information, Teaching Practice, Goals for Teaching
History, Influences on Teaching Practice and Goals for Teaching History, and Attitudes Towards Ethical Judgments.

For the second research question "What are the different ways that ethical judgments are present in history classes?" I collected a variety of data including: the teacher surveys, direct classroom observations that were audio and video recorded, post-observation semi-structured teacher interviews (see Appendix F), and written artifacts and documents from the classes. I observed four Grade 11 Social Studies teachers' lessons that focused on five ethically controversial events in Canadian history that are part of the curriculum (Conscription Crisis in World War I, The Winnipeg General Strike, The On to Ottawa Trek, Japanese Canadian internment, and the October Crisis of 1970). Although I observed four teachers' lessons about all five ethically controversial events, the analysis for this study focused specifically on their approaches to Japanese Canadian Internment (hereafter JCI) because it was the only one of the five topics where all four teachers assigned and collected students' responses to ethical judgment questions which allowed me to compare students' written responses.

During the observations I kept extensive field notes to record what occurred during the lessons, and how teachers and students approached ethical judgments. I made video and audio recordings of all four teachers' lessons, which were later professionally transcribed. I also collected important artefacts and resources used by teachers and students in the lessons including: primary sources (historical photographs and political cartoons), secondary sources (background information sheets, textbook pages, and articles, history videos, and PowerPoint slides), and students' completed assignments. I also conducted semi-structured post-lesson interviews with all four teachers where they were asked a variety of questions about their goals and objectives for the lesson, their thoughts about JCI, reflections about the success of the lesson,
and their perspectives on students' responses and comprehension of the lesson. For the third research question, "How do students in those teachers’ history classes approach ethical judgments?" I administered student surveys (see Appendix E) and collected students' completed written assignments for each of the four classes. The student survey includes 37 questions in a variety of formats including multiple choice, agree/disagree statements, and constructed response. The questions were organized into four categories: student demographics and academic achievement, how often activities take place in their social studies class, how important different goals were in their social studies class, and ethical judgments in their social studies class. For the dissertation, I focused exclusively on questions #1-10 that provided information about students' demographics and academic achievement. I also collected (n=95) completed student written responses that each of the four teachers assigned including 24 responses to Assignment #1, 25 responses to Assignment #2, 25 responses from Assignment #3, and 21 responses to Assignment #4. I have described the type of assignments and the specific wording of the assignments given by the four case study teachers in Table 1 below.

**Table 1** Class assignments assigned by the four case study teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assign #</th>
<th>Type of Assignment</th>
<th>Specific Wording of Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Three questions from page 157 of the <em>Counterpoints</em> (2nd edition) textbook</td>
<td>1. Why were Japanese Canadians relocated and detained during the Second World War?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. How would posters like Remember Hong Kong (on page 137) contribute to these attitudes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. In your opinion, what would be just compensation for Japanese Canadians interned during the war?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Assign # 2

**Type of Assignment**: Paragraph response (two parts)

**Specific Wording of Question**

1. Do you think the Canadian government was justified in internment Japanese Canadians?
   a. How has this changed your perception of your country?

### Assign # 3

**Type of Assignment**: Two textbook questions

**Specific Wording of Question**

1. Write a short paragraph about why the policy of Japanese Internment was or was not necessary and justified at the time.
   a. How would you have reacted to this policy?
   b. In what ways might this policy have been adjusted to make it more equitable?

2. Do you think it is fair for people in the 21st century to judge the actions the government took during World War II? Why—or why not?

### Assign # 4

**Type of Assignment**: One question

**Specific Wording of Question**

1. Was the Canadian government's decision to evacuate and intern Japanese Canadians during World War II justified? (Students were asked to answer the question in one sentence with three arguments, reasons or points to support their answer).

### 4.4.2 Geographic setting

The public school district where the study took place is the fifth largest in a province in Western Canada and serves 180,000 people living in four different municipalities. According to the 2006 Canada Census, 95.5% of the people in the municipality speak English at home. There are six different secondary schools in the school district, three of which are senior secondary schools (grades 10-12), two are secondary schools (grades 8-12), and one offers alternate programs and services for grade 8-12 students.

I chose this geographic location to conduct research for a number of reasons. Firstly, I worked as a teacher in this school district for over a decade and have relationships with district administrators and school principals, increasing my chances of receiving consent to conduct my
research there. Furthermore, I have presented many social studies workshops and worked with and alongside many of the social studies teachers in the school district over the past decade, which helped in recruiting teachers to participate in the study.

4.4.3 Teacher survey participants

The sixteen teachers who completed the survey varied in terms of their teaching experience. One teacher had three years of experience or less, five teachers had between four and eight years of experience, four teachers had between nine and fifteen years of experience, and two teachers had more than 25 years' experience. In terms of their undergraduate education, eight teachers (50%) majored in history, one teacher had a double major in history and geography, two teachers had a geography major and a history minor, three teachers had a minor in history, and two teachers did not have any background in history, geography, the social sciences, or the humanities. Ten of the sixteen (62.5%) teachers had completed Master's degrees in education.

4.4.4 Case study participants

I selected a purposive sample of four accomplished social studies teachers to participate in the case study. The four teachers all specialized in history during their undergraduate degrees, they had all been teaching social studies for at least six years, they were recognized in their schools for being quality social studies teachers, and they are all passionate about teaching social studies. Selecting four accomplished social studies teachers strengthened any claims to generalizability I might be able to make, especially considering the limited sample size. The reasoning behind the selection of this sample is that if the most accomplished teachers struggle in their approaches to ethical judgments, then it can be reasonably assumed that other accomplished
history teachers might struggle with their approaches, as might less well accomplished social studies and history teachers. In making claims to generalizability from this sample, I recognize that there are unaccounted factors that could also influence teachers' approaches to ethical judgments, including their political leanings, gender, and age, amongst others. The process of selecting the case study teachers was also limited by two other factors. Only ten of the sixteen teachers who completed the survey said they were interested in participating in the case study, which limited my choices of participants. Also, despite wanting more gender equity amongst the case study participants, there were only three female teachers who completed the survey: one of them did not have a history major, one was not willing to participate in the case study, and the other teacher's contract ended halfway through the term and she could not participate in the research.

All four teachers had undergraduate degrees with majors in history, and three of the four teachers had Master's degrees in Education. Two teachers had at least twelve years of social studies teaching experience, while the other two had been teaching social studies for six years. All four teachers had previously taught Grade 11 Social Studies multiple times and have reached a level of experience in their practice where they are comfortable in the classroom, confident about their teaching practices, and knowledgeable about the curriculum. They know how to identify quality resources, plan history lessons, lead class discussions, and at this point in their career, they have encountered several opportunities to reflect upon and revise their practices. The four teachers were also well-liked by students, passionate about teaching social studies, and committed to improving their history teaching practice through participation in professional development opportunities and history education organizations. Grade 11 Social Studies is most often taught by the most experienced social studies teachers at each school because it is the only
K-12 social studies course in the province where students write a mandatory provincial exam worth 20% of their final grade.

4.4.5 Introduction to the four case study teachers

The four male teachers who participated in the case study were given pseudonyms: Mr. Arbour, Mr. Bay, Mr. Hunter, and Mr. Mahoney. Table 2 shows the similarities amongst the four teachers in their educational backgrounds and teaching experience.

Table 2 Introduction to the four case study teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Mr. Arbor</th>
<th>Mr. Bay</th>
<th>Mr. Hunter</th>
<th>Mr. Mahoney</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>School A</td>
<td>School B</td>
<td>School C</td>
<td>School C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic status of school</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate History Major?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's Degree in Education?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of social studies teaching experience</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taught Grade11 Social Studies at least 5 times previously?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mr. Mahoney has been at his current school since 2009 where he shares the role of social studies department head with Mr. Hunter. Throughout his career Mr. Mahoney has been

5 All four teachers who participated in the case studies were given pseudonyms.
nominated for and received several teaching awards, is actively involved in professional social studies teachers' organizations at the district and provincial level, and has attended several national and international professional development conferences. Mr. Mahoney is renowned throughout the school district for creating a specialized course on the Holocaust and other genocides, his passion for teaching history and the strong relationships he builds with students. His classroom walls reflect his passion for history, and there is not a space that is not covered in history-related film posters, student projects, historical photographs and memorabilia, and signed photos of Canadian politicians and celebrities.

Mr. Hunter and Mr. Mahoney share duties as department head of social studies, and like Mr. Mahoney, Mr. Hunter has good rapport with his students and regularly expresses an interest in students' lives outside of school. He has organized several trips to Europe during school breaks to various historical sites. Two doors down from Mr. Mahoney, his classroom is filled with student assignments, historical posters, artefacts, reproductions and memorabilia. Although Mr. Hunter and Mr. Mahoney regularly share lesson ideas and resources, they utilize different resources, activities, and practices when teaching social studies.

Like Mr. Mahoney, Mr. Bay is passionate about teaching a course on genocide and the Holocaust, and regularly collaborates with Mr. Mahoney to share curriculum, resources, lessons and professional development opportunities. Throughout his career he has attended several international and national professional development conferences, and recently won an award for excellence in Holocaust education. Mr. Bay and a social studies teacher colleague designed a series of PowerPoint slides for each topic and learning outcome in the Grade 11 Social Studies curriculum which he uses each class. Mr. Bay's classroom is similar in appearance to Mr.
Mahoney's and Mr. Hunter's classrooms in that there are many history and Holocaust themed posters, student work, and artefacts posted throughout the room.

Mr. Arbour is very involved in extra-curricular school activities and is well-liked by the students in his class for his knowledge of history, sense of humour, and use of sarcasm. Mr. Arbour's classroom is small, crowded, and difficult to move around in when full of students. The students' desks are haphazardly organized into three long horizontal rows, and little natural light enters the room because the curtains were usually drawn over the windows in the back of the classroom. The room is untidy and there is football gear, old books, papers, trolleys, broken chairs and other items strewn about the classroom. Of the three teachers, Mr. Arbour is the least accomplished in terms of teaching awards, and his involvement in social studies related professional development opportunities and local and provincial social studies organizations.

4.4.6 Student participants

As Table 3 reveals, the students (n=101) in the four Grade 11 socials studies classes who completed the survey are similar to each other in terms of average age, male-female ratio, percentage of students born in Canada, and the percentage of students who speak English at home. Mr. Arbour's class has the highest percentage of students with one parent who has completed a graduate or professional degree, which is almost three times higher than Mr. Hunter's class, Mr. Bay's class, and Mr. Mahoney's class. Furthermore, 73% of the students in Mr. Arbour's class have a parent who has completed either a Bachelor's degree (or beyond), which is higher than Mr. Mahoney's class (61%), and almost double Mr. Bay's class (42%) and Mr. Hunter's class (41%). The difference in the education level of the parents is explained by the
fact that the Mr. Arbour's school is located in one of the wealthier socioeconomic regions in the city with more valuable real estate, less poverty, and higher levels of education for the parents.

Table 3 Student demographics in the four teachers' classes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Mr. Arbor's class</th>
<th>Mr. Bay's class</th>
<th>Mr. Hunter's class</th>
<th>Mr. Mahoney's class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>School A</td>
<td>School B</td>
<td>School C</td>
<td>School C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic status of school</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>Mid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of students who completed the survey</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average age of students</td>
<td>16.2 years old</td>
<td>16.5 years old</td>
<td>16.5 years old</td>
<td>16.7 years old</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male/Female ratio</td>
<td>16:10</td>
<td>13:11</td>
<td>15:13</td>
<td>12:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of students born in Canada</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother born in Canada</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father born in Canada</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of students who commonly speak English at home</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of parents with a Bachelor's degree or higher</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of parents with a graduate or professional degree</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of students with a B or higher on social studies projects and tests</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of students with an A on social studies projects and tests</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4.7 Data analysis

In this section I describe the data analysis and interpretation process used to investigate the three research questions. I addressed the first research question about teachers' beliefs regarding ethical judgments in the discipline of history and history education, and the factors that influenced their beliefs, by focusing on the teachers’ survey. Using the literature about ethical judgments in the discipline of history and history education and the eight characteristics of reasoned ethical judgments described in Chapter 2, I categorized the survey responses about teachers' approaches to ethical judgments including their classroom practices, goals for teaching history, and attitudes towards ethical judgments as sophisticated (S) or less sophisticated (LS). Although the sophisticated/less sophisticated dichotomy is a crude way to approach such a complex phenomenon as teachers' approaches to ethical judgments, this method of classification helped me identify four teachers with sophisticated approaches to ethical judgments to take part in the case study. A more nuanced scale of teachers' approaches to ethical judgments would be preferable; however, it is beyond the scope of this study. Developing such a scale should be considered a high priority for future research in this area.

As an example of an item that helps discriminate between the two categories, Question 30 on the teacher survey (see Appendix D) provides eight statements about ethical judgments and instructs teachers to either agree or disagree with the statements and provide a brief explanation of their response. Statement 30 a) says, "Historians make ethical judgments when they research, write, and teach history." Using the literature on ethical judgments as my theoretical base, I categorized "Agree" responses as sophisticated, and "Disagree" responses as less sophisticated. After categorizing the different survey questions focused on ethical judgments
as sophisticated or less sophisticated, I analyzed the teachers' survey responses using frequency counts to make conclusions about the sophistication of the sixteen teachers' classroom practices, their goals for teaching history, and their attitudes about ethical judgments. Using frequency counts, I also identified the influences on teachers' beliefs about ethical judgments in the discipline of history and history education that were selected most often. These methods of data analysis enabled me to identify the sophistication of teachers' beliefs about ethical judgments in the discipline of history and history education, and highlight the various factors that influenced their beliefs.

I addressed the second research question about the different ways teachers brought ethical issues, questions, and judgments to their history classes by focusing primarily on the transcripts from the audio and video recordings of the four teachers' lessons and the different resources they used, as well as the field notes from the observations, and the transcripts from the post-observation teacher interviews. After familiarizing myself with the data, I identified five activities in the four teachers' lessons that became the units of study for analyzing how teachers approached ethical issues, judgments, and questions when teaching history: #1) teachers described and explained Japanese Canadian internment (JCI); #2) teachers and students analyzed primary and secondary sources; #3) teachers invited students to make ethical judgments; #4) teachers provided instruction and scaffolding to teach students how to make ethical judgments; and #5) students' completed written responses. My next step was to go through the lesson observation transcripts to identify the occurrence of the five different activities in the four teachers' lessons.

After highlighting the five different activities in the four teachers' lessons, I followed a dialectical approach to data analysis, referred to as content analysis, in order to determine how
ethical judgments were present in the teachers' lessons. Content analysis is a research method used to analyze the presence, meanings, and relationships of words and concepts within sets of texts (Krippendorff, 2004; Krippendorff & Bock, 2009; Neuendorf, 2002). More specifically, I utilized a type of content analysis known as conceptual analysis which involves selecting a concept (like ethical judgment) for examination, and then identifying the concept within texts and counting its presence (Krippendorff & Bock, 2009). Conducting conceptual analysis involved an iterative process of going back and forth between a priori analytic frameworks for ethical judgments influenced by the literature on ethical judgments in the discipline of history and history education (see Chapter 2), as well as a more grounded approach in which my understanding of ethical judgments developed from the data analysis (Weston et al., 2001). In other words, my conceptual understanding of ethical judgments was informed by theory and from the data analysis.

I developed three different analytical frameworks to identify ethical judgments in the five activities that took place in the four teachers' lessons. The Analytical Framework for Ethical Judgments was used to identify the different types of explicit and implicit ethical judgments present when teachers described and explained JCI (#1, above), when teachers and students analyzed primary and secondary sources (#2), and when teachers provided instruction and scaffolding to teach students how to make ethical judgments (#4). This analytical framework was created via an iterative process of moving between an a priori framework for ethical judgments influenced by the literature on ethical judgments (see Chapter 2), as well as from the data.

Analytical Framework for Ethical Judgments

1. Explicit ethical judgments
2. Implicit ethical judgments
- Word choice has consequences for the ethical position taken
- Historical detail or event included has consequences for the ethical position taken
- Viewpoint and perspective included has consequences for the ethical position taken
- Inaccurate or exaggerated statement has consequences for the ethical position taken
- Comparison to another event where a positive or negative ethical judgment is assumed
- Visual (photographs and recreations) has consequences for the ethical position taken

A second analytical framework, entitled Class Assignments that Invite Ethical Judgments (see Table 25), was developed inductively from the data that emerged, and was used to analyze the different questions and written assignments teachers asked students to respond to when teaching about JCI (#3). In order to develop the Analytic Framework for Student Responses (see Table 29) I used the Analytical Framework for Ethical Judgments (see Table 11) that had already been created, a coding scheme that I co-developed in a previous research study on the quality of students' ethical judgments, as well as from codes that emerged inductively from students' responses to ethical judgment questions. I used the Analytic Framework for Student Responses to analyze the sophistication level of students' written responses (#5).

After categorizing and analyzing the data using the three analytic frameworks, and moving back and forth among raw data, codes, categories, and plausible explanations, the last step was to identify patterns and themes in order to generate a theory about teachers' and students' ethical judgments in history classes.

4.5 Ethical Considerations

According to Fontana and Frey (2005) the three most common ethical concerns when conducting research are informed consent, right to privacy and, protection from harm. In this section I describe the negotiations that took place to obtain informed consent, how privacy and
protection from harm were guaranteed, and the ethical dilemmas encountered when conducting this research.

The first step in conducting this research was to submit my research proposal and have it approved by the University of British Columbia Behavioural Research Ethics Board. After receiving a certificate of approval from the Behavioural Research Ethics Board (see Appendix H), I submitted my research proposal to the School Board Research Committee. Once I received written approval from the School Board Research Committee, I sent the approval letter and copies of my proposal to the principals at secondary schools where I intended to conduct my research. The principals, in consultation with the staff and students involved, then decided if they would provide approval to conduct the research study in their schools.

After receiving the consent of the principals, I personally approached each of the potential teacher participants to explain the purposes of the study, the research procedures, and the expectations required of them should they agree to take part. I presented teachers with a Letter of Initial Contact (see Appendix G) describing the study as well as a consent form (see Appendix B) that invited them to provide informed consent to participate in the study. Once teachers provided informed consent, I provided them with the survey (see Appendix D) and an addressed envelope to return the surveys to me once it was completed.

After analyzing the teacher survey data, I identified four potential teachers to participate in the case study and approached them to discuss their involvement. I gave each teacher a letter outlining the case study expectations and a consent form to conduct interviews and observations (see Appendix C) so they were totally clear about the requirements and demands on their time. After the four teachers provided informed consent to participate in the case study I attended each of their classes to explain the research study to their students. When meeting with the students I
outlined the details of the study and presented them with a permission letter (see Appendix A) that provided information to them and their parent(s) and/or guardian(s) about the purposes of the study, the types of activities that student participants were asked to participate in, and the specific details about the survey, observations, and tasks that students would be asked to complete as part of the case study. Once I received informed consent from their parent(s) and/or guardian(s) and assent from the students I gave them the survey and began the classroom observations.

The only potential ethical issue that emerged during this study was related to my dual role as graduate researcher and employee of the school district as a member of the Instructional Leadership Team where I regularly worked collaboratively with groups of teachers to plan lessons, units, and courses. When recruiting teacher participants to take part in the study I clearly explained the difference between my role as a researcher and my role as an employee in the school district. I made sure that teachers were clear about the differences between these two roles so they did not feel obligated to take part in the research study.

4.5.1 Privacy

Teachers and students were each assigned a Research Code Number to keep their identities strictly confidential. No names appear on any data collection forms (surveys, field notes or student tasks). The name/code sheets were stored in a separate file, in a secure, locked filing cabinet in the researcher's home office. Audio recordings of teacher and student interviews were transferred to MP3 files and stored on an external hard drive that was kept in a secure, locked filing cabinet in the researcher's home office, and a password protected computer. Video and audio files of class observations were also stored on an external hard drive that was kept in a...
secure, locked filing cabinet in the researcher's home office, as were the completed surveys. All materials handled by the researcher were identified only by code numbers and no computer files included student's names. Additionally, data were stored on password protected computers, without any student identifiers other than their research code number. No data were posted to the web, and teacher participants in the case study were assigned pseudonyms which were used in all written work related to the research.

4.6 Trustworthiness

In this section I describe steps taken to ensure trustworthiness of the research findings presented in Chapters Five and Six. Guba (1981) argued that researchers can establish the trustworthiness of their research by addressing the credibility, dependability, confirmability and transferability of their research. Credibility considers the researcher's ability to consider the complexities of the study and address the problems that are not easily explained. Dependability focuses on the stability of the data and whether or not similar results would be achieved if the study were repeated. Confirmability refers to researcher neutrality and the control of researcher bias. Transferability is the degree to which findings can be applied to other contexts, participants, groups and situations. In the following paragraphs I describe how I established the trustworthiness of my research study by addressing the issues of credibility, dependability, confirmability, and transferability.

4.6.1 Credibility

Credibility focuses on how well the researcher has considered the complexities of the study and addressed the difficult to explain problems that emerged throughout the study.
Maxwell (1992) refers to a researcher's ability to interpret the meaning of the participants' words or actions as "interpretive validity." In order to address issues of credibility and interpretive validity I conducted observations of the four cases over a period of four months during the spring semester (February-June 2013), which provided enough time to overcome distortions caused by my presence in the classrooms I was observing and an opportunity to test my biases and perceptions of the case. I also regularly debriefed my changing insights on the different cases with my supervisor. In order to use multiple perceptions to clarify meaning and verify the repeatability of an observation or interpretation I triangulated my data sources by collecting a variety of data including audio and video recordings of the four teachers' lessons, all resources used by teachers during the lessons, student assignments, post-observation audio interviews, and surveys. I also conducted member checks (or stakeholder checks) with the four teachers to verify the factual accuracy of my transcriptions and evaluate the interpretations and explanations drawn from the data before it was shared in its final form. I also reviewed what Guba (1981) refers to as the "referential adequacy" of the analyses and interpretations I arrived at to ensure they accurately reflect the data collected during the study.

4.6.2 Dependability

Dependability refers to the degree to which similar findings would be obtained if the study were repeated. The word "similar" must be emphasized because any subsequent study repeated in the same context with the same participants would still be a “new” study. I enhanced the dependability of my study by overlapping data collection methods and triangulating different data sources, and also by using code-recode consistency (the same coding or observation occurs more than once using the same instrument). For example, the transcripts from each of the four
teachers' lesson observations were analyzed at least three times over a period of several months to ensure that the identification of the different types of ethical judgments was consistent.

### 4.6.3 Confirmability

Confirmability refers to the neutrality of the researcher and the ability to mitigate the amount of researcher bias. It is easy to say that bias is an ever-present concern in research, but difficult to adequately address this issue. The main strategies employed to confront confirmability were triangulation and reflexivity. Triangulation is the process of using multiple methods, data collection strategies, and data sources to gain a more complete and complex understanding of what is happening, and to cross-reference information and interpretations (Gay, Mills, & Airasian, 2005). Reflexivity is the process of intentionally revealing underlying assumptions and biases that may cause the researcher to analyze data or interpret a situation in a particular way. In order to practice reflexivity I regularly discussed my interpretations of the data with my supervisor in order to identify my biases and assumptions about history teaching and ethical judgments. The process of analyzing and writing about the research also helped me reflect and understand how my perceptions of the data were influenced by my assumptions and beliefs. I also established an audit trail to make it possible for an external auditor to examine my processes of data collection, analysis, and interpretation, and I documented all of my data collection, analysis, and interpretation methods and processes in order to provide access to all of the primary sources I analyzed during the study.
4.6.4 Transferability

According to Eisenhart (2009), from the 1980s to the 2000s many researchers (Carspecken, 1996; Lincoln & Guba, 1985) suggested that generalizability is inappropriate, unwarranted, or even dangerous in qualitative research because this type of research is good at providing "thick descriptions", identifying relevant factors, and generating plausible hypotheses, but is not useful for developing theories that generalize. Lincoln and Guba (1985) proposed transferability, or the degree to which findings can be applied to other contexts, participants, groups and situations, as an alternative to generalizability, which they believe is both possible and warranted when evidence of similarity exists across sites. In this section I use the terms generalizability and transferability interchangeably.

One of the biggest contentions amongst case study researchers is the degree of generalization that can be drawn from different case study designs. Flyvbjerg (2001) argues that intrinsic case studies can lead towards generalization producing studies or theory building, but Stake (2005) maintains that grand generalization should not be pursued in case study research because the commitment to generalize can distract the researcher’s attention away from the features important for understanding the case. Despite making arguments against the possibility of making generalizations in case study research, Stake contends that it is impossible for case study researchers to avoid generalization when they describe the case with sufficient description to enable the reader to comprehend the interpretations and draw their own conclusions (p. 450).

Recently, various researchers including (Eisenhart, 2009; Ercikan & Roth, 2006) have suggested that it is possible for researchers to make generalizations from qualitative research. Eisenhart (2009) discusses several well-established methods of making generalizations from qualitative research including: probabilistic generalization, nomological generalization, grounded
generalization, meta-analysis as generalization, and theoretical generalization. Probabilistic generalizations are warranted when researchers prove that a particular study site or group is typical or representative of a larger population. Nomological generalizations are possible when researchers describe the context in detail and prove that the site or sites being described are typical of other sites. Grounded generalizations occur when researchers follow a phenomenon of interest across time and space to investigate how the phenomena reacts in each new situation in order to develop tentative hypotheses that accommodate all previous situations and anticipate what new situations will reveal. The researcher then seeks out situations that might force revision or rejection of the hypotheses until new situations do not yield any new information the hypotheses do not account for. Meta-analysis or syntheses as generalization occur when researchers develop techniques for synthesizing the results of studies about similar topics or groups. Lastly, theoretical generalizations occur when researchers develop a theory and then choose other cases or groups to establish, refine, or refute a theory. Theoretical generalization is similar to grounded generalization except it aims to make existing theories more refined and incisive, whereas grounded generalization aims to produce new theories.

There are several aspects of the research study that can be generalized. The sixteen social studies teachers who completed the survey varied in terms of their teaching experience and educational background. One teacher had three years of experience or less, five teachers had between four and eight years of experience, four teachers had between nine and fifteen years of experience, and two teachers had more than 25 years' experience. In terms of their educational background, eight teachers (50%) majored in history, one teacher had a double major in history and geography, two teachers had a geography major and a history minor, three teachers had a minor in history, and two teachers did not have any background in history, geography, the social
sciences, or the humanities. Ten of the sixteen (62.5%) teachers had completed Master's degrees in education. As a result of their variability in their educational backgrounds in history and years of teaching experience, their beliefs about ethical judgments in the discipline of history and history education and the factors that influenced their beliefs can be generalized to teachers in other contexts who have similar experience and educational training. The four case study teachers comprised a purposive sample of accomplished, well-liked, experienced, and highly educated social studies professionals. The nature of this purposive sample was designed to support generalization about the levels of sophistication beyond the sample: if this group had difficulties with teaching the ethical dimension of history, then there would be a strong argument that other less qualified teachers would have similar or greater difficulty. However, these teachers' practices cannot be generalized to all history teachers because it is possible that other factors influence teachers' approaches to ethical judgments including their gender, political beliefs, and years of experience, to name a few.

Nomological generalizations can also be made because the "thick" descriptions of the different ways the four teachers approached ethical issues, questions, and judgments in their history classes helped me identify elements of teachers' approaches to ethical judgments that could be generalizable to similar teachers' contexts. Stake (2005) points out that rich descriptions provided in multiple case study often provide readers with useful ideas that stimulate them to look at old problems in new ways, or develop awareness of issues that they did not know existed.

Lastly, my purposive sample for the multiple case study research design creates a stronger case for making grounded generalizations than other types of case study samples. I investigated how ethical judgments were approached by four different teachers in four different contexts with the purpose of developing a tentative hypothesis about teachers' approaches to
ethical judgments that accommodates all four cases and anticipates what different cases might reveal. The purpose of this research is to gain insight and understanding of four accomplished teachers’ approaches to ethical judgments, with the possibility that these findings can be applied to teachers in other contexts to be confirmed, refined, or refuted. Many researchers contend that multiple case study leads to better theorizing about a larger collection of cases because one is more able to generalize the results of multiple cases than from a single case (Johnson & Christensen, 2012; Stake, 2005).
Chapter 5: RESEARCH FINDINGS

During the first part of the data collection, sixteen Grade 11 Social Studies teachers from six secondary schools completed a survey about their beliefs about history teaching and the place of ethical judgments in history education. In the second part, case studies were conducted with four teachers in order to gain a deeper understanding of the different ways that ethical judgments were present, and how teachers and students approached ethical judgments as they focused on an ethically controversial event in Canadian history, Japanese Canadian internment (JCI) during World War Two. The findings presented in this chapter address the central questions that frame the study:

1. What do history teachers believe about including ethical judgments in their teaching, and what factors influence their beliefs?
2. What are the different ways that teachers bring ethical issues, questions and judgments to their history classes?
3. How do students in history classes approach ethical judgments?

In addressing these research questions in the chapter I argue that teachers have sophisticated beliefs about ethical judgments and can talk about ethical judgments in history in advanced ways. They are not aware, however, of the degree or frequency to which ethical judgments suffuse their classroom materials and didactic instruction. Furthermore, teachers spend the vast majority of their time describing and explaining historical events. They nevertheless provide little instruction to students on how to analyze and identify ethical judgments in historical accounts, or about how to make them in their own accounts. As a result, students have less understanding than they should have about how ethical judgments work in the practices of doing history.
5.1 Teachers' Beliefs about Ethical Judgments

In order to address the question about teachers' beliefs and the factors that influence them, I focus on two data sources: teacher surveys completed by sixteen teachers in the first stage of data collection, and post-classroom observation interviews conducted with four teachers in the second stage.

5.1.1 Sixteen teachers' beliefs about ethical judgments

Table 4 and Table 5 include survey questions that focus on teachers' beliefs about ethical judgments in the discipline of history and history education, and how the sixteen teachers' responded to each question. The shaded boxes indicate sophisticated beliefs, whereas the boxes that are not shaded indicate less-sophisticated beliefs. I used the literature on ethical judgments in the discipline of history and history education, as well as the characteristics of reasoned ethical judgments outlined in Chapter 2 to distinguish between sophisticated responses and less sophisticated responses. When describing the teachers' responses to Question 30 in the following paragraphs, I also discuss teachers' written explanations for each of the eight statements.

Table 4 Sophistication of teachers' beliefs about ethical judgments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Questions</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Both</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30. Agree (A) or disagree (D) with the following statements about ethical judgments in history</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Historians make ethical judgments when they research, write, and teach history.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>(0%)</td>
<td>(0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. History is not about making ethical judgments, but about learning the facts about the past.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(25%)</td>
<td>(69%)</td>
<td>(6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey Questions</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. History teachers should not make ethical judgments because they need to be as objective as possible. ²</td>
<td>9 (60%)</td>
<td>4 (27%)</td>
<td>2 (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. It is a historian's job to make ethical judgments in history, not the teacher’s or student’s job. ²</td>
<td>1 (7%)</td>
<td>13 (84%)</td>
<td>1 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Ethical judgments should not be made in history because times were different in the past and there is no point condemning individuals for the circumstances in which they found themselves.</td>
<td>1 (6%)</td>
<td>15 (94%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Ethical judgments are the end results of historical inquiry.</td>
<td>10 (63%)</td>
<td>6 (37%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. There may be several plausible ethical judgments about the same event, person or time period.</td>
<td>16 (100%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Ethical judgments have been an important part of history education since history was included in public schooling over a century ago.</td>
<td>8 (50%)</td>
<td>8 (50%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Teachers who both agreed and disagreed with the statement.
2. Question C and D each had one No Response.

Table 5 Sophistication of sixteen teachers' goals for teaching about ethical judgments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How important are the following goals in your history teaching?</th>
<th>VI¹</th>
<th>QI¹</th>
<th>SI¹</th>
<th>NI¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17. I want them to be able to judge historical events in terms of right and wrong, good and bad, and fair and unfair.</td>
<td>3 (19%)</td>
<td>12 (75%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. How important is it for teachers to tell students what was right or wrong, fair or unfair, or right or wrong in the past?</td>
<td>2 (12.5%)</td>
<td>2 (12.5%)</td>
<td>8 (50%)</td>
<td>4 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. How important is it that teachers invite students to decide what was right or wrong, fair or unfair, or right or wrong in the past during class discussions or activities?</td>
<td>11 (69%)</td>
<td>5 (31%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How important are the following goals in your history teaching?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>VI</th>
<th>QI</th>
<th>SI</th>
<th>NI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35. How important is it that students are taught how to make their own reasonable ethical judgments about historical events, people and institutions in your classes?</td>
<td>12 (75%)</td>
<td>4 (25%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. How important is it that students learn to identify ethical judgments located in textbooks, films, books, articles, or teacher lectures?</td>
<td>10 (63%)</td>
<td>5 (31%)</td>
<td>1 (6%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. VI: Very Important, QI: Quite Important, SI: Somewhat Important, NI: Not Important

As Table 4 and 5 illustrate, the majority of the sixteen teachers have relatively sophisticated beliefs about the importance of ethical judgments in the discipline of history and in history education. Of the sixteen teachers' responses to thirteen questions about their beliefs about ethical judgments, only 18% of the responses were classified as less sophisticated. All of the teachers recognize that ethical judgments are unavoidable for historians when they research, write, and teach history. In the written explanations, teachers use words such as bias, prejudice, point of view, values and opinions to explain why ethical judgments are inevitable for historians. One of the teachers explains, "Historians are a product of their own 'history' and while they should strive to be objective, personal bias will be present to some degree." All of the teachers also agree that there are several plausible ethical judgments about the same historical topic or event, and several teachers explain that this occurs because historians have differing points of view, perspectives, value systems, and personal biases. One teacher says that there can be multiple plausible ethical judgments about the same event because historical events have different impacts on people's lives, people interpret primary sources differently, there are different theories and interpretations that exist, and there are, "two sides to everything."
Thirteen of fifteen teachers (84%) also believe that historians, teachers and students should make ethical judgments and several teachers defended this belief by saying that, "historians do not have the right to make ethical judgments for others just because they are experts in their field", and, "everyone who is engaged in history can make their our own judgments." All but one of the teachers agree that ethical judgments can be made despite the different times and circumstances in the past and the present. In explaining their responses, several teachers discuss the importance of understanding the historical context and using historical perspective-taking to consider the different conditions, attitudes, and values that existed at the time the event occurred. In one of the more sophisticated explanations of why it is important to make ethical judgments despite the differences between the past and the present, one teacher writes that, "Ethical judgments should always be made. One can understand/empathize the reasoning of a horrendous act and judge it." In this statement the teacher highlights the important connection between taking historical perspectives before making ethical judgments (see Seixas & Morton, 2013, p. 180-183).

Eleven of sixteen teachers (69%) disagree with the statement “history is, not about making ethical judgments but about learning the facts.” According to the teachers who disagree, historical facts and ethical judgments are interconnected because students need to understand basic facts about a historical event in order to make an ethical judgment about it. The five teachers who agree that history is about the facts and not about ethical judgments argue that teachers should strive to be objective, students need to learn the facts from more than one source, and that ethical judgments contain "bias." Not only do these statements reveal less sophisticated understandings of ethical judgments, they also reveal misconceptions about the nature of historical evidence.
Ten of sixteen teachers (63%) agree that ethical judgments should be the end results of historical inquiry because they contend that people who are too quick to make ethical judgments make uninformed judgments. The six teachers who disagree with the statement explain that not all historical inquiry results in ethical judgments; ethical judgments are made throughout the inquiry process; and one teacher explains that well-researched historians make ethical judgments at the end of inquiry, but "students must be allowed to fumble through research to eventually arrive at an educated opinion."

All of the teachers believe it is either quite important or very important that students are able to judge historical events in terms of right and wrong, that students are invited to make ethical judgments during class discussions and activities, that students are taught how to make reasonable ethical judgments, and that students learn how to identify ethical judgments in textbooks, films, books, articles, and teachers' lectures.

Several teachers contend that rather than make ethical judgments themselves, teachers should expose students to the relevant facts and perspectives on the topic, and then invite them to make their own ethical judgments and form their own opinions about the topic. These teachers believe that it is possible for teachers to remain objective when presenting the historical details of an event. One teacher explains that, "I try to be objective in the presentation of very debatable topics so the kids can be free to explore their own responses." The four teachers who disagree with the statement explain that it is impossible for teachers to be objective when teaching history, that history teachers should strive to have informed opinions because it is, "fundamentally a part of good citizenship to make ethical judgments", and, "History teachers can make ethical judgments but they must be transparent in their decision making process and open to criticism."

There is other evidence that suggests that several teachers believe that it is possible for them to
remain objective when teaching history. The five teachers who agree that history is about the facts and not about making ethical judgments explain the importance of teachers remaining objective.

The question that asks teachers whether they agree or disagree that "ethical judgments have been an important part of history education since history was included in public schooling over a century ago" evenly divided teachers into two groups (eight agree and eight disagree). The eight teachers who disagree with the statement explain that in the past the focus was on having students memorize events, dates, and names. Those who agree with the statement recognize that, since history was first included in public schooling history teachers have always made commentary about controversial issues, "even if only with their silence."

The majority of teachers believe that ethical judgments are unavoidable in the discipline of history, and a crucial part of history education in terms of teaching students how to recognize them, regularly inviting students to make them, and instructing students to make them plausibly. Despite these beliefs, many teachers still cling to the contrary belief that it is important that they remain neutral and objective when teaching history. The combination of these two beliefs is a radical disjunction: it is contradictory for teachers to claim that ethical judgments are unavoidable when writing, teaching and doing history, yet believe that they can remain objective when teaching history. I will discuss the implications of this contradiction further in Chapter 5.

5.1.2 Four teachers' beliefs about ethical judgments

Table 6 shows the four teachers' responses to the survey questions about their beliefs about ethical judgments in the discipline of history and history education. Table 7 focuses on four teachers' responses to survey questions about their goals for teaching about ethical
judgments. The shaded boxes indicate sophisticated responses (S), while the boxes not shaded indicate less sophisticated (LS) responses.

**Table 6** Four teachers' beliefs about ethical judgments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Questions</th>
<th>Mr. Arbour</th>
<th>Mr. Bay</th>
<th>Mr. Hunter</th>
<th>Mr. Mahoney</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 a. Historians make ethical judgments when they research, write, and teach history.</td>
<td>A&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 b. History is not about making ethical judgments, but about learning the facts about the past.</td>
<td>D&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 c. History teachers should not make ethical judgments because they need to be as objective as possible.</td>
<td>AD&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 d. It is a historian's job to make ethical judgments in history, not the teacher’s or student’s job.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 e. Ethical judgments should not be made in history because times were different in the past and there is no point condemning individuals for the circumstances in which they found themselves.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 f. Ethical judgments are the end results of historical inquiry.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 g. There may be several plausible ethical judgments about the same event, person or time period.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 h. Ethical judgments have been an important part of history education since history was included in public schooling over a century ago.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. A: Teacher agreed with the statement; D: Teacher disagreed with the statement; AD: Teacher both agreed and disagreed with the statement.
Table 7 Sophistication of four teachers’ goals for teaching about ethical judgments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Questions</th>
<th>Mr. Arbour</th>
<th>Mr. Bay</th>
<th>Mr. Hunter</th>
<th>Mr. Mahoney</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17. I want them to be able to judge historical events in terms of right and wrong, good and bad, and fair and unfair.</td>
<td>VI¹</td>
<td>QI</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>QI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. How important is it for teachers to tell students what was right or wrong, fair or unfair, or right or wrong in the past?</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>SI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. How important is it that teachers invite students to decide what was right or wrong, fair or unfair, or right or wrong in the past during class discussions or activities?</td>
<td>QI</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. How important is it that students are taught how to make their own reasonable ethical judgments about historical events, people and institutions in your classes?</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>QI</td>
<td>QI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. How important is it that students learn to identify ethical judgments located in textbooks, films, books, articles, or teacher lectures?</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>QI</td>
<td>QI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹. VI: Very Important, QI: Quite Important, SI: Somewhat Important, NI: Not Important

The four teachers had relatively sophisticated beliefs about ethical judgments, and 83% of the four teachers’ responses were sophisticated, while only 17% were less sophisticated. The four teachers are similar to each other with a few notable differences. All four teachers share the same beliefs about three shaded statements in Table 6, but there are a series of outliers. Mr. Mahoney is the only one of the four teachers (25%) who thinks that history is not about making ethical judgments, but about learning the facts of the past. In his written explanation he explains that knowledge of the facts is an important base upon which to make ethical judgments, or in other words, students need to understand the facts first before making ethical judgments.
Mr. Arbour is the only one of the four teachers to both agree and disagree with the statement that history teachers should not make ethical judgments because they need to be objective. Mr. Mahoney is the only one of the four teachers who disagrees with the statement, and in his explanation he argues that humans have their own opinions and it is impossible for them to remain neutral and avoid making judgments.

Mr. Hunter is the only one of the sixteen teachers who holds the less sophisticated belief that only historians, but not teachers and students are permitted to make ethical judgments because he believes that historians are, "trained to look at multiple types of primary sources about a topic."

Mr. Bay is the only one of the four teachers who disagrees that “ethical judgments should be the end result of historical inquiry,” because he feels that, "This should be done throughout the entire learning process." In addition, Mr. Mahoney says that, "problems and ignorance rules when judgments are made without inquiry."

The four teachers were also very alike in terms of the number of sophisticated and less sophisticated responses to the thirteen questions asked. Mr. Bay had the most unsophisticated beliefs with three, Mr. Mahoney and Mr. Hunter had two and Mr. Arbour had one. The group of four teachers are similar to the group of sixteen teachers in terms of the ratio of sophisticated to unsophisticated beliefs which makes them a strong sample for the case study.

5.1.3 Influences on teachers' beliefs about ethical judgments

There were two questions on the teacher survey focused on the influences on teachers’ beliefs about ethical judgments. The first question asks teachers about influences on their beliefs
about the *discipline* of history, and the second question asks about influences on their beliefs about *teaching* history. Table 8 shows the results from the first question.

**Table 8** Influences on teachers' beliefs about ethical judgments in the discipline of history

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Influences on Teachers' Beliefs</th>
<th>How many of the 16 teachers selected the influence?</th>
<th>Influence ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experiences as a student in university or college history classes</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching experience and practice</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books or films</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching colleagues</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiences as a student in high school history or social studies classes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiences in professional development workshops or seminars</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other influences</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiences as a student in university or college teacher education program</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The sixteen teachers identified multiple factors as being influential on their beliefs about ethical judgments. Eight different influences are selected by at least four (25%) of the sixteen teachers. However, despite the variety of influences selected, over 60% of the teachers selected the same four influences: their experiences as students in university or college history classes, their teaching experience and practice, books and films, and teaching colleagues.
The influences selected least often by teachers include teachers' experiences as a student in high school social studies or history classes, experiences as a student in a teacher education program, professional development experiences, and a variety of "other" factors.

Table 9 shows the similarities amongst the four teachers' beliefs about whether ethical judgments are an important part of the discipline of history. The shaded boxes indicate influences selected by a teacher.

**Table 9** Influences on four teachers' beliefs about whether ethical judgments are an important part of the discipline of history

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Influences</th>
<th>Mr. Arbour</th>
<th>Mr. Bay</th>
<th>Mr. Hunter</th>
<th>Mr. Mahoney</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experiences as a student in university or college history classes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching colleagues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching experience and practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books or films</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiences as a student in high school history or social studies classes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiences in professional development workshops or seminars</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiences as a student in university or college teacher education program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 9 shows, the four teachers are generally similar to each other in terms of the factors they identify as influencing their attitude and beliefs about whether ethical judgments are
an important part of the discipline of history. Three of the four teachers selected their experiences as a student in university or college history classes, and their teaching colleagues, and two teachers selected their teaching experience and books and films.

Table 10 Influences on teachers' beliefs about whether history teachers should make ethical judgments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Influences</th>
<th>How many of the 16 teachers selected the influence?</th>
<th>Influence ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experiences of a teacher</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns about offending a student or family of a student</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiences as a student in university or college history classes</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching colleagues</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiences as a student in high school history or social studies classes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional development experiences</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of students' abilities and interests</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books or films</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worries about getting into trouble with the school administration for taking a controversial position</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiences as a student in university or college teacher education program</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whether it is included in curriculum documents or final exams or tests</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10 shows the influences on sixteen teachers' beliefs about whether teachers should make ethical judgments when teaching history. In addition to their experiences as a student in university or college history classes, the other three factors that most influence teachers' beliefs are their experiences as teachers, concerns about offending a student or family of a student, and their teaching colleagues. I further discuss the implications of these influences in Chapter 6.

The group of sixteen teachers also selected the same two influences least often: ethical judgments included in curriculum documents, final exams, or tests, and their experiences as a student in university or college teacher education program. I will also return to discuss the implications of what the three least frequently cited influences might have for history education in Chapter 6.

Table 11 shows the different influences on the four teachers' beliefs about whether they should make ethical judgments when teaching history in order to determine how similar the four teachers are to each other. The shaded boxes indicate influences selected by each teacher.

Table 11 Influences on four teachers' beliefs about ethical judgments in history education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Influences</th>
<th>Mr. Arbour</th>
<th>Mr. Bay</th>
<th>Mr. Hunter</th>
<th>Mr. Mahoney</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching colleagues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiences of a teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns about offending a student or family of a student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiences as a student in university or college history classes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Influences | Mr. Arbour | Mr. Bay | Mr. Hunter | Mr. Mahoney
--- | --- | --- | --- | ---
Books or films |  |  |  |  
Worries about getting into trouble with the school administration for taking a controversial position |  |  |  |  
Professional development experiences |  |  |  |  
Knowledge of students’ abilities and interests |  |  |  |  
Experiences as a student in university or college teacher education program |  |  |  |  
Whether it is included in curriculum documents or final exams or tests |  |  |  |  
Other influences |  |  |  |  
Experiences as a student in high school history or social studies classes |  |  |  |  

All four teachers chose teaching colleagues as their most important influence on their beliefs about ethical judgments in history education, and three teachers also selected their experiences as a teacher, concerns about offending a student or family of a student, and their experiences as a student in university or college history classes.

In considering the first research question, “What do history teachers believe about including ethical judgments in their teaching, and what factors influence their beliefs?” there are several conclusions that can be arrived at. The majority of teachers have sophisticated views about the place of ethical judgments in the discipline of history and history education, yet several of them cling to the belief that it is important that they remain objective when teaching history. While all of the teachers believe that ethical judgments are unavoidable for historians when they
research, write and teach history, they also believe that it is important and possible that teachers remain objective when teaching about history. Teachers' beliefs about ethical judgments in the discipline and in the teaching of history have been influenced by a variety of factors. Noticeably absent from these factors are teacher education and professional development programs.

5.2 Ethical Issues, Questions, and Judgments in History Teachers' Practice

The second research question is concerned with the different ways that teachers bring ethical issues, questions and judgments into their history classes. In investigating the question, I focus on three data sources: the teachers' survey, classroom observations of the four teachers and post-observation interviews. I begin by reviewing the sixteen teachers' survey results to identify the types of activities that teachers' say regularly occur in their classes and then compare the larger group with the four teachers in the case study. I then provide an overview of the four teachers' lessons on JCI, and examine the post-observation interviews to determine the four teachers' beliefs about JCI and their awareness of the ethical judgments present in their lessons. The majority of this section focuses on analyzing the different ways that the four teachers brought ethical issues, questions, and judgments to the teaching of JCI in their lessons.

5.2.1 Teachers' classroom practice

Table 12 shows sixteen teachers' responses to ten questions about how frequently particular activities take place in their teaching practice.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 6 to Question 15: How often do the following activities take place in your history classes?</th>
<th>Frequency of classroom activities in sixteen teachers’ classes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. Students listen to me talk about historical events.</td>
<td>Never or once/twice per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Students discuss and debate different interpretations of what happened in the past.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Students analyze historical sources, e.g., letters, old documents, or photographs from the past.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Students watch historical videos and films.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Students use the textbook and/or worksheets related to the textbook.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Students use a range of activities, e.g. role play, local projects or visiting museums/sites.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Students write their own interpretations of past events and people.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Students use the internet or library to do historical research.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Other activities not listed, which teachers do often or very often.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. One teacher chose both every month and weekly.
2. Guided notes and PowerPoint presentations, small and large group projects, guest speakers, document based questions (DBQ’s), debates, inquiry questions, current events, Socratic circles, response journals.
As is revealed in the survey, most of the sixteen teachers are similar to each other in terms of the activities that regularly take place in their classes. Almost all of the sixteen teachers indicated they talk to their students about historical events every class. The majority of the teachers indicated they use the textbook or worksheets related to the textbook and watch historical films on a weekly basis. In terms of activities that take place each month, the majority of teachers indicated that they invite students to discuss and debate different interpretations of what happened in the past, analyze historical sources, debate and discuss different historical interpretations, and use the internet or library to do historical research.

The greatest difference in how often different activities take place in teachers' classes was how often they tell students what was good or bad, or right or wrong in history, or in other words, how often they make explicit ethical judgments. One teacher claims to do this each class, six teachers said that they do this every week, four other teachers said that they do this a few times per year, and four teachers said that they never, or once or twice per year make explicit ethical judgments.

**Table 13 Ethical judgments in sixteen teachers' practice**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Frequency of classroom activities in sixteen teachers' classes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never or once/twice per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Students are told what was good or bad, right or wrong in history.</td>
<td>4 (25%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
36. Over the past year, how often have students been asked to make an ethical judgment about a historical person, event or institution in a class assignment, activity or test?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Never or once/twice per year</th>
<th>A few times per year</th>
<th>Every month</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Almost every class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>3 (19%)</td>
<td>5 (31%)</td>
<td>5 (31%)</td>
<td>3 (19%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teachers claimed to make ethical judgments less frequently in Question 33 (see Table 14) than in Question 7 (see Table 13) which could be explained by the different wording used to describe ethical judgments in the two questions, or the different options for answering the two questions (Question 33 provides six options, while Question 7 provides five). The important point here is that the majority of teachers believe they do not make ethical judgments very often when they teach history, but they do claim to regularly invite students to make ethical judgments in assignments, tests, and class discussions.

**Table 14 Ethical Judgments in sixteen teachers' practice**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Frequency of classroom activities in sixteen teachers' classes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. How often over the past year have you made ethical judgments about historical events, people, or institutions when talking with students?</td>
<td>1 (6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.2.1.1 Four teachers describe their classroom practice

This section focuses on the four teachers' classroom practice (according to their own claims) in order to determine how similar they are to each other. Table 15 shows the four teachers' responses to questions about how often the following activities take place in their classroom practice.

Table 15 Four teachers' classroom activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 6 to Question 15: How often do the following activities take place in your history classes?</th>
<th>Mr. Arbour</th>
<th>Mr. Bay</th>
<th>Mr. Hunter</th>
<th>Mr. Mahoney</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Students listen to me talk about historical events.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Students are told what was good or bad, right or wrong in history.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Students discuss and debate different interpretations of what happened in the past.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Students analyze historical sources, e.g., letters, old documents, or photographs from the past.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Students watch historical videos and films.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Students use the textbook and/or worksheets related to the textbook.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Students use a range of activities, e.g. role play, local projects or visiting museums/sites.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Students write their own interpretations of past events and people.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Despite some minor variations in their classroom practice, the four teachers' responses about how often different activities take place in their classrooms are similar to each other.

Table 16 and Table 17 show how often each of the four teachers believe they make ethical judgments when teaching, and how often they invite students to make ethical judgments.

**Table 16** How often the four teachers made ethical judgments over the past year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Arbour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Bay</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Hunter</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Mahoney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Codes: (1) Never, (2) Less than once per month, (3) About once per month, (4) Several times per month, (5) Several times per week, (6) Several times per class

**Table 17** Ethical judgments in four teachers' practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Arbour</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Bay</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Hunter</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Mahoney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Students are told what was good or bad, right or wrong in history.
All four teachers report that they ask students to make an ethical judgment about a historical person, event, or institution every week, but there are significant differences in how often the four teachers claim they make ethical judgments when teaching. Mr. Bay and Mr. Hunter believe they make ethical judgments far less frequently than Mr. Arbour or Mr. Mahoney.

The four teachers invite students to make ethical judgments more often than the group of sixteen teachers. Like the larger group of sixteen teachers, the four teachers are divided in terms of how often they make ethical judgments in their teaching.

### 5.2.1.2 Overview of the four lessons

Of the four teachers, Mr. Mahoney spent the most time (134 minutes over two class periods) teaching about JCI during World War Two, while Mr. Arbour spent 56 minutes, Mr. Hunter spent 37 minutes and Mr. Bay spent 30 minutes. Mr. Mahoney's lesson was longer than the other three teachers because he introduced eleven activities, while Mr. Arbour introduced six, Mr. Bay introduced four, and Mr. Hunter introduced three.

The prescribed curriculum and provincial exam at the end of the course had a significant influence on how much time Mr. Hunter and Mr. Bay focused on JCI. Mr. Hunter and Mr. Bay moved through the curriculum at a much faster pace than the other two teachers and they taught
about JCI ten days before Mr. Mahoney and three weeks before Mr. Arbour even though they were on similar course timetables. Mr. Hunter explained that he does not usually spend much time on the topic, "cause I’m getting rushed at this point of the day". Mr. Bay was also worried that he was "behind" and would not complete the required curriculum before the provincial exam. Mr. Bay and a colleague co-designed and organized a series of PowerPoint slides to teach each topic in the curriculum, and he used the slides to gauge whether he was moving through the mandated curriculum quickly enough for students to be ready for the provincial exam. Mr. Mahoney did not express any concern about the provincial exam or finishing the curriculum in time, and he was the only teacher who taught the lesson differently than he had in the past.

The four teachers' purposes for teaching about JCI featured several different approaches to ethical judgments and offered several ethical judgments that JCI was unjust. Mr. Bay's purpose for the lesson was to, "go through Japanese internment, show them what the Canadian government did and the degree of persecution the Japanese faced in Canada." In using the word "persecution" Mr. Bay implied that JCI was unjust. Furthermore, Mr. Bay said that he wanted to "show" students the degree of persecution Japanese Canadians faced, to accept his interpretation of JCI rather than invite students to make their own judgments about whether it was unjust. Mr. Hunter explained that he wanted to show students, "a time in Canadian history where we did not consider equality as much as we do now, which might surprise them." This statement implies that JCI was wrong because Canadians in the past did not consider racial equality whereas Canadians today do value racial equality. Mr. Hunter also said he wanted students to understand that, "government has to make some decisions in times of crisis that some may see as being, you know, unjustifiable or justifiable." Mr. Hunter's statement reveals sophisticated thinking about ethical judgments because he recognized the importance of helping students understand the
historical context when making ethical judgments, and that there can be different perspectives on ethically controversial historical events.

Mr. Arbour said that his purpose was to help students understand one of the major themes for the course, how Canada "hopefully" progressed as a nation and because JCI is a great chapter in Canadian history for showing, "how backwards our thinking was." He went on to explain that JCI is a good teaching point for students because it shows how, "we've progressed as a society in terms of racial tolerance, and by not falling prey to mass hysteria." Stating that Canadians' thinking about JCI was backward is an implied ethical judgment that JCI was unjust. Also, saying that we've progressed as a society in terms of racial tolerance and for not falling prey to mass hysteria reveals a narrative of interrupted progress in racial tolerance.

Mr. Mahoney said that his main purpose was to, "tell the story of internment" by explaining who Japanese Canadians were and what happened to them during the war so that students could decide whether the government's actions were justified or not justified. Unlike the other teachers, Mr. Mahoney claimed that he did not want students to accept his ethical judgment about JCI, he wanted them to make their own. Although Mr. Mahoney emphasized the fact that JCI was not justified from a present-day perspective, he wanted his students to understand the immediate and underlying causes of the event, and consider the historical context of JCI before making an ethical judgment. Mr. Mahoney approach to teaching about JCI, as he stated it, was more sophisticated than the other three teachers.

There were several similarities and differences in the teachers' JCI lessons. All four teachers used similar activities, resources, and lesson sequences. Each teacher, except for Mr. Mahoney, began their lessons by presenting information about JCI using a variety of secondary sources including various textbook accounts, background sheets and PowerPoint slides. Mr.
Mahoney, started his lesson by inviting students to analyze two primary sources about JCI, introduced students to the inquiry question that they were going to answer at the end of the lesson, and showed the same PowerPoint slides that Mr. Bay used in his lesson. Mr. Bay was the only teacher other than Mr. Mahoney to use primary sources in his lesson and he showed eight pairs of photographs that compared aspects of JC and the Holocaust. Mr. Arbour was the only teacher to conduct a class discussion with his students, and they discussed aspects of JCI after reading the *Canadian Encyclopedia* article. All four teachers showed the same seven-minute section of *Canada: A People's History*, and used the video to deepen students' understanding of JCI. After learning about JCI from the various secondary sources, Mr. Hunter and Mr. Arbour invited students to complete written activities about JCI from different textbooks, while Mr. Bay and Mr. Mahoney assigned written activities they created (see Table 25). For a more detailed overview of the four teachers' lessons see Appendix I.

5.2.1.3 Teachers' awareness of ethical judgments in their lessons

In the post-observation interviews, each of the four teachers were asked if they were aware of any ethical judgments they made during the lesson, and if they did not think they made any, what were the reasons they avoided making them? Each of the four teachers recognized that they made ethical judgments during their lessons, although they did not recognize how often they made them, and the different situations in which they were made.

Mr. Bay recognized that it was probable that he made ethical judgments because, "There’s always something in there. Your bias will always come up, especially in your passion…in the way you present the material it'll show a bias." Mr. Bay's awareness of his own ethical judgments contradicts his survey responses where he stated that he made ethical
judgments a few times per year. Mr. Hunter recognized that although he did not make any explicit ethical judgments during the lesson, his wording was probably perceived by students as having included ethical judgments. Mr. Arbour also recognized that it would not be difficult for students to pick up on the fact that he thought JCI was a disgraceful chapter in Canadian history. Furthermore, Mr. Mahoney acknowledged that he made several ethical judgments throughout the lesson when he pointed out reasons JCI was both justified and not justified so that students understood there were, "two sides to this issue."

Despite the recognition that ethical judgments were unavoidable, three of the four teachers said they tried to avoid making ethical judgments during the lesson because they worried that their ethical stance would influence students' beliefs about whether JCI was justified. Mr. Hunter said, "I want to just give them the facts and let them make their own decisions", while Mr. Mahoney stated that, "I just don't want to superimpose my position on the students." In the interviews, the teachers described several strategies they utilized to avoid influencing students' ethical judgments, including offering reasons why JCI was both justified and unjustified, and highlighting important contextual information about JCI before students made their own ethical judgments.

5.2.1.4 Teachers' ethical judgments about JCI

During the post-observation interviews the four teachers were asked whether they thought JCI was justified or unjustified, and all four said it was not justified. When making these explicit ethical judgments about JCI, the teachers revealed some of the characteristics of reasoned and sophisticated ethical judgments; they considered the perspectives of people in their historical context, identified differences between the worldviews, values, attitudes, and beliefs
that existed in the past and today, and identified some of the different perspectives of the historical actors who participated in the event.

Mr. Bay indicated that his thoughts about JCI were similar to a line the narrator said in the *Canada: A People's History* video clip. "The narrator said that military officials at the time concluded that Japanese Canadians were not a threat." Mr. Bay said that JCI was caused by widespread racism and animosity towards Japanese Canadians at the time, and the government should have realized that Japanese Canadians were not a threat and just left them alone. When asked whether he agreed with historian Jack Granatstein's argument that the Japanese were removed for their protection, Mr. Bay responded by saying, "I don't buy that in the slightest…it [JCI] was done as a racial policy within Canada."

Mr. Hunter also said that JCI was unjust because Japanese Canadians were treated much worse than other enemy aliens during the war. Furthermore, he argued that selling their property and possessions for rock bottom prices was based on racial discrimination. Like Mr. Arbour, Mr. Hunter considered the historical context before making his judgment. He recognized that although mass hysteria against Japanese Canadians might justify some of the actions taken, it did not justify the dispossession of Japanese Canadian property. He also wondered why the Canadian government could not have left Japanese Canadian property alone until the war was over and allowed them to return and collect it.

Mr. Arbour said it was a "horrible" event, but after considering the historical context including the state of the war at the time, the shock of the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor, the fear of attack that people on the west coast felt, and the racial intolerance that existed, he was not surprised that Japanese Canadians were treated the way they were. Furthermore, Mr. Arbour wondered how difficult it would have been for the average citizen to get accurate information
during the war, and doubted whether the message from the RCMP and the military that the Japanese Canadians posed no threat to security was well known by the majority of people in B.C. Although Mr. Arbour believed that racism and intolerance were part of Canadian society at the time, he felt that, "people probably had a pretty good reason" to do what they did to Japanese Canadians.

Like the two previous teachers, Mr. Mahoney highlighted the importance of considering the differences in the values, attitudes, and beliefs that existed in the past and the present, or what he referred to as the "time differential and time difference." From a contemporary perspective he thought JCI was unfair, but also suggested that there may have been justifiable reasons for it. "Of course I think it's unfair from nowadays but had I been a teacher back then I might have been all aboard, I don't know....I think it's important to try to create a balance because yes it’s unfair but there was some rationale for it." After considering JCI from contemporary and past perspectives, and contextual events such as Pearl Harbor and the treatment of Canadian prisoners, Mr. Mahoney concluded that JCI was, "Totally not justified" because most Japanese Canadians were Canadian citizens and should have been treated better than the Japanese military treated Canadian soldiers captured after the fall of Hong Kong in 1942.

In making explicit ethical judgments that JCI was unjust, all four teachers displayed some of the characteristics of reasoned and sophisticated ethical judgments. They considered the perspectives of people in their historical context, identified differences between the worldviews, values, attitudes, and beliefs that existed today and in the past, and identified the different perspectives that existed amongst the historical actors who participated in the event. In analyzing their lessons, it will be interesting to see if teachers can offer instruction to students on how to make reasonable ethical judgments, as they were able to do.
5.2.1.5 Analytical framework for teachers' activities

In the following sections, I use the analytical framework introduced in Chapter 4 to analyze how the four teachers approached ethical issues, questions, and judgments in three of the activities that took place in the four teachers' lessons: #1) teachers described and explained JCI, #2) teachers and students analyzed primary and secondary sources, and #4) teachers provided instruction and scaffolding to teach students how to make ethical judgments. For the other two activities, #3) teachers invited students to make ethical judgments, and #5) students' completed written responses, I use a different analytical framework.

The analytical framework for ethical judgments was created via an iterative process of moving back and forth between an a priori framework for ethical judgments influenced by the literature on ethical judgments (see Chapter 2), as well as a more grounded approach in which ethical judgment codes were developed as they emerged from the data (Weston et al., 2001).

Analytical Framework for Ethical Judgments

1. Explicit ethical judgments
2. Implicit ethical judgments
   - Word choice has consequences for the ethical position taken
   - Historical detail or event included has consequences for the ethical position taken
   - Viewpoint and perspective included has consequences for the ethical position taken
   - Inaccurate or exaggerated statement has consequences for the ethical position taken
   - Comparison to another event where a positive or negative ethical judgment is assumed
   - Visual (photographs and recreations) has consequences for the ethical position taken

The framework includes two categories of ethical judgments, explicit and implicit. As discussed by Oldfield (1981) explicit judgments are obvious and clear statements of praise or blame based on standards of right or wrong, fair or unfair, and justified or unjustified that focus
on the intentions of individuals or institutions, the quality of actions that resulted from the intentions, and the consequences of the actions to the extent they were foreseen or foreseeable. As previously mentioned, explicit ethical judgments are extremely rare in teachers' classrooms, but are usually quite obvious when they occur. For example, Mr. Hunter made an explicit judgment in the post-observation interview when he said, "I don’t think it was, the way they [Canadian government] went about it wasn’t justifiable."

The analytical framework includes six types of implicit ethical judgments that occur more frequently, some even in the same sentence. Implicit ethical judgments made through the historical details are the most frequently occurring type of implicit ethical judgment, often occurring alongside implicit ethical judgments made via word choice. Bedarida (2000) and Boobbyer (2002) argue that historians' values influence the selection of relevant facts and the hierarchies of explanatory factors included in an account. Similarly, Seixas and Morton (2013) explain that ethical judgments are interpretations of the historical record in which decisions are made about which parts of an account to include. One PowerPoint slide Mr. Bay and Mr. Mahoney used describes how Japanese Canadians were forced to move out of B.C. or be repatriated back to Japan at the end of the war, and the next bullet point says that, "Many were 2nd generation, & had never seen Japan." Including this historical detail suggests that the repatriation of Japanese Canadians was unjust because the government sent Canadian born Japanese Canadians to a country they had never been before. Another way historical details can reveal an implicit ethical judgment is when the majority of details in an account focus on negative or unethical aspects. For example, twelve of fourteen bullet points in the PowerPoint shown by Mr. Bay and Mr. Mahoney focus on negative aspects of the treatment of Japanese Canadians before and after the war, which overwhelmingly suggests that JCI was unjust. One of
the difficulties with identifying implicit ethical judgments in the historical details included in an account is that some historical events are so ethically unjust that it is difficult to describe an event without selecting historical details that make an implicit ethical judgment. One cannot describe the Holocaust without including historical details that make implicit ethical judgments. JCI on the other hand, can be described without focusing exclusively on details that imply their treatment was unjust. There were examples where implicit ethical judgments were made via word choice without including a particularly judgmental historical detail, or, alternatively via a historical detail without a judgmental word choice, but in several instances these two modes of implicit judgment merged inseparably.

Implicit judgments made through word choice are the second most commonly occurring type of implicit ethical judgment. The different words that teachers use to describe and explain historical events can have consequences for the ethical position taken. For example, when discussing the causes of JCI Mr. Mahoney said that, "the underlying cause of this is racism, the immediate cause of this is the attack" [on Pearl Harbor]. Use of the word "racism" is an implicit ethical judgment because by contemporary standards "racism" is ethically unjust, and as a result, calling anything racist is an implicit ethical judgment.

Another type of implicit ethical judgment occurs when perspectives about a historical issue, person, or event are included that have consequences for the ethical position taken. This type of implicit ethical judgments is revealed in a variety of ways: the historical perspectives of key actors or groups involved in the event are included in the narrative, one (or more) perspectives of historical actors are given more consideration than other perspectives, or one perspective is portrayed more sympathetically than others. In the Canadian Encyclopedia article Mr. Arbour's class read, the fourth paragraph included a quote from army Major General Ken
Stewart that said, "From the army point of view, I cannot see that Japanese Canadians constitute the slightest menace to national security.” Including this perspective suggests that JCI was unjust. Similarly, "The Dispossessed” video from Episode 14 of Canada: A People’s History includes only two individual's perspectives, Muriel Kitagawa and federal Cabinet Minister Ian Mackenzie. Kitagawa is used to represent the Japanese Canadian community, while Ian Mackenzie symbolizes the Canadian government. Kitagawa is introduced and re-introduced four different times throughout the video, and is depicted as a heroic Canadian-born mother of four who experiences feelings of fear, indignation, and horror during the war. Mackenzie is introduced just once, and is characterized as an intolerant, bigoted racist who uses his political power to convince the Canadian government to intern Japanese Canadians. By focusing more on the historical perspective and experiences of Muriel Kitagawa, and portraying her character in a more sympathetic way, the video implies that JCI was unjust.

The inclusion of inaccurate, exaggerated, or false historical details, whether on purpose or mistakenly, is another way that implied ethical judgments are made. The four teachers offered more inaccurate and exaggerated historical statements when describing and explaining JCI than commercially produced textbooks and videos. When teachers talk to students in real time, they knowingly or unknowingly exaggerate details or offer inaccuracies that have ethical implications. A PowerPoint slide used by Mr. Mahoney and Mr. Bay states, "Conditions were so drastic that Japanese in Japan sent assistance through the Red Cross." Choosing the word "drastic" to describe conditions in the interior housing camps makes an implicit ethical judgment via word choice that Japanese Canadians were not well treated. Furthermore, saying that conditions were so drastic that Japanese people had to send assistance through the Red Cross is an exaggeration with ethical implications. According to Roy et. al (1990), the Red Cross and the
Spanish Consul routinely visited Japanese Canadians at different settlements throughout B.C. and frequently encountered complaints about a variety of issues including overcrowding, the unsuitability of the houses for the severe climate, inadequacy of relief payments, the high cost of food, and the lack of indoor recreational facilities. In December 1943 the Canadian government appointed a Royal Commission to inquire into the conditions in the interior housing settlements. When the report was published in March 1944 it said that conditions in the interior settlements were, "as a war-time measure, reasonably fair and adequate" and the International Red Cross approved the report (Roy et al., 1990, p. 137). While it is accurate to say that Japanese Canadians received little more than the bare necessities of food, shelter, health care, and education during war, but to suggest that the conditions were so drastic that Japanese citizens had to send assistance through the Red Cross is inaccurate and misleading, and suggests that JCI was unjust.

Implicit ethical judgments are also made by comparison. There are numerous examples throughout the case study where a teacher or student compares JCI to the Holocaust. Mr. Mahoney compared the dispossession of Japanese Canadian property during World War Two to Kristallnacht in 1938 where Jewish Germans' synagogues were burned, their shop windows smashed, stores looted, and compensation money was paid to the government. After describing Kristallnacht to students he commented, "That's kind of similar isn't it? …”

The last way that implicit ethical judgments are made is through the presentation of visual images that have consequences for the ethical position taken. Images can powerfully evoke emotions and ideas. They make implicit ethical judgments through the subject focused on, the elements included in the image, and the purpose for the creation of the image. If the image focuses on events that are unjust, or shows images that appear to be unfair, they offer implied
ethical judgments. The image of impounded Japanese Canadian fishing boats\(^6\) below is included in many books, films and websites, and is featured in several of the resources teachers used during their lessons.

![Japanese Canadian fishing vessels](image)

**Figure 1** Japanese Canadian fishing vessels

The photograph in Figure 1 shows impounded Japanese Canadian vessels at Annieville Dyke on the Fraser River before they were reconditioned and sold at auction, often for far less money than market value. The tied-up boats serve as a reminder that many Japanese Canadians lost their livelihoods when the fishing boats were impounded. Furthermore, one can imagine the damages several of the boats incurred as they crashed into each other and bobbed up and down when they were rounded up and moored to the dyke. The photograph thus makes an implied ethical judgment.

\(^6\) The photograph was taken from the Japanese Canadian research collection held in the Rare Books & Special Collections at the University of British Columbia Library.

In the following sections, I use this analytical framework to analyze how teachers brought ethical issues, questions and judgments to the different activities that took place in their history classes. I start by focusing on teachers' PowerPoint slides and then analyze a video shown to students, various secondary accounts, visual primary sources, and lastly teachers' personal stories that were told in class.

5.2.2 Teachers describe and explain JCI

Of the five different types of activities that took place in the lessons, teachers spent the majority of time describing and explaining JCI. In this section I describe how teachers approached the different resources they used to describe and explain JCI, and discuss the ethical judgments present in the resources. Table 18 outlines the different resources teachers used to describe and explain JCI.

Table 18 Resources used to describe and explain JCI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Resource</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Teacher(s) who used the resource</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PowerPoint slides</td>
<td>Designed by Mr. Bay and a colleague, the three slides include fourteen bullet points, 198 words of text, seven historical photographs, and one digital image of a fictional newspaper.</td>
<td>Mr. Bay Mr. Mahoney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada: A People’s History (CAPH) video &quot;The Dispossessed&quot;</td>
<td>A seven minute-four second chapter from Episode 14 of CAPH that features sequences of third-person voice-over narration, on-camera or voice-over narration by actors representing historical figures, dramatized re-enactments of events, and over forty different images including 23 photographs, two images of historical artefacts, eight film clips, and seven re-creations of historic events are shown.</td>
<td>All four teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Resource</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Teacher(s) who used the resource</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Canadian Encyclopedia article</strong></td>
<td>828-word “feature article” entitled “Japanese Internment: Banished and Beyond Tears.” Feature articles focus on, “Historical and biographical themes written in a narrative style intended to engage readers and introduce them to a broad range of related content in the encyclopedias” (Marsh).</td>
<td>Mr. Arbour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evacuation of the Japanese Canadians textbook account</strong></td>
<td>865-words, including a title, two learning objectives, eight paragraphs, two photographs, a 268-word poem by Joy Kogawa, and a 156-word &quot;Connections&quot; textbox that describes the Redress Settlement.</td>
<td>Mr. Hunter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Japanese Internment justified background sheet</strong></td>
<td>Three-page, 1,431-word background sheet from History Docs, an online collection of sets of primary and secondary source documents about different events in Canadian history.</td>
<td>Mr. Mahoney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher stories</strong></td>
<td>Four brief stories about JCI that were meant to: entertain students; to share stories of people who experienced the events firsthand; to show students how the history they learn is connected to people's lives; and to show the importance of learning about history.</td>
<td>Mr. Mahoney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Historical Photograph Comparison Activity</strong></td>
<td>Seven pairs of historical photographs that show an aspect of JCI and a similar aspect of the Holocaust.</td>
<td>Mr. Bay</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the four teachers understand the interpretive and constructed nature of historical accounts, they approached the different resources as information sources about JCI, rather than as historical evidence to be analyzed and interpreted for the ethical position present. In the post-observation interviews, each of the four teachers recognized ethical judgments were made during their lessons, but they were unaware of how often they were made, and the different situations in which they occurred. There were few explicit ethical judgments present in the
resources or teachers' descriptions, however, numerous ethical judgments were present in each of
the resources teachers used to describe and explain JCI, and when teachers described and
explained the resources to students. The two most common types of implicit judgments occurred
through the word choice and historical details included in the accounts, however, certain types of
implicit judgments were more prevalent in some resources than others. In this section I discuss
the notable ways ethical judgments were present in the four types of resources teachers used to
describe and explain JCI, and in their explanations of the resources.

5.2.2.1 Three secondary accounts

Mr. Arbour, Mr. Hunter, and Mr. Mahoney each used different secondary accounts to
describe and explain JCI. Mr. Arbour asked students to read the "feature article" from the
Canadian Encyclopedia entitled "Japanese Internment: Banished and Beyond Tears" that was
written by editor in chief James T. Marsh. Feature articles are different from standard Canadian
Encyclopedia entries that summarize factual information about 20,000 Canadian topics in that
they focus on, "Historical and biographical themes written in a narrative style intended to engage
readers and introduce them to a broad range of related content in the encyclopedias" (Marsh).
Mr. Arbour chose to use the article because the textbook section on JCI was "a little bit vague",
and he wanted to find a "good kind of online source" that had "more detail", and "a bit of a
position behind it." Furthermore, Mr. Arbour chose the article because it "pointed out how bad it
[JCI] was", and it was written and published by a historian who was knowledgeable about the
topic which was important to M. Arbour because, "you have to be careful with these topics
because they’re sensitive." Mr. Hunter used a two-page photocopy entitled "Evacuation of the
Japanese Canadians" taken from a textbook neither he nor the teaching colleague he received it
from knew where it was originally from. Mr. Mahoney used a background sheet from a set of History Docs entitled "Japanese Internment justified" because he felt it put JCI into context and provided a history of the causes of JCI. History Docs is an online collection of sets of primary and secondary source documents about different events in Canadian history. Each set of History Docs is focused on an inquiry question that students answer after they have read the background sheet and analyzed different primary and secondary sources. The background sheet is meant to provide students with enough historical information to begin investigating the inquiry question, but not enough information that students could answer the question without analyzing the primary and secondary sources.

Table 19 compares the frequency that different types of ethical judgments were made in the three secondary accounts and two teachers' explanations of the accounts. The three different secondary sources Mr. Arbour, Mr. Hunter, and Mr. Mahoney used to describe and explain JCI include a similar number of implicit ethical judgments suggested by the choice of historical details to include despite the fact that the Japanese Internment Justified background sheet used by Mr. Mahoney is almost twice as long. The Canadian Encyclopedia article and the Evacuation of the Japanese Canadians textbook account used by Mr. Arbour and Mr. Hunter include more implicit ethical judgments made through word choice, inaccurate or exaggerated statements, and comparisons to other historical events where a negative ethical judgment is assumed.

Table 19 Ethical judgments in three secondary accounts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethical Framework</th>
<th>CE¹</th>
<th>EJC²</th>
<th>Mr. H³</th>
<th>JIJ⁴</th>
<th>Mr. M⁵</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Explicit ethical judgments</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Implicit ethical judgments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Word choice has consequences for the ethical position taken</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The *Canadian Encyclopedia* article and the Evacuation of the Japanese Canadians textbook account include more implicit ethical judgments made through word choice, inaccurate statements, and comparisons to other events because they were written for different purposes and in a different style than the Japanese Internment Justified background sheet. The background sheet was created to provide the contextual information required by students to begin analyzing primary sources and answer the question about whether JCI was justified or not. The *Canadian Encyclopedia* article and the Evacuation of the Japanese Canadians textbook account were created to offer interpretations, analysis, and explanations of JCI to establish what happened, why it happened, and what the consequences were in order to provide readers with a brief, but complete history of the event. The background sheet is written in point-form and provides more
of a factual description and chronology of the key historical details and events that took place during JCI. The word choice is also more neutral than the other secondary sources in order to avoid influencing students' beliefs about whether JCI was justified or not.

Mr. Hunter and Mr. Mahoney made several implicit ethical judgments when describing and explaining the secondary source accounts they introduced in class. The majority of the implicit ethical judgments made by Mr. Hunter were implied through the word choice he used when discussing aspects of the textbook account, the historical details he focused on, and the exaggerations and inaccuracies he made. One passage in particular provides an example of all three types of ethical judgments. After a student finished reading a paragraph that described how 20,000 Japanese Canadians were evacuated and the government auctioned off everything they left behind including homes and businesses, Mr. Hunter summarized the account by saying the following.

OK, so they come to your door, RCMP at gunpoint, and say you have, you know, a short period of time to gather two suitcases of possessions and then you’re leaving. And if you want to stay together you gotta go to Alberta or Manitoba, but if you want to stay in B.C., the women and children are going to one spot, man is going elsewhere. And we’re gonna take your home, we’re gonna take your car and we’re gonna take everything else and sell it and use it for the Canadian War effort. And these are people who were born in Canada, alright?

Mentioning historical details such as the RCMP coming to the door at gunpoint, only being allowed two suitcases of possessions, and the government selling Japanese Canadian possessions for the war effort all suggest JCI was unjust. Mr. Hunter's used second-person pronouns such as "you" and "your" numerous times in the brief account to help students empathize with the Japanese Canadian perspective. Mr. Hunter's account also included an inaccuracy that had consequences for the ethical position when he suggested that the government confiscated and sold Japanese Canadians' possessions and property to pay for the war effort. Although many
Japanese Canadians’ possessions and property were sold to individuals for less than market value, and there was often very little money left over for Japanese Canadians after the government deducted handling, storage, auction fees, and relief payments, it is inaccurate to suggest that it was used to fund the war effort.

Mr. Arbour was the only teacher to approach a resource he used to describe and explain JCI as a constructed source that needed to be analyzed for its ethical stance, although he did not spend enough time, or ask questions in a systematic way to teach students to identify ethical judgments. After students read the *Canadian Encyclopedia* article, Mr. Arbour asked students if they noticed, "a tone, or a slant to this article at all. Like the language used?" In other words, Mr. Arbour wanted students to identify the author's perspective and ethical position on JCI in the article. One student recognized that the article was, "Kind of anti-Canadian, like it's anti-Canadian, but what they did was really bad." Mr. Arbour agreed the article was, "fairly negative in tone", and then asked the rest of the class whether they picked up on the "tone" of the article?

One of the students asked, "How was the source supposed to be positive?" What this student meant was how could any account discuss JCI in a positive way because in his mind JCI was a negative event. Rather than explain how authors portray events as either positive or negative, Mr. Arbour explained that, "it's not necessarily supposed to be positive… it's just that this one is like it's fairly openly negative, with reason…." which suggested the author had good reasons to suggest JCI was unjust.

### 5.2.2.2 Ethical judgments in historical documentaries

All four case study teachers showed the *CAPH* video "The Dispossessed" in their lesson on JCI, and all four teachers used the video to provide information about JCI rather than analyze
it as a constructed account, or to identify the ethical judgments present. Each of the four teachers reported regularly using the *CAPH* video series to teach Grade 11 social studies and cited numerous reasons for doing so: it touches on many of the topics included in the curriculum and helps reinforce points made in class, it prevents students from getting bored because it discusses, "facts about a topic in a very short period of time", it is another resource for delivering information in addition to notes, readings, and discussions, it brings history to life through the use of visuals and first-person narration, it covers some topics better than the student textbook, and because there is a lack of quality videos in a short format that illustrate Canadian History, a point that is also discussed by Bryant and Clark (2006).

In the post observation interviews each of the four teachers recognized that the *CAPH* video took the ethical position that JCI was unjust. Mr. Mahoney recognized that *CAPH* took the position that JCI was, "sort of politically correct, like this [JCI] was wrong" because it was told from Muriel Kitagawa's perspective and, "she would show how unjustified it [JCI] was." Mr. Arbour noted that the *CAPH* video had, "a pretty sombre tone", and the video suggested, "how ugly a chapter it is for us." Mr. Bay recognized the video, "has a bias in it", but said that he did not highlight examples of bias for students because he wanted them to learn to identify it on their own. Despite wanting students to identify the ethical position present in the video, he did not ask students any questions about the bias in the video after it was over. Mr. Hunter acknowledged that the *CAPH* video took, "a different viewpoint on Canadian history than some other sources we may use in the classroom" because it described Japanese Canadian peoples' experiences during the war, but did not discuss the perspectives of other groups involved in the event.

Despite recognizing the ethical stance in the video, none of the teachers asked students to detect the video's ethical stance before, during, or after watching it, nor did they offer any
instruction to students on how to identify the ethical stance. The only instructions the four
teachers gave students was to watch the video. The four teachers approached "The Dispossessed"
as an information source to teach students about JCI rather than as a constructed narrative
account that students should interrogate for its ethical position. Executive Producer Mark
Starowicz (2003) did not create CAPH to be a factual account of Canadian history, but to create a
narrative history that showed “Canada, through the eyes of the people who lived it” (p. 155). For
Starowicz, narrative history focuses on creating a vibrant and exciting narrative that presents
history through the eyewitness accounts of those who lived through key events. By approaching
the video as a source of information about JCI rather than as a narrative account that needs to be
interrogated for its ethical stance, these teachers missed an opportunity to improve their students'
understanding of ethical judgments. Seixas and Morton (2013) discuss the importance of
teaching students about the interpretive nature of historical accounts before helping them identify
ethical judgments.

As indicated in Table 20, the video includes five different types of implicit ethical
judgments that suggest JCI was unjust. Of the different resources used by teachers to describe
and explain JCI, the CAPH video includes the most images that suggest JCI was unjust, and also
introduces historical viewpoints and perspectives that have consequences for the ethical position
taken.

Table 20 Frequency of ethical judgments in The Dispossessed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethical Framework</th>
<th>Ethical Judgments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Explicit ethical judgments</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Implicit ethical judgments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Word choice has consequences for the ethical position taken</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Throughout the film, over forty different images including twenty-three photographs, two images of historical artefacts, eight film clips, and seven re-creations of historic events are shown, the majority of which focus on negative aspects of JCI in order to evoke empathy and condemnation from viewers. All twenty-three photographs focus on negative aspects of JCI including the photograph of hundreds of fishing boats moored together near Annie's Dyke (see Figure 1). It appears as though photographs were chosen for their emotional impact, rather than providing an accurate representation of what is being described in the script. For example, when the narrator explains how Japanese Canadian workers were fired from different jobs immediately after Pearl Harbor, a photograph is flashed on the screen that shows a number of Japanese Canadian men surrounding an RCMP officer. The photograph shown has nothing to do with men being fired from their jobs, and actually shows Japanese Canadians being processed by an RCMP officer after their arrival at an interior housing settlement in late-1942, almost half a year after Pearl Harbor.

The CAPH video also includes four different perspectives that have consequences for the ethical stance taken in the video: the RCMP, the Canadian government, Muriel Kitagawa, and federal Cabinet Minister Ian Mackenzie. The RCMP and Canadian government perspective are...
mentioned once when the narrator describes how from their perspectives the Japanese Canadian community did not present a threat to Canadian security. Introducing these two perspectives suggests that JCI was unjust because the RCMP and government were responsible for Canadian security, and if they said Japanese Canadians were not a threat, then the argument that Japanese Canadians were interned for security measures is invalid.

Kitagawa and Mackenzie's perspectives are presented by voice actors reading excerpts from primary sources. The video tells the story of JCI through the words of the protagonist Kitagawa who represents the Japanese Canadian perspective, and the antagonist Ian Mackenzie, who represents the Canadian government perspective. Kitagawa is introduced to the video four different times by an actor who read excerpts from her book, *This Is My Own: Letters to Wes and Other Writings on Japanese Canadians, 1941-1948*. The video portrays the Canadian-born mother of four as an articulate, intelligent and provocative thinker who incisively captures the range of emotions that she and many others experienced after Pearl Harbor including the fear, defiance, sorrow, bitterness, anguish, and outrage. Mackenzie on the other hand, is introduced once in the video and is portrayed as a narrow-minded bigot who represents the Canadian government's prejudicial attitude towards Japanese Canadians. "It is the government’s plan to get these people out of B.C. as fast as possible. It is my personal intention, as long as I remain in public life, to see they never come back here. Let our slogan be for British Columbia: ‘No Japs from the Rockies to the seas’." Although Mackenzie was undoubtedly a virulently anti-Japanese racist, the quote from one of his speeches included in the video was taken out of context. He made this statement during a campaign nomination speech on September 18, 1944 in support of the policy of dispersing Japanese Canadians throughout Canada, not to push the government of Canada to remove Japanese Canadians from the B.C. coast in February 1942 as the video would
have you believe. This chronological error highlights how the video manipulated visual images and events to fit with the narrative.

Using Kitagawa and Mackenzie to characterize diverse groups like the Japanese Canadian community and the Canadian government minimizes and misrepresents the differences that existed amongst the groups. Kitagawa's thoughts and feelings about JCI did not represent the views of other Japanese Canadians any more than Mackenzie's views spoke for the entire Canadian government. Kitagawa was much more than the, "Canadian-born mother of four" as the video described. Kitagawa was the senior editor for the first Canadian newspaper to express a Canadian-born Japanese Canadian perspective, and in 1938 she began writing for The New Canadian under several pen names, where she became known to her readers, "as a colourful and provocative writer" who was not afraid to challenge the views of racist individuals, politicians or groups (Tsukiye Muriel Kitagawa, n.d.). Her experiences during the war were very different than many other people in B.C.’s Japanese Canadian community because she and her family received special permission to move to Toronto to live with her brother in June 1942 where they stayed for the entire war. Including these two characters' perspectives in the video also has consequences for the ethical stance taken in the video, because through the humanity of Kitagawa, and the inhumanity of Mackenzie, the video suggests JCI was unjust.

5.2.2.3 Ethical judgments in teachers' PowerPoint slides

According to the teachers' survey, Mr. Bay said that he made ethical judgments only a few times per year when teaching history, yet as Table 21 indicates, he made numerous ethical judgments when he described and explained the three PowerPoint slides. Furthermore, Mr. Bay's discussion of the PowerPoint slides included the most ethical judgments made through word
choice, and inaccurate and exaggerated statements than the other three teacher's discussion of any resource.

Table 21 Ethical judgments in teachers' PowerPoint slides

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethical Judgments Framework</th>
<th>Ethical judgments in PPT slides</th>
<th>Ethical judgments made by Mr. Bay</th>
<th>Ethical judgments made by Mr. Mahoney</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Explicit ethical judgments</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Implicit ethical judgments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Word choice has consequences for the ethical position taken</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Historical detail or event included has consequences for the ethical position taken.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Viewpoint and perspective included has consequences for the ethical position taken</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Inaccurate or exaggerated statement has consequences for the ethical position taken</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Comparison to another event where a positive or negative ethical judgment is assumed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Visual (photographs and recreations) has consequences for the ethical position taken</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of the implicit ethical judgments Mr. Bay made via word choice occurred when he referred to the Canadian government as "we" and Japanese Canadians as "them" or "they" throughout his discussion. Use of these pronouns separated Canadians and Japanese Canadians into "we" (Canadian) and them (non-Canadian). When he summarized JCI at the end of the third PowerPoint slide he made several implicit ethical judgments that suggested JCI was unjust.
we took these people, we took all their possessions, we took their livelihood from them, we locked them up for the duration of a war, the end of the war we said no, you guys still can't go back, you're too much of a risk. Finally we said ok you can go back now and then we waited until '88 and we said that was wrong we shouldn't have done that. Here's $21,000. Is that enough money? Right? Depends on your perspective.

Although Mr. Bay ended this statement by asking students whether the compensation that Japanese Canadians received was enough, all of the words he used and historical details discussed prior to asking the question suggested the answer was no. He said "we" took their possessions, "we" took their livelihood away from them, "we" locked them up for the duration of the war, "we" refused to allow them to return to the B.C. coast until 1949, and then "we" waited until 1988 to compensate them. Another reason Mr. Bay utilized the strategy of using first person to describe the Canadian government's actions and second person to describe Japanese Canadians was because he wanted students' to learn and understand that the Canadian government mistreated Japanese Canadians in order to challenge their perceptions of Canada as a fair and just nation. In the post-observation interview Mr. Bay said that many people in the world view Canada as, "a nice little utopia", but he wanted students to challenge this perception and understand that the pedestal Canada is placed on is not necessarily true. Mr. Bay discussed how the Canadian government has committed many injustices in the past which can be used to show students that, "people’s perception of us isn’t necessarily what it actually truly is."

5.2.2.4 Using primary sources to describe and explain JCI

Mr. Bay used seven pairs of historical photographs to describe and explain JCI. During the activity he displayed two photographs at a time; one photograph showed aspects of JCI, and the other revealed comparable aspects of the Holocaust. The pairs of photographs showed people
behind barbed wire fences, people being transported in trucks, piles of confiscated possessions and luggage, and the camps themselves, amongst others. At the beginning of the activity Mr. Bay explained to students that the pairs of photographs were selected to make them, "think about some comparisons" between the two events, and in between the two photographs Mr. Bay wrote the abbreviation "vs." to indicate that he wanted to compare the two photographs.

Mr. Bay recognized that the photographs definitely "had a bias in them" because they were specifically selected to get students, "to understand the negative aspects" of JCI. Furthermore, Mr. Bay said that he presented pairs of historical photographs to students, "to show them the images of the Holocaust versus the images of Japanese Internment and how they just mirrored each other. We’re not talking about the same scale, but we’re talking about the same imagery for both of them." In the post-observation interview Mr. Bay explained that the purpose of the photograph activity was to, "go through Japanese Internment, show them what the Canadian government did, and to what degree of persecution the Japanese faced in Canada." In other words, Mr. Bay's purpose for the photograph comparison activity was to guide students towards the conclusion that Japanese Canadians were "persecuted" and unjustly treated. He did not want students to analyze the photos to make their own assessments about whether JCI was similar to the Holocaust. Rather, he wanted to use the photographs to describe and explain the similarities between JCI and the Holocaust. In the post-observation interview Mr. Bay recognized that the photograph analysis activity was not as successful as he envisioned, and stated that next time he conducts the activity he will invite students to identify the implied message in each photograph, and determine whether the JCI photograph is similar or different to the Holocaust photograph. These revisions to the way that he approached the photographs would
greatly improve his students' understanding of JCI, historical evidence, and their ability to identify ethical judgments.

As Table 22 shows, the majority of the implicit ethical judgments Mr. Bay made during the photography activity occurred by making comparisons between JCI and the Holocaust. The activity also included more inaccuracies that had consequences for the ethical position taken than any other resource teachers used to describe and explain JCI.

Table 22 Ethical Judgments in Mr. Bay's photograph comparison activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethical Framework</th>
<th>Ethical Judgments in Mr. Bay's Photograph Comparison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Explicit ethical judgments</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Implicit ethical judgments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Word choice has consequences for the ethical position taken</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Choice of historical details or events to include has consequences for the ethical position taken</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Viewpoints and perspectives included have consequences for the ethical position taken</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Inaccurate or exaggerated statements have consequences for the ethical position taken</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Comparisons to another event where a positive or negative ethical judgment is assumed</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Choice of visuals (photographs and recreations) has consequences for the ethical position taken</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mr. Bay's purpose for the photograph comparison activity was to guide students towards the conclusion that JCI was similar to the Holocaust, and therefore Japanese Canadians were "persecuted" and unjustly treated like the Jews during the Holocaust. He did not invite students to make their own judgments about the similarities and differences between the two photographs,
he wanted, "to show them the images of the Holocaust versus the images of Japanese Internment and how they just mirrored each other. We’re not talking about the same scale, but we’re talking about the same imagery for both of them." Showing students how the photographs of JCI "mirrored" photographs of the Holocaust, implied that JCI was ethically equivalent and similar in scope and scale to the Holocaust. Although Mr. Bay pointed out a few differences between JCI and the Holocaust, and reminded students not to assume that they were the same, he made fifteen comparisons between JCI and the Holocaust and several times during the activity he commented on how different aspects of the two events were, "equally as bad." Despite warning students about making unjustified comparisons between JCI and the Holocaust, Mr. Bay's frequent comparisons between JCI and the Holocaust might have led his students to conflate the two events as ethically similar.

Mr. Bay's photograph comparison activity also included several inaccuracies that implied that JCI was unjust. Of the seven photographs of JCI, only three of them actually focused on JCI because the other four portrayed photos of Japanese American Internment, an event with several notable differences from JCI. The first photograph he showed featured a woman standing outside a home with her finger pointed at a sign that said, "Japs Keep Moving This is a White Man's Neighbourhood." Mr. Bay explained that these types of signs, "were all over the place" and that, "Japanese were not welcome in any of these neighbourhoods." Mr. Bay did not realize that the photograph was taken in California during the 1920s, well before World War Two even began, and there does not appear to be any evidence that signs like these were displayed in any B.C. community in the exclusion zone. Mr. Bay also displayed two other photographs that he assumed were of a Japanese Canadian resettlement camps, but were actually American internment camps. American internment camps were enclosed by barbed wire, whereas none of the Japanese
Canadian camps had barbed wire, except for a POW camp in Angler, Ontario. Comparing photos of Japanese American Internment with photographs of the Holocaust is invalid and inaccurate and gives the mistaken and exaggerated impression that the resettlement camps in the interior of B.C. were similar to concentration and extermination camps in Europe.

5.2.3 Analyzing primary sources

Mr. Mahoney was the only teacher who asked students to analyze primary sources in his lesson and his approach can be contrasted with Mr. Bay who used primary sources to describe and explain JCI. In this section I discuss how Mr. Mahoney invited students to analyze two primary sources by asking a variety of sourcing (who created it, why it was created, when it was created), contextualizing (the events, conditions, worldviews and worldviews that existed when the source was created), and corroborating (confirming or refuting inferences about a source with information from other sources) questions.

Mr. Mahoney started his lesson by placing two primary sources on each student's desk, a photograph and a political cartoon (see Figure 2 and Figure 3 below).
World War II Japanese-Canadian translators

Photograph taken in 1945 of second-generation Japanese-Canadians working as interpreters alongside British units in India.

Courtesy of the National Association of Japanese Canadians.

Figure 2 Photograph of Japanese Canadian Translators during World War Two
In the post-observation interview Mr. Mahoney said he chose the photograph and the political cartoon because they offered, "different depictions of Japanese Canadians, one positive and one negative. So one would justify Internment, and one wouldn't justify Internment." For Mr. Mahoney, the two different sources problematized JCI for students because they introduced conflicting evidence about whether JCI was justified or not. Throughout the activity Mr. Mahoney conspicuously hinted that the photograph was the "positive" one, and the political
cartoon was the negative one. "Let's look at this positive one, I don't want to give it away, but let's look at this positive one first." Mr. Mahoney did not understand that just because the two primary sources depicted Japanese Canadians in a positive or negative light, does not mean that they provided evidence that JCI was justified or not.

Over the next 25 minutes Mr. Mahoney guided the class through an activity he called "Around the Outside" in which he asked each student a question about the two primary sources as he moved from student to student around the class. Mr. Mahoney asked students six different types of questions during the activity. Sourcing questions focus on when and where primary sources were created, who created the sources, why they were created, and what audience they were created for. Contextualizing questions addressed the historical events that took place before or after the primary sources were created, and the circumstances that existed at the time the primary sources were created. Knowledge and recall questions focused on students' basic understanding of concepts (i.e. what is a translator? what does second generation mean?), historical knowledge (i.e. what year were the atomic bombs dropped?) or recall of previously discussed points (i.e. what were Japanese Canadians working as again?). Observation questions focused on what students could directly see or read when looking at the images, while inference questions invited students to make conclusions or judgments based on what they observed in the images.

The questions did not follow a logical sequence, several questions had obvious and simple answers, and the questions did not guide students through a comprehensive analysis of the two images. The inference questions for the photograph focused on what the Japanese Canadian soldiers were feeling, and whether they were willing and proud to take the photograph, while the political cartoon inference questions focused on asking students to decode the
cartoonist's intended meaning of the cartoon. The purpose of Mr. Mahoney's questions was to
guide students towards the conclusion that the photograph was a positive depiction of Japanese
Canadians and did not justify JCI, and the political cartoon was negative and justified JCI.

Table 23 shows the six different types of questions and how often they were asked for
each primary source. Half of the questions focused on sourcing, contextualization, and
knowledge and recall, and the other half asked students to make observations and inferences
about the images.

Table 23 The types of questions asked when analyzing primary and secondary sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Questions Asked By Mr. Mahoney</th>
<th>Frequency of Occurrence for Photograph</th>
<th>Frequency of Occurrence for Political Cartoon</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sourcing questions</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextualizing questions</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge and recall questions</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation questions about the image</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inference questions about the images</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judgment questions about whether the images were a negative or positive depiction of Japanese Canadians</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

None of the questions asked about ethical judgments, although it was difficult to
determine whether any implicit ethical judgments were made when Mr. Mahoney asked whether
the primary sources were positive or negative depictions of Japanese Canadians? Calling a
source negative or positive could be an ethical judgment because both words have ethical
connotations. However, Mr. Mahoney was not inviting students to make an ethical judgment about the creators' purposes for constructing the sources, nor was he asking students to make an ethical judgment about whether JCI was justified. He was asking students whether the tone or nature of the images portrayed Japanese Canadians in a positive or negative light, which is a historical evidence question, but not an ethical judgment.

Table 24 reveals the frequency that Mr. Mahoney made ethical judgments when analyzing the two primary sources. Considering the amount of time spent on the activity and the amount of discussion that occurred, this activity included fewer ethical judgments than other activities teachers introduced in their lessons.

**Table 24 Ethical judgments made in Mr. Mahoney's class when analyzing primary sources**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethical Framework</th>
<th>Frequency of Occurrence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Explicit ethical judgments</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Implicit ethical judgments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Word choice has consequences for the ethical position taken</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Choice of historical details or events to include has consequences for the ethical position taken</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Viewpoints and perspectives included have consequences for the ethical position taken</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Inaccurate or exaggerated statements have consequences for the ethical position taken</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Comparisons to another event where a positive or negative ethical judgment is assumed</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Choice of visuals (photographs and recreations) has consequences for the ethical position taken</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of the ethical judgments Mr. Mahoney made were implied through word choice, and the historical details included when he expanded upon students' responses or asked
follow-up questions. For example, Mr. Mahoney agreed with a student that the tone of the cartoon was negative and said, "It's negative and it's also racist isn't it?" Saying the cartoon "is racist" is an implicit ethical judgment made through word choice, however, he justified this ethical judgment by explaining the distance between attitudes and views in the past and the present. "Nowadays retrospectively it's a negative depiction of Japanese, and it's racist in nowadays language right? And then things were a bit different back then in terms of what the issues were, but nowadays you wouldn't get away with that." In highlighting the differences between values in the past and present, Mr. Mahoney was helping students understand that they need to contextualize primary sources and recognize that there were different values in the past than the present when making ethical judgments.

5.2.4 Inviting students to make ethical judgments

All four teachers invited students to make ethical judgments about JCI in written assignments, and one teacher, Mr. Arbour conducted a class discussion that provided students the opportunity to make ethical judgments. In this section I describe the different ways that teachers invited ethical judgments in written assignments and then discuss how Mr. Arbour approached ethical judgments during the class discussion.

5.2.4.1 Inviting ethical judgments in written assignments

As Table 25 indicates, the four teachers asked students to complete written activities that asked them to make ethical judgments about JCI. Three of the four activities included more than one question or sub-question, and types of questions were asked, implied ethical judgment
questions, assumed ethical judgment questions, presentist questions, and explicit ethical judgment questions.

**Table 25** Class assignments that invite ethical judgments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Type of Assignment</th>
<th>Specific Wording of Question</th>
<th>Type of Ethical Judgment Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Arbour</td>
<td>Three questions from page 157 of the <em>Counterpoints</em> (2nd edition) textbook</td>
<td>1. Why were Japanese Canadians relocated and detained during the Second World War?</td>
<td>Implied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. How would posters like Remember Hong Kong (on page 137) contribute to these attitudes?</td>
<td>Assumed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. In your opinion, what would be just compensation for Japanese Canadians interned during the war?</td>
<td>Assumed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Bay</td>
<td>Paragraph response (two parts)</td>
<td>1. Do you think the Canadian government was justified in interning Japanese Canadians? a. How has this changed your perception of your country?</td>
<td>Explicit Judgment Assumed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Hunter</td>
<td>Two questions from a textbook</td>
<td>1. Write a short paragraph about why the policy of Japanese Internment was or was not necessary and justified at the time. a. How would you have reacted to this policy? b. In what ways might this policy have been adjusted to make it more equitable?</td>
<td>Explicit Judgment Presentist Presentist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Do you think it is fair for people in the 21st century to judge the actions the government took during World War II? Why—or why not?</td>
<td>Explicit Judgment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Type of Assignment</td>
<td>Specific Wording of Question</td>
<td>Type of Ethical Judgment Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Mahoney</td>
<td>One question</td>
<td>1. Was the Canadian government's decision to evacuate and intern Japanese Canadians during World War II justified? (Students were asked to answer the question in one sentence with three arguments, reasons or points to support their answer).</td>
<td>Explicit Judgment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first question Mr. Arbour asked students to complete was an implied ethical judgment question because students could not answer the question and explain why Japanese Canadians were relocated and detained during the Second World War without making an implied ethical judgment. If students said that Japanese Canadians were relocated and detained because of racism and discrimination present in B.C., or conversely because they were a threat to Canadian security during the war, then they would be making an implied ethical judgment.

Mr. Arbour and Mr. Bay both assigned ethical judgment questions that assumed Japanese Canadians were treated unjustly. For example, the last question that Mr. Arbour assigned to students asked, "In your opinion, what would be just compensation for Japanese Canadians interned during the war?" The question does not ask whether Japanese Canadians should be compensated, it assumes that Japanese Canadians should be given some form of compensation. Similarly, the second part of a two-part question Mr. Bay asked included an assumed ethical judgment. Asking "How has this changed your perception of your country?" invites students to explain how their knowledge of JCI has changed their perception of Canada, and assumes that learning about JCI has, or should have changed their perception of Canada. It is not surprising Mr. Bay asked students this question considering that his main goals for teaching about JCI was to get students,
to understand that Canada isn't what or how we're viewed in the world. We're viewed as a nice little utopia, like everything's perfect here….we're held on a pedestal. I want them to understand that that pedestal isn't necessarily true….I talk to them about Japanese Internment, the SS St. Louis, all those different things, right, to try and show that, you know, people’s perception of us isn’t necessarily what it actually truly is.

Mr. Hunter assigned students two questions from a textbook, and the first question had three parts, two of which asked presentist questions. Presentism is the antithesis of reasoned historical thinking and occurs when present-day ideas, values, and perspectives are anachronistically used to interpret the past. The second part of the first question asked, "How would you have reacted to Japanese Internment in this time period considering your background as a Canadian?" and the third part asked, "In what ways might this policy have been adjusted to make it more equitable for Canadians?" Asking students to describe how they would have reacted to JCI if they were alive in 1942 invites them to impose contemporary values and attitudes on the past. Most students understand that racism and discrimination are unjust, and it is expected that many students would respond to the question by saying that if they were alive in 1942 they would have thought that JCI was unfair, they would have protested the government's actions, or they would have taken steps to stop it from happening. The third part of the first question asks, "In what ways might this policy have been adjusted to make it more equitable?" This question also encourages students to make presentist responses. Making government policies more equitable for those involved might be a common concern today, but it was clearly not a concern during World War Two. The Canadian government was not concerned about ensuring their policy towards Japanese Canadians was equitable. JCI was focused on removing and relocating Japanese Canadians, and asking students how they might make this policy more equitable invites them to impose present-day values on the past.
Mr. Bay, Mr. Hunter and Mr. Mahoney each asked students to answer explicit ethical judgment questions that ask students to decide whether an event was fair or unfair, justified or unjustified, or right and wrong. Although there are minor differences in the wording of the three teachers' questions, each question asked whether the Canadian government's JCI policy was justified, and required students to make an explicit ethical judgment about whether the government had justifiable reasons for JCI.

Mr. Hunter's second question introduced a different type of explicit ethical judgment question. The question asked, "Do you think it is fair for people in the 21st century to judge the actions the government took during the World War II? Why—or why not?" This question is an explicit judgment question because it asks students to make an explicit judgment about whether it is fair for people today to judge the actions of governments that took place in a different time than our own. This question is more of a philosophical question, and does not require much historical knowledge or understanding of JCI to answer.

All four of the teachers asked students to complete written assignments that invited different types of ethical judgments, and later in the chapter, I analyze students' responses to these assignments to determine how the questions might have influenced students' responses.

5.2.4.2 Ethical judgments in class discussions

Mr. Arbour was the only teacher to organize a class discussion during the lesson, and in this section I discuss the ethical judgments he made when responding to students' questions and comments.

The discussion began after students read the Canadian Encyclopedia article and highlighted parts of the article that were interesting, hard to believe, or they had a question about.
During the sixteen minutes of class discussion, thirteen different students discussed the article or an aspect of JCI, or asked Mr. Arbor a question. As Table 26 indicates, Mr. Arbour made one explicit ethical judgment and numerous implicit ethical judgments throughout the discussion. Like the other activities that took place in the four teachers' classes, the majority of ethical judgments were offered through the choice of historical details to include, the word choice, and by comparing JCI to the Holocaust.

Table 26 Teachers' ethical judgments in class discussions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethical Framework</th>
<th>Frequency of Occurrence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Explicit ethical judgments</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Implicit ethical judgments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Word choice has consequences for the ethical position taken</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Choice of historical details or events to include has consequences for the ethical position taken</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Viewpoints and perspectives included have consequences for the ethical position taken</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Inaccurate or exaggerated statements have consequences for the ethical position taken</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Comparisons to another event where a positive or negative ethical judgment is assumed</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Choice of visuals (photographs and recreations) has consequences for the ethical position taken</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of the implicit ethical judgments made by Mr. Arbour during the class discussion were suggested by the historical details and the word choice. Mr. Arbour said the government took away Japanese Canadians' possessions "because of their ethnicity" and, "were never properly compensated." He discussed examples of discrimination and racism in the history of the province and the local community, and highlighted the fact that despite Canada being
considered a democratic nation, a group of people were, "denied a whole lot of rights and freedoms" because of their race and heritage. He also wanted students to remember that from the army's points of view, "Japanese Canadians did not constitute the slightest menace to national security." When a student asked why JCI happened, Mr. Arbour' response included several ethical judgments. He said that the government and the RCMP confirmed that, "people of Japanese descent in BC are not going to try and revolt, or start an insurrection. So what is the reason? Ultimately what we see is it's a lot about underlying racism in our society and ignorance in our society that has quite a long history in BC's past."

At the beginning of the class discussion Mr. Arbour pointed out that the article began by comparing Nazi Germany and JCI, but warned students to be careful when comparing the two events because despite the perceived similarities, there were several important differences. Despite cautioning students about making comparisons between the Holocaust and JCI, Mr. Arbour made four implied ethical judgments by comparing JCI to the Holocaust. He said it was well-documented that in both events people were put on trains and their property was taken away and there were several "deliberate acts of discrimination" against people of Asiatic descent in B.C. and Jewish descent during the Holocaust. He concluded by saying that despite the parallels between the two events, JCI did not feature "the desire to annihilate" like the Holocaust.

Mr. Arbour's class discussion was similar to the other types of teachers' activities discussed thus far in terms of the number and type of ethical judgments present, however, there were more comparisons to the Holocaust, an event that implies a negative ethical judgment. The number of comparisons to the Holocaust could be explained by the fact that the Canadian Encyclopedia article includes several comparisons to the Holocaust, and because Mr. Arbour taught about the Holocaust in the first half of class prior to introducing JCI.
5.2.5  **Instruction for making ethical judgments**

Instruction for making ethical judgments describes any advice, suggestions, strategies, or explanations that teachers offer to help students make ethical judgments. The four teachers offered three different types of instruction for making ethical judgments about JCI: to help students complete written assignments, to help students take historical perspectives, and to remind students to consider the historical context when making ethical judgments. As Table 27 indicates, all four teachers offered some types of instruction to help their students make ethical judgments about JCI, however, only Mr. Mahoney and Mr. Arbour offered all three types of instruction, and Mr. Mahoney was the only teacher to devote a significant part of his lesson to do this.

**Table 27** Types of instruction offered for making ethical judgments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Instruction Offered</th>
<th>Mr. Arbour</th>
<th>Mr. Bay</th>
<th>Mr. Hunter</th>
<th>Mr. Mahoney</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How to complete the assigned activities</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking and considering different historical perspectives</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considering the historical context</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In terms of offering instruction to complete the written activities, all of the teachers except Mr. Hunter offered some form of instruction. Mr. Bay offered very brief advice on how to complete the written response, Mr. Arbour clarified the meaning of a question for one student, and Mr. Mahoney offered instruction to help students understand the question being asked and
gave specific instructions about writing their response. When offering instruction about how to take and consider historical perspectives, Mr. Arbour and Mr. Mahoney explained the differences between current worldviews and those in the past, described how to take perspectives of historical actors in the past, and outlined different perspectives on JCI. Mr. Arbour and Mr. Mahoney were also the only teachers to offer instruction on considering the historical context when making ethical judgments. When making a judgment about whether JCI was justified, Mr. Mahoney reminded students to consider the historical context including what had happened in the war prior to JCI, as well as the immediate and underlying causes of JCI. Mr. Arbor discussed the historical context when he paused the CAPH video after images of the attack on Pearl Harbor were shown. He told students that, "we can't overlook…the element of fear involved here because of Pearl Harbor, OK?" and, "we can't forget the circumstances in which this all happened. Not justifying anything, I'm just saying that this is something that has to be considered." Mr. Arbour made these comments to raise students' awareness of the historical context but also to ensure that students understood that just because there was fear and hysteria about a potential Japanese attack, the Canadian government was not necessarily justified in removing Japanese Canadians from the B.C. coast.

As indicated in Table 28, teachers made few ethical judgments when offering instruction to students about making ethical judgments. This is to be expected considering teachers did not spend much time in their lessons teaching students to make ethical judgments, and it is expected that teachers would make fewer ethical judgments when teaching students to make ethical judgments rather than teaching students about JCI.
Table 28 Teachers' ethical judgments when offering instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethical Framework</th>
<th>Mr. Arbour</th>
<th>Mr. Bay</th>
<th>Mr. Hunter</th>
<th>Mr. Mahoney</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Explicit ethical judgments</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Implicit ethical judgments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Word choice has consequences for the ethical position taken</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Choice of historical details or events to include has consequences for the ethical position taken</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Viewpoints and perspectives included have consequences for the ethical position taken</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Inaccurate or exaggerated statements have consequences for the ethical position taken</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Comparisons to another event where a positive or negative ethical judgment is assumed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Choice of visuals (photographs and recreations) has consequences for the ethical position taken</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mr. Mahoney made the most implicit ethical judgments when offering instruction to students, and the majority of his ethical judgments were made in one set of comments. When discussing the two historical perspectives represented in the two primary sources the class analyzed, Mr. Mahoney asked students whether the photograph of Japanese Canadian translators provided evidence that it was fair or right they were interned. When a student responded that it was justified Mr. Mahoney asked, "So it's good that we interned them and took them away from their homes?" Saying that "we" interned them is an implied ethical judgment made via word choice, and saying that we "took them away from their homes" is a historical detail that offers an ethical judgment. Furthermore, Mr. Mahoney asked the student,

what have they done to make it unjustified to take them away from their home and put them in internment camps? So was it right then if you contribute in society you help out,
you help us win the war, and because you helped us win the war we're going to take you away from your homes and you're going to lose your fishing boats?

This statement includes a myriad of ethical judgments through word choice and historical details. Saying that Japanese Canadians contributed in society, helped "us" win the war, and yet they were still taken away from their homes, put in internment camps, and had their fishing boats taken, suggests the Canadian government's actions were unjust.

5.2.6 Ethical judgments in students' responses

This section focuses on the ethical judgments present in the written responses students completed in the four teachers' classes. Before beginning this discussion, I compare the student demographics in the four classes, and discuss the analytic framework used to analyze and interpret the students' responses.

5.2.6.1 Analytic framework for students' responses

In order to analyze students' responses to the written assignments, the analytic framework outlined in Table 29 was developed from the analytic framework utilized to identify the ethical judgments present in the different resources used to describe JCI, and also from a coding scheme that I co-developed to analyze the quality of students' ethical judgments for a previous research study.
Table 29 Analytic framework for students' responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Justified JUST</td>
<td>Makes an explicit ethical judgment that the historical action was justified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unjustified UNJU</td>
<td>Makes an explicit ethical judgment that the historical action was unjustified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both BOTH</td>
<td>Makes an explicit ethical judgment that the historical action was both justified and unjustified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word Choice WORD</td>
<td>Word choice has consequences for the ethical position taken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Details DET</td>
<td>Historical detail or event included has consequences for the ethical position taken.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inaccuracies INACC</td>
<td>Inaccurate or exaggerated statement has consequences for the ethical position taken.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical perspective PERS</td>
<td>Viewpoint and perspective included has consequences for the ethical position taken.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison COMP</td>
<td>Compares historical event under investigation to another event where a positive or negative ethical judgment is assumed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair FAIR</td>
<td>States general principles of ethics, fairness or human rights.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentism PRE</td>
<td>Presentist belief or statement is made when analyzing or judging the past.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Context CON</td>
<td>Considers the historical context when analyzing or judging past actions or events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance DIS</td>
<td>Comments on temporal distance between now and then.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human nature GEN</td>
<td>Uses broad generalizations, clichés or aphorisms about human nature.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remember and respond RES</td>
<td>Makes a plausible argument for or against the requirement to remember and respond to injustices of the past.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggestions SUG</td>
<td>Offers recommendations or suggestions about what could (or should) have been done differently in the past.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lessons from the past LES</td>
<td>Draws direct lessons for the present or future from this past event.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of Canada PERC</td>
<td>Discusses how learning about the event has influenced their perception of Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response NR</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first three codes (JUST, UNJU, and BOTH) focus on whether students made explicit ethical judgments in their written assignments by saying that the event was justified, unjustified,
or both. The next five codes (WORD, DET, INACC, PERS, and COMP) focus on the different ways that implicit ethical judgments are present in students’ responses. These codes were taken word-for-word from the analytical framework used to identify ethical judgments in different resources that are discussed previously in this chapter. In the following paragraphs I describe the FAIR, PRE, CON, DIS, GEN, RES, SUG and PERC codes and provide selected student responses as examples.

The code FAIR describes any statements made by students that outline general principles of ethics, fairness or human rights. For example, in Mr. Bay's class one of the student's written assignments includes an example of a FAIR statement. "I personally don't agree with it [JCI] and I don't like the fact that Canada did it because we should treat everyone the same and with equal rights." This statement suggests that JCI was unjust because it violated individuals' right to equal treatment before the law, but fails to consider that these rights were not guaranteed by the Canadian Constitution until well after World War Two. Although FAIR statements are presentist because they do not consider the historical context or beliefs that existed at the time, and impose present-day beliefs about ethics, fairness and human rights upon the past, they are not necessarily unsophisticated. As discussed in Chapter 2, historians' ethical judgments negotiate the tension between the past and the present by considering the ethical beliefs and standards that existed at the time the event occurred and compare these with the ethical beliefs and standards that exist in the present. Students' FAIR statements are merely articulating their present-day ethical beliefs and standards which are an important part of making ethical judgments, especially if combined with an understanding of the ethical beliefs present at the time the event occurred.

The code PRE is used for any statement in which a student uses present-day thoughts, beliefs, and values to judge, assess, or analyze past actions, or historical actors. When writing or
responding to history presentism is to be avoided because it ignores the differences between standards of right and wrong in the past and the present. There are several examples of presentism in students' written responses. One student wrote that, "I would have reacted badly to this policy [JCI] at the time. I don't believe innocent people should be forced to live in such horrible conditions. I think that the Japanese should have been treated like we would like to be treated." This student made a presentist statement by suggesting that Japanese Canadians should be treated, "the way that we would like to be treated."

The code CON is used for any statement that considers or refers to the historical context when analyzing or judging past actions or events. Considering the historical context of a past event or action when making a sophisticated ethical judgment is important for identifying any limitations on historical actor's choices, or whether there was evidence that the historical actor had alternative choices to those that were made. Furthermore, considering the historical context before making an ethical judgment helps students avoid presentist thinking.

The distance code (DIS) code is used to describe any student comment or statement that discusses the temporal distance between the past and present. As mentioned in Chapter 2, making reasoned ethical judgments is reliant upon the ability to take historical perspectives of those who lived in times and circumstances very different from the present. One of the key aspects of taking historical perspectives is identifying the differences between contemporary beliefs, values, and worldviews and those in the past. The DIS code highlights students' responses that recognize differences that exist between the past and the present. For example, one student wrote that, "Times and technology has advanced an incredible amount since the time period of the war along with laws and how people live."
The GEN code is used to highlight statements where students make broad generalizations, clichés, or aphorisms about human nature in their responses. These types of statements indicate less sophisticated historical thinking because they focus on the general and universal, rather than specific contextual historical information and evidence. There are few examples of generalizations in the students' responses, however, one student said that, "My view on the Canadian government has not changed because they had to do what they had to do."

The RES code is used to categorize any response in which students make a plausible argument for or against the requirement to remember and respond to past injustices. A plausible judgment includes an accurate understanding of historical events, would be possible to implement, and would be acceptable to the general public and those affected by the event. For example, when answering a question about just compensation for JCI, one student made the following plausible argument. "I feel like there is no possible compensation for the way the Japanese were treated, their lives were ruined by this discrimination and it would be very hard to compensate that." Another student's response is less plausible. "Just compensation? Why should they get anything? They should just be sent back to there [sic] homeland." This response is implausible because it includes an inaccurate understanding of JCI, and it would have been impossible to send all Japanese Canadians back to their homeland because many Japanese Canadians were born in Canada.

The code SUG is used to label student responses that offer recommendations or suggestions about what could (or should) have been done differently when the event was occurring. The SUG code and the RES code are similar in that they are concerned with recommendations for action (or inaction), however, the SUG code describes responses that suggest what could or should have been differently at the time the event was occurring, whereas
the RES code describes responses that suggest what should be done to respond or remember a historical event after it has taken place. An example of a student's response that received a SUG code is as follows. "Also, I think that after the war was over Japanese Canadians should have been let go immediately and should not have been encouraged to leave Canada."

Besides the NR (no response) code which is self-explanatory, the last code in the analytical framework is PERC (Perception of Canada), which describes any statement that describes how JCI has influenced their perception of Canada, either good or bad. A student in Mr. Bay's class wrote a response that was given a PERC code. "Yes, this does change my views on Canada because I never believed we were so racist as a country."

5.2.6.2 Students' responses

In this section, I discuss the notable aspects of students' responses to the various questions that the four teachers assigned. I have included Table 25 in order to refer to the different questions teachers asked, because they have an important impact on how students responded to JCI.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Type of Assignment</th>
<th>Specific Wording of Questions</th>
<th>Type of Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Arbour</td>
<td>Three questions from a textbook</td>
<td>1. Why were Japanese Canadians relocated and detained during the Second World War?</td>
<td>Implied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. How would posters like Remember Hong Kong (on page 137) contribute to these attitudes?</td>
<td>Assumed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. In your opinion, what would be just compensation for Japanese Canadians interned during the war?</td>
<td>Assumed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Type of Assignment</td>
<td>Specific Wording of Questions</td>
<td>Type of Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Bay</td>
<td>Paragraph response (two parts)</td>
<td>1. Do you think the Canadian government was justified in interning Japanese Canadians?</td>
<td>Explicit Judgment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a. How has this changed your perception of your country?</td>
<td>Assumed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Write a short paragraph about why the policy of Japanese Internment was or was not necessary and justified at the time.</td>
<td>Explicit Judgment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a. How would you have reacted to this policy?</td>
<td>Presentist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b. In what ways might this policy have been adjusted to make it more equitable?</td>
<td>Presentist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Hunter</td>
<td>Two questions from a textbook</td>
<td>1. Write a short paragraph about why the policy of Japanese Internment was or was not necessary and justified at the time.</td>
<td>Explicit Judgment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a. How would you have reacted to this policy?</td>
<td>Presentist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b. In what ways might this policy have been adjusted to make it more equitable?</td>
<td>Presentist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Do you think it is fair for people in the 21st century to judge the actions the government took during World War II? Why—or why not?</td>
<td>Explicit Judgment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Mahoney</td>
<td>One question</td>
<td>1. Was the Canadian government's decision to evacuate and intern Japanese Canadians during World War II justified? (Students were asked to answer the question in one sentence with three arguments, reasons or points to support their answer).</td>
<td>Explicit Judgment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 30 shows the different questions from each teacher, the number of students who responded to each question, the different codes used to classify students' responses, and the number of times each code was used for students' responses. The students' responses to Mr. Arbour's Question #1 were not included in the data chart because there was no point analyzing students' responses for their thinking about ethical judgments because they copied their responses almost word-for-word from the textbook.
Table 30 Students’ written responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>Mr. Arbour Ques #1</th>
<th>Mr. Arbour Ques #2</th>
<th>Mr. Arbour Ques #3</th>
<th>Mr. Bay Ques #1</th>
<th>Mr. Hunter Ques #1</th>
<th>Mr. Hunter Ques #2</th>
<th>Mr. Mahoney Ques #1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of Stud. Responses</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUST *</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNJU *</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOTH *</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORD *</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DET *</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INACC *</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERS *</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMP *</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAIR *</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRE *</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON *</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIS *</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN *</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RES *</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUG *</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERC *</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR *</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 71 students asked an explicit judgment question about whether JCI was justified (Mr. Bay's Question #1, Mr. Hunter's Question #1, and Mr. Mahoney's Question #1), 54 students (76%) said that it was not justified, 9 students (13%) said it was justified, and 8 students (11%) said it was both justified and not justified. The fact that the majority of students' argued that JCI was unjust suggests that students might have been influenced by the numerous implicit ethical judgments in the resources and class activities that suggested JCI was unjust. Furthermore, all of the teachers said that JCI was unjust in the post-observation interviews, and it is possible that the teachers' beliefs about JCI emerged during the lesson and had some effect on the students' responses.
There were numerous implicit ethical judgments present in students' word choice in their written responses. The number of ethical judgments made via word choice is dependent upon the number of words students wrote in their responses. Students wrote longer responses to the questions that required an explicit judgment about JCI (Mr. Bay's Question #1, Mr. Hunter's Question #1, and Mr. Mahoney's Question #1) because these questions required students to make an ethical judgment and support their position with reasoning, arguments, and historical details. The number of ethical judgments made via word choice in these three questions was relatively similar between Mr. Bay (58), Mr. Hunter (50), and Mr. Mahoney (41). Although Mr. Hunter's Question #2 also asked students to make an explicit judgment, it asked students whether it is fair for people in the 21st century to judge actions the government took during World War Two. This question does not require them to support their answers with historical details and explains why there are substantially fewer implicit judgments made via the word choice for this question than the other three explicit judgment questions.

Students' responses to the three explicit judgment questions also featured more implicit ethical judgments made through the historical details included than any of the other questions asked. Students' in Mr. Mahoney's class included almost double the number of historical details in their responses than students' responses in Mr. Hunter's, or Mr. Bay's class. This can be explained by the fact that when outlining his expectations for the assignment, Mr. Mahoney explained to students that they were expected to decide if the Canadian government's decision to intern Japanese Canadians was justified or not, and had to support their decision with three reasons, or arguments. What is clear is that the number of historical details students included in their responses differentiated sophisticated responses from less sophisticated responses. The
quality of ethical judgments is more dependent on the reasons, arguments and evidence provided to support the ethical judgment, rather than the ethical judgment itself.

Another important characteristic of sophisticated ethical judgments is the frequency with which students considered the historical context. Students in Mr. Mahoney's class considered the historical context almost twice as often in their responses to explicit judgment questions as the students in Mr. Bay's, or Mr. Hunter's class. They considered the historical context more than students in the other classes because Mr. Mahoney frequently reminded students to consider the context when answering the question, whereas the other teachers did not do this as often.

Some students in all four classes included inaccuracies and exaggerations in their responses, which is to be expected considering that all students encountered historical inaccuracies and exaggerations in the resources they encountered and in the comments their teachers made during class. Students in Mr. Mahoney's and Mr. Bay's class included more inaccurate or exaggerated statements in their responses to explicit judgment questions than the other classes, which is not surprising considering their responses were longer and included more historical details than the other types of questions, thus increasing the likelihood of inaccuracies and exaggerations.

Nine students in Mr. Bay's class made comparisons between JCI and the Holocaust in their responses, whereas only one student in the other three classes made comparisons between the two events. This is explained by the fact that Mr. Bay's photograph comparison activity discussed the similarities between the two events, and each pair of seven photographs showed analogous aspects of JCI and the Holocaust which led students to view the two events as ethically equal.
Students' responses to explicit judgment questions also elicited a larger number of statements of general principles of fairness, ethics, or human rights. Mr. Bay's students made the most statements with seventeen, Mr. Hunter's students made thirteen, and Mr. Mahoney's students made eight. Students in Mr. Bay's class and Mr. Hunter's class made more FAIR statements in their responses because of the sub-questions asked as part of the explicit judgment questions. In addition to asking students whether they thought JCI was justified, Mr. Bay asked students an assumed ethical judgment question about how JCI has changed their perception of Canada. Mr. Hunter's students also made FAIR statements in their responses because of the question they were asked. Mr. Hunter's Question #1 asked students to consider the ways government policy towards Japanese Canadians could have been adjusted to make it more equitable. Students made general statements of fairness and human rights in their responses because the question invited them to consider what could have been done to make the policy fairer.

The fact that Mr. Hunter's students made three times the number of presentist statements in their responses as any other class can also be explained by the type of question asked. Mr. Hunter's Question #1 asks students how they would have reacted to the Japanese Internment policy had they been alive at the time, which invited them to impose their values and beliefs onto the past and make less sophisticated presentist statements.

Mr. Hunter's students also made more than double the number of comments about the distance between the past and the present in their responses than students' in the other classes. This is best explained by the type of question he asked. Question #2 asked students whether they think it is fair for people in the 21st century to judge the actions the government took during World War Two. Students made a variety of arguments that considered the distance between the
past and the present. Some students said the distance was too great to judge what took place during World War Two, others said that despite the differences between the two time periods we can judge the past, and others argued that we have an obligation to judge the past in order to learn from it. Neither response was more valid than the other, but the important part was that students considered the historical distance between the past and today.

The RES code is used for responses that outline what should be done to respond to, or remember a historical event. The students' responses to Question #3 in Mr. Arbour's class included nineteen different statements about whether something should be done to respond to, or remember the injustices Japanese Canadians experienced during the war, which was sixteen more than the next closest class. The explanation for these types of responses also reflects the type of question asked. Question #3 assumes that Japanese Canadians should be given some form of compensation by the Canadian government, and so it is not surprising that the majority of students said that something should be done to respond to JCI.

The SUG code was used to categorize responses that suggested what could or should have been done differently when JCI was occurring. Students' responses to Mr. Hunter's Question #1 included the largest number of SUG responses, which was more than three times the number in any of the other teachers' classes. One of the sub-questions for Mr. Hunter's Question #1 asked students how the government's policy towards Japanese Canadians might have been adjusted to make it more equitable. As discussed previously, asking students to decide how the policy could have been made more equitable invites students to make suggestions about what could or should have been done differently at the time, which is an implicit ethical judgment because it assumes that what was done was not fair or just. Furthermore, asking how to make a
policy more equitable also invites students to make presentist judgments because making a policy equitable is a common concern today, but it was not a concern during JCI.

There were 23 students in Mr. Bay's class who made statements in their responses about how JCI influenced their perception of Canada, whereas only one student in the other three classes discussed how JCI changed their perception of Canada. Of the 23 responses, 19 of them said that their perception of Canada was changed for the worse, and four students said their perception did not change. Mr. Bay was the only teacher who asked students a question about their perception of Canada, and he did not ask students "if" JCI changed their perception of Canada, he asked "how" it changed their perception. One of Mr. Bay's purposes for teaching about JCI was to get students to challenge the perception of Canada as, "a utopian society", and he wanted to use JCI as an example to show students that Canada has not always been as accepting and tolerant as it is now. It is likely that the various implicit ethical judgments Mr. Bay made during the lesson that suggested JCI was unjust explains why 19 of 23 students said that learning about JCI negatively affected their perception of Canada. There also seems to be a positive correlation between the number of PERC statements and the number of FAIR statements Mr. Bay's students made in their responses.

The different questions that teachers asked, the resources teachers used, and the instruction they provided influenced the ethical judgments students made, and the way they made them, in their responses. Among these, the type of question asked seems to have had the greatest impact on students' ethical judgments. Sophisticated responses to ethical judgment questions include accurate historical details, consider the historical context and the distance between the past and the present, and include a minimum of inaccuracies. They also avoid comparisons between historical events that do not warrant a comparison, avoid making presentist statements,
and avoid making broad generalizations about human nature and relying on general principles of ethics, fairness or human rights.
Chapter 6: DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

In this dissertation I focused on three questions: What do history teachers believe about including ethical judgments in their teaching, and what factors influence their beliefs? What are the different ways that teachers bring ethical issues, questions and judgments to their history classes? How do students in history classes approach ethical judgments? In this chapter I first discuss general conclusions about the three questions, and then discuss the implications these conclusions have for history teaching, policy and curriculum, and future research.

6.1 Teachers' Beliefs about Ethical Judgments and the Influences on their Beliefs

Teachers hold contradictory beliefs about the place of ethical judgments in the discipline of history and history education, which makes it problematic for them to teach about ethically controversial historical events. The majority of the sixteen teachers have sophisticated views about the place of ethical judgments in the discipline of history and history education. More sophisticated understandings about ethical judgments in history education include beliefs that ethical judgments are inescapable when historians write, research and teach history, that ethical judgments are part of all historical study for historians, teachers, and students, that several reasonable ethical judgments can be made about the same event, person or time period, and that ethical judgments can be made despite the differences between the past and the present.

Sophisticated beliefs about ethical judgments in history education include goals of having students learn how to identify ethical judgments in textbooks, films, books, articles, and teacher lectures, understanding the need to teach students how to make reasonable ethical judgments, regularly inviting students to make ethical judgments in discussions and activities, and the importance of having students be able to make reasoned ethical judgments.
Despite these sophisticated beliefs, nine of the sixteen teachers surveyed held the contradictory and unsophisticated belief that, "History teachers should not make ethical judgments because they need to be as objective as possible." It seems paradoxical for teachers to believe that historians cannot remain objective when writing, discussing, or researching history, but teachers can. The most plausible explanation for this contradiction is that teachers' beliefs about ethical judgments are influenced by the positivist philosophical tradition that maintains that the historian's role is “to describe”, “to stand impartial”, and to provide “history without bias, history that is partial to nobody” (Cracraft, 2004, p. 31). To positivist historians, ethical judgments are too temporary, too subjective, too easily manipulated, and as a result, should be avoided at all costs. Admitting that ethical judgments are inescapable when teaching history undermines teachers' beliefs about the importance of objectivity in history. These teachers worry that if they regularly make ethical judgments when teaching history, students' beliefs and ethical judgments will be influenced by their ethical judgments, and students might find it hard to separate fact from fiction. This conclusion is similar to the findings from the research literature on controversial issues where Hess (2002; 2004; 2005; 2008; 2009) discovered that teachers avoided taking a stance on controversial issues because they believed their viewpoints unduly influence their students' conclusions.

The sixteen teachers identified a number of different influences on their beliefs about ethical judgments in the discipline of history and history education, but some influences were selected more frequently than others. At least nine of sixteen teachers selected four personal influences as having affected their beliefs about whether ethical judgments are an important part of the discipline of history: their experiences as students in university or college history classes (14 teachers), their teaching experience and practice (14 teachers), books and films (10 teachers),
and teaching colleagues (9 teachers). At least nine of sixteen teachers also reported that their beliefs about ethical judgments in history education were influenced by five factors: their experiences as a teacher (14 teachers), concerns about offending a student or family of a student (13 teachers), experiences as a student in university or college history classes (12 teachers), teaching colleagues (11 teachers), and their experiences as a student in high school history or social studies classes (9 teachers). The survey data indicate that experiences as students in university or college history classes, their teaching experience and practice, and their teaching colleagues have the greatest influence on their beliefs about ethical judgments in the discipline of history and in history education.

Like the majority of the historians discussed in the historiography of JCI, the four teachers who took part in the case study said that JCI was not justified. Despite their ethical position on JCI, three teachers said they tried avoiding making ethical judgments during the lesson because they worried their ethical stance would influence students' beliefs about JCI. The teachers used strategies during the lesson to avoid influencing students' opinions on JCI, including playing devil's advocate, and offering arguments about why JCI was both justified and unjustified. However, despite utilizing these strategies, the teachers were unable to avoid making numerous ethical judgments.

When responding to the interview question about whether JCI was justified or not, the four teachers made a number of moves that revealed their understanding of JCI and their ability to make reasoned ethical judgments. Prior to making their final explicit ethical judgments, three of the teachers considered the historical context and the values, attitudes, and beliefs that existed when the event occurred. One went further, stating that attitudes about whether JCI was justified or not were different in the past than the present. When answering the post-observation interview
question about whether JCI was justified or not, all four teachers also made implicit ethical judgments through their word choice, the historical details they selected to support their ethical stance, and two of the teachers offered suggestions and recommendations about alternate courses of action the Canadian government could or should have taken to make their actions more justified. The four teachers' responses to the question about whether JCI was justified reveal sophisticated historical thinking, but also highlight the difficulty teachers' encounter when translating their own thinking into classroom activities and practices that help students' historical thinking progress.

6.2 Ethical Issues, Questions, and Judgments in Teachers' History Classes

Teachers' classroom activities, as revealed in their reports, are typical for history teachers in the history and social studies literature, showing the, “remarkable resilience of common practice in history teaching” described by VanSledright and Limon (2006, p. 557) and others (Levstik & Barton, 2008; Levstik, 2008; Osborne, 2003b; Osborne, 2012). On a daily or weekly basis they talk to their students about historical events, they use the textbook or worksheets related to the textbook, they show historical films, and less frequently, they invite students to discuss and debate different historical interpretations, analyze historical sources, and use the internet or library to do historical research.

All four teachers said they ask students to make an ethical judgment about a historical person, event or institution every week, but there were significant differences in how often they said they made ethical judgments, themselves, during class. Two of the teachers claimed to make ethical judgments about historical events, people, or institutions less than once per month, while the others said that they make ethical judgments several times per week.
When discussing how they would teach students about an ethically controversial event, the four teachers described similar activities and methods. They highlighted the importance of providing students with the necessary background knowledge about the event before inviting students to make an ethical judgment or assessment. The activities that the four teachers actually used in their JCI lesson were similar to the activities they said they typically use when teaching history, and when teaching about ethically controversial events. I classified the activities that took place during the four teachers' lessons into five categories: teachers described and explained JCI, teachers and students analyzed primary sources, teachers invited students to make ethical judgments, teachers provided instruction and scaffolding to teach students how to make ethical judgments, and students made ethical judgments in written assignments.

At 134 minutes, Mr. Mahoney spent more than twice the amount of time teaching about JCI than any of the other three teachers, and four times more time than the teacher with the shortest lesson. As a result, Mr. Mahoney was able to spend more time, and introduce more resources and activities to improve students' understanding of JCI than the other teachers.

Of the five different activities that took place in the four lessons, teachers spent the majority of time describing and explaining JCI in order to provide students with the necessary background information about JCI required to complete the written assignments. The four teachers used a few of the same, but also several different resources to describe and explain JCI, however they approached the different resources used to describe and explain JCI in a similar way. Rather than approach the resources as constructed interpretations that need to be analyzed for their viewpoint, audience, and purpose, the teachers utilized the sources to provide information about JCI.
In the post-observation interviews, each of the four teachers recognized that they made ethical judgments during their lessons, but they were not aware of the quantity of ethical judgments they made, the different situations in which they made them, or the different ways that ethical judgments were present in the resources and classroom activities. Furthermore, if the JCI lesson is any indication of how often Mr. Bay and Mr. Hunter make ethical judgments when teaching about ethically controversial topics, it is likely that they make ethical judgments more than once per month as they indicated in the survey.

Ethical judgments were present in each of the resources used to describe and explain history, and teachers regularly made ethical judgments when discussing the resources. Explicit ethical judgments were not made very often during the five types of activities, but implied ethical judgments were present in the word choice, historical details included, viewpoints or perspectives included, inaccurate or exaggerated statements, comparisons to other historical events where a positive or negative judgment is assumed, and the visuals selected. The two most common types of implicit ethical judgments occurred through word choice and the historical details included or focused on. There were examples where implicit ethical judgments were made via word choice without including a particularly judgmental historical detail, or, alternatively via a historical detail without a judgmental word choice, but in several instances these two modes of implicit judgment merged inseparably.

The three different secondary accounts teachers used to describe and explain JCI include a similar number of implicit ethical judgments present in the historical details. However, one account features fewer ethical judgments made through the word choice and the inaccuracies or exaggerations included than the other two secondary sources, despite the fact that it is the longest of the three. The two accounts that are written in more of a narrative style feature more
description, explanation, and interpretation of JCI, and as a result, there are more opportunities for ethical judgments to be made via word choice than the account that provides more of a factual description and chronology of the key historical details and events that occurred before and after the war. Commercially produced resources include fewer inaccurate or exaggerated statements that had consequences for the ethical position than the resources created by the teachers. This is to be expected considering the commercially produced resources are vetted by editors and other reviewers who ensure the facts and interpretations are accurate and plausible.

Many of the resources used by teachers included visual images that suggested JCI was unjust by showing photographs that would have a negative emotional impact on the viewer. Although teachers recognized that many of the visual sources implied that JCI was unjust, none of the teachers asked students to identify or consider the ethical stance present in the images, nor did the teachers offer any instruction to students about how to detect the ethical position. The teachers used the images to teach students about JCI, much in the same way they used a textbook or article to provide information about the topic. This informational approach to images can be contrasted with a critical approach that would treat the images as constructed sources that need to be interrogated for their purpose, perspective, and ethical stance.

The two teachers who used primary sources in their lessons had different purposes and utilized a variety of methods for using the sources, which had various consequences for the ethical judgments present in the lesson. Mr. Bay compared photographs of JCI with photographs of the Holocaust, but did not invite students to analyze and interpret the photographs in order to determine whether the two events were similar: his purpose for the activity was to get students to accept the interpretation that Japanese Canadians were unjustly treated. As a result, the photograph comparison activity featured more implicit ethical judgments made by comparisons
to another event (the Holocaust) than any other activity in the four teachers' lessons. Moreover, comparing photographs of JCI with photographs of the Holocaust implied that the two events were ethically similar, possibly influencing students to include more comparisons between JCI and the Holocaust in their written responses.

Mr. Mahoney's approach to primary sources was considerably different in that he asked students six types of questions about the origins, context, and content of a historical photograph and a political cartoon, rather than to use primary sources to describe and explain JCI and conclude that it was unjust. This approach to primary sources included fewer ethical judgments than the photograph comparison activity, which is surprising considering the amount of time and discussion that occurred. None of the questions Mr. Mahoney asked about the primary sources included ethical judgments or invited students to make ethical judgments because they focused on the origins, context, and content of the two primary sources, rather than ask whether JCI was justified, or what the creators' purpose was for constructing the primary sources. Mr. Mahoney asked questions about the primary sources to guide them towards a pre-determined conclusion, however: he wanted students to conclude that the photograph was a positive depiction of Japanese Canadians, and the political cartoon was a negative depiction, neither of which is an ethical judgment. What can be concluded from the two teachers' treatment of primary sources is that the purposes for using primary sources play a large role in how often ethical judgments occur. If teachers use primary sources to help students determine if a historical event was just or unjust, then ethical judgments occur frequently. When teachers focus on teaching students how to analyze primary sources by asking questions about their context, origin and content, ethical judgments occur less frequently.
Although all four teachers offered instruction to help students make reasonable ethical judgments, Mr. Mahoney was the only teacher who devoted a significant part of his lesson to doing this. Very few ethical judgments were made by teachers during this activity because teachers did not devote very much time to teaching students how to make reasonable ethical judgments. There were three types of instruction teachers offered to help students make reasonable ethical judgments: they explained how to complete the written assignment, they asked students to consider different historical perspectives, and they reminded students to consider the historical context. Mr. Mahoney and Mr. Arbour were the only teachers to include all three types of instruction in their lessons, but Mr. Arbour offered cursory comments and suggestions, while Mr. Mahoney devoted specific time in his lesson to teaching students to make ethical judgments.

All four teachers invited students to make ethical judgments in written assignments, whereas only one teacher conducted a class discussion in which students made ethical judgments. Teachers asked students to complete written responses to four types of questions: implied judgment questions, assumed judgment questions, presentist questions, and explicit ethical judgment questions.

The four teachers were unaware of the frequency or degree to which ethical judgments were included in the different activities and resources used in the lesson on JCI. Furthermore, teachers spent the majority of their time describing and explaining JCI, and provided little instruction for students on how to identify ethical judgments in historical accounts, or on how to make reasoned ethical judgments in their own accounts. These conclusions are consistent with the literature on pedagogical content knowledge in history education that highlights the difficulties teachers encounter when translating what they know and believe to classroom
practice (see for example, Fallace & Neem, 2005; Fallace, 2007; 2009; Hartzler-Miller, 2001; McDiarmid, 1994; McDiarmid & Vinten-Johansen, 2000; Wineburg, 1996).

6.3 Students' Ethical Judgments

The majority of students (76%) asked to write written responses to explicit ethical judgment questions concluded that JCI was unjust, which is to be expected considering that everything students watched, heard, or read during the lessons included numerous ethical judgments that implied JCI was unjust. Students wrote longer responses to explicit judgment questions because these questions asked them to take an ethical position and support it with reasoning, arguments, and historical details, plus teachers instructed students to support their responses with historical details. As a result, implicit ethical judgments made through word choice and historical details occurred more often in students' responses to explicit ethical judgment questions, and the number of ethical judgments made through word choice in students' written responses to explicit judgment questions was relatively similar amongst the three classes.

Students' written responses to explicit ethical judgment questions featured more implicit ethical judgments made through the historical details included than the three other types of questions. The number of historical details included is an indication of how sophisticated the response: reasonable ethical judgments are dependent on the reasons, arguments, and historical details provided. Students in Mr. Mahoney's class included almost double the number of historical details in their responses than students in the other classes because Mr. Mahoney instructed students to support their decision with three reasons, arguments and historical details, whereas none of the other three teachers did so.
The degree to which the historical context was considered is another characteristic of sophisticated ethical judgments in students' written responses. Consideration of the historical context when making ethical judgments is important to understand why historical actors acted as they did, to consider whether historical actors had options to act differently, to determine whether the historical action would have been considered ethical at the time, and to guard against making presentist judgments. Students in Mr. Mahoney's class considered the historical context almost twice as often as the other classes because Mr. Mahoney consistently reminded students to consider the historical context in their responses whereas the other teachers did not. Furthermore, because Mr. Mahoney introduced more activities and used more resources in his lesson, his students may have had a better understanding of the historical context than the others.

Students in Mr. Hunter's class made double the number of comments about the distance between the past and the present than the other three classes, another characteristic of sophisticated ethical judgments. The question asked students to determine whether people in the present can fairly judge the actions of people living in a different time period. It would have been difficult for students to respond to the question without making a comment about the distance between the past and the present.

The less sophisticated aspects of students' responses were also influenced by the types of questions asked and the instructional methods teachers employed. Students in each of the classes included inaccuracies and exaggerations in their responses, not surprising considering that many of the students were learning about JCI for the first time, and it would be unrealistic to expect all students to have an entirely accurate understanding of the events. Additionally, students regularly encountered historical inaccuracies and exaggerations in the resources they read and watched, and in statements made by their teachers, and this may also have influenced their responses.
Students who responded to explicit judgment questions made more inaccurate or exaggerated statements than the other classes. The more the students wrote, the greater the possibility of inaccuracies being included in their responses.

Students' responses that included facile comparisons to events where a positive or negative ethical judgment is assumed, were also considered less sophisticated. Nine students in one class made unwarranted comparisons between JCI and the Holocaust in their responses, whereas only one student in the other three classes made the same kind of comparison. Students in this class made more unwarranted comparisons between JCI and the Holocaust because they were influenced by the activity their teacher introduced in the lesson where images of different aspects of JCI were compared with images of different aspects of the Holocaust. Although the teacher highlighted the differences between JCI and the Holocaust throughout the activity, displaying analogous photographs of JCI and the Holocaust influenced students to make superficial comparisons between the two events.

Several students' responses to explicit judgment questions in two of the classes included statements of general principles of fairness, ethics, or human rights which are also characteristics of less sophisticated ethical judgments. Students made more statements of general principles of fairness in their responses because of the questions these two classes were asked to respond to. One question asked an assumed ethical judgment question about how JCI has changed their perception of Canada. In responding to this question, several students made statements about how the unfair treatment of Japanese Canadians changed their perception of Canada as a just, fair, and accepting country. The other class of students who made general statements of fairness and human rights in their written responses did so because they were asked to respond to a presentist question about how the government policy towards Japanese Canadians could have
been adjusted to make it more equitable. In explaining what could have been done to make the policy more equitable, students made several statements about general principles of fairness, ethics, or human rights.

Students responding to the presentist question also made three times the presentist statements as the other classes, another characteristic of less sophisticated judgments. They made more presentist statements because they were asked to respond to a presentist question that asked them how they would have reacted to JCI had they been alive at the time. Inviting students to imagine how they would have reacted if they were alive at the time led several students to make eleven presentist statements that imposed contemporary values and beliefs onto the past.

When students were asked a presentist question about how the government's policy towards Japanese Canadians might have been adjusted to make it more equitable, their responses included three times the number of suggestions about what could or should have been done differently to make it more equitable than students made in other classes. In their responses students also made several presentist statements because making JCI equitable is an important concern today, but it was not a concern for many people during World War Two.

Twenty-three students made statements about how their knowledge of JCI influenced their perception of Canada because they were asked an assumed judgment question about how their perception of Canada was impacted by JCI. Of the 23 statements, four said their perception did not change, and 19 said that their perception of Canada changed for the worse. Asking this assumed ethical judgment question influenced the majority of students to say that their perception of Canada was changed for the worse because it did not ask s "if" JCI changed their perception of Canada, it asked "how" it changed their perception. The teacher who asked this question revealed that one of his purposes for teaching about JCI was to get students to challenge
the perception of Canada as, "a utopian society." It is likely that the wording of the question and the implicit ethical judgments the teacher made throughout the class explains why 19 of 23 students said that learning about JCI negatively affected their perception of Canada.

The students' responses in Mr. Mahoney's class were more sophisticated than the other classes because he spent the most amount of time focused on JCI, he provided the most in-depth instruction on how to make an ethical judgment, and he asked students an explicit judgment question, the type of question that resulted in the most sophisticated student responses. The conclusions that can be drawn from students' responses is that the main influences on the sophistication of students' responses appears to be the amount of time students focused on the historical topic, the amount and quality of instruction students received about making reasonable ethical judgments, and the type of question asked.

6.4 Conclusions

Among the sample I studied, the majority of teachers have sophisticated views about the place of ethical judgments in the discipline of history and history education. They would not have difficulty articulating the historiographic differences between Ken Adachi and Jack Granatstein; they believe it is important for students to be taught how to make ethical judgments; and they believe students should be regularly invited to make ethical judgments. Yet, when it comes to their classroom practice, the teachers were not aware of the various ways ethical judgments were present in the activities and resources introduced in the classroom and the extent to which they brought their own ethical judgments into the classroom. Furthermore, the teachers did not teach students how to identify ethical judgments in different accounts or to make their own reasoned
ethical judgments. In other words, there was a large gap between what teachers believed about ethical judgments, and how they actually approached ethical judgments in the classroom.

This study utilizes Shulman's (1986; 1987) notion of pedagogical content knowledge as the theoretical framework for understanding the knowledge teachers have about ethical judgments in history, and how this knowledge is transformed for teaching students about an ethically controversial historical event. As discussed in Chapter 2, pedagogical content knowledge involves, "the blending of content and pedagogy into an understanding of how particular topics, problems, or issues are organized, represented, and adapted to the diverse abilities of learners, and presented for instruction" (Shulman, 1987, p. 8). In utilizing this theoretical framework, the findings from this study extends the theory as well because even though teachers have relatively sophisticated knowledge and understanding of ethical judgments, they are not able to translate this knowledge into instructional strategies and activities that help students make reasoned ethical judgments. The gap between what teachers know and actually do in regards to approaching ethical judgments in their history classes has several implications for teaching, policy and curriculum, and future research that are discussed in the following section.

6.5 Implications for Teaching

The conclusions drawn from this research have several implications for teaching history. The fact that ethical judgments were so prevalent in the different activities that took place in the four classes suggests that ethical judgments occur frequently in history classrooms, and as a result, deserve more attention from history teachers and history educators.

Teaching students to identify and make ethical judgments is a crucial piece of teaching history. One of the essential building blocks for teaching about ethical judgments is to help
students understand the constructed and interpretive nature of all historical accounts Seixas and Morton (Seixas & Morton, 2013). Although the four history teachers are aware that historical accounts are interpretations, they did not discuss this with students, nor did they make students aware of the interpretive nature of the different accounts they introduced during the lesson. If students do not have a basic epistemological understanding of the nature of historical accounts, they cannot begin to identify ethical judgments present in historical accounts, or make their own reasoned ethical judgments.

Another important consideration is to teach students how to identify ethical judgments, and regularly invite them to identify ethical judgments in the accounts they encounter. As a starting point Denos and Case (2006) describe how teachers can help students distinguish between descriptive claims and value judgments by identifying evaluative or non-neutral terminology, and then distinguish between ethical judgments and other types of value judgments (environmental, economic, military, amongst others). Another important step for teachers is to introduce students to the six types of implicit ethical judgments identified in the study and invite students to identify them in various accounts. Helping students in this way strengthens their understanding of ethical judgments, the nature of historical accounts, and makes them more aware of the ethical judgments they and others make.

When choosing resources to provide background information, teachers should consider the accuracy of the information they contain. The commercially produced resources include fewer ethically significant but inaccurate or exaggerated statements than teacher-created resources. This is not to say that teachers should not create resources themselves, only that they should be aware of the likelihood of inaccuracies in the sources they create and select, or invite students to identify inaccuracies that might be present. Another important consideration is to
select primary and secondary sources that present a variety of perspectives on the historical topic being examined. For example, the majority of resources teachers used in their JCI lessons focused on Japanese Canadian perspectives and to a limited degree the government perspective, but rarely addressed the perspectives of other social, ethnic and cultural groups towards JCI. If students are to make reasoned ethical judgments, they need to consider the perspectives of different groups and individuals involved in the event.

Both Seixas and Morton (2013) and Bellino and Selman (2011) describe how students' ability to make reasoned ethical judgments is dependent on their ability to take historical perspectives, a point that is reinforced by my research findings. Historical perspective taking involves trying to understand the beliefs, values, and motivations of people who lived in the past, and to identify how their thoughts, feelings, and beliefs were similar and different from those in the contemporary world. If students are not able to take the perspectives of the individuals and groups involved in past events, and consider the historical context that historical actors operated within, they run the risk of imposing presentist beliefs on the past.

Similarly, when making ethical judgments it is important for students to consider the historical context of the event in question and be cautious about imposing contemporary standards of right and wrong on the past. In order to help students consider the historical perspectives of the individuals and groups they are focusing on, teachers should ask students questions about the beliefs, attitudes, and worldviews that existed at the time of the historical event, and invite students to consider how these views are similar or different from contemporary beliefs. Furthermore, teachers should ask students questions about the historical context that existed at the time, and more specifically whether there were any limitations on choices that
restricted historical actors’ actions in the past, or alternatively questions about whether the historical actors had a variety of choices about how to act.

When inviting students to make ethical judgments, the types of questions asked are important for helping students make reasonable ethical judgments. Some types of questions should be avoided because they lead students towards making less reasoned ethical judgments. Assumed ethical judgment questions influence students to agree with the assumed ethical stance taken in the question rather than make an ethical decision between two or more plausible alternatives. Presentist questions invite students to impose contemporary perspectives on the past without considering the different context and worldviews that may have existed at the time the event occurred. Teachers should avoid asking questions that invite students to use contemporary views to interpret, analyze, or place themselves in the past without identifying the differences between the past and the present. As well, asking students what could or should have been done differently in the past implies that what was done was unjust, and invites students to make presentist judgments and impose contemporary beliefs when making suggestions.

If a teacher's goal is to get students to make reasoned ethical judgments about whether actions or decisions made in the past were justified or not, then they should ask explicit ethical judgment questions. When framing explicit judgment questions it is crucial for teachers to ask students whether the action or decision was justified or not, offering students options to choose between. It is also important that the historical issue or event under consideration has two or more plausible options for students to choose between. Not all historical events have an ethical dimension, and it is important that explicit judgment questions focus on ethically controversial issues that are still important to historians and the general public. The further back the historical event occurred in the past, the more difficult it is to ask an explicit ethical judgment question.
because events in the distant past took place in a historical context where beliefs, values, and worldviews are so foreign to us today that it is impossible to make ethical judgments.

There are other types of explicit ethical judgment questions teachers can ask that help students exhibit the qualities of a reasoned ethical judgment. Asking students to consider whether society or government has a responsibility to remember and respond to an ethically controversial event in the past invites students to decide whether historical decisions or actions taken were justifiable, but also asks students to consider whether anything could or should be done in the present to remember and respond to the events that took place. Furthermore, this type of question invites students to consider the distance between the past and the present, a characteristic of a sophisticated ethical judgment. Asking students whether people or governments in the present should judge the actions of governments taken in the past, or whether governments of today should take responsibility for actions taken by governments in the past is another type of explicit judgment question that compels students to consider the distance between the past and the present.

When teaching students to make reasonable ethical judgments about controversial events, there are several teaching practices teachers might want to consider utilizing. The first point is an obvious one: teachers need to focus explicitly on teaching about ethical judgments if they expect students to improve their ability to make them. None of the four teachers in the case study mentioned ethical judgments, or taught students specifically about what they are, or explained how to make them, despite the fact that teachers made frequent ethical judgments during the four lessons, and asked students to make them in their written responses. Teachers should consider the order in which they introduce different ethically controversial events. One of the teachers introduced the Holocaust in the lesson prior to teaching about JCI, which may have influenced
students to compare the two events. It is also important that teachers are cautious about comparing two ethically controversial events so that students do not assume the events are ethically equivalent. When comparing two ethically controversial events teachers should highlight the similarities and differences between the events, or ask students to determine the extent to which the two events are similar or different from each other so that students understand the similarities and differences.

When teaching students about ethical judgments, it is also important for teachers to consider their own attitudes towards ethical judgments. All four teachers said that JCI was unjustified, but they all took measures to make sure that their ethical stance was hidden from students because they feared that their beliefs would influence students' ethical judgments. Instead of concealing their ethical position from students, teachers should discuss the values and beliefs that informed their ethical position, the criteria and questions they considered before making ethical judgments, and the evidence that supports their ethical judgment. By verbalizing their thinking as they work through the process of making an explicit ethical judgment, teachers model the type of thinking they want students to execute, which might improve students' ability to make reasoned ethical judgments. This is not to suggest that teachers offer ethical judgments at every opportunity, but they should be conscious when they make them and clear about why they are making them. To do this, teachers need to have a deep understanding of ethical judgments so that they can recognize when and where they occur, and how to make them in a reasonable manner. In the next section I discuss the policy and curricular implications of the research conclusions.
6.6 Policy and Curricular Implications

When considering the most effective methods of changing teachers' beliefs and understanding of ethical judgments in history education, the logical starting point is to focus on the personal, organizational, and policy influences outlined in Chapter 2 and identified by teachers as having most influenced their beliefs about ethical judgments: their experiences as students in university or college history classes, their teaching experience, and their teaching colleagues. Focusing special attention on these influences is the most promising avenue for change, and as a result, the following policy and curriculum initiatives are recommended.

Many of the sixteen teachers surveyed in the study said their beliefs about ethical judgments in history and history education were influenced by their experiences as students in university or college history classes. This was unexpected since few undergraduate history programs include historiography courses that focus on the issue of ethical judgments (Fallace & Neem, 2005; Fallace, 2007; Fallace, 2009; Sandwell, 2007). If students' undergraduate degrees included mandatory historiography or methodology courses, it is possible that students would deepen their understanding of the discipline of history and the place of ethical judgments within it. They might realize it is impossible to remain objective when teaching history, and ethical judgments are inescapable when reading, writing, and teaching history. Taking historiography courses might further influence their beliefs about history and could continue to influence their teaching practice once they became teachers. However, as the work of Fallace (2005; 2007; 2009) indicates, historiography courses alone will not help teachers bridge the gap between being a sophisticated historical thinker and having the pedagogical content knowledge required to teach students how to think historically. Pre-service or graduate courses jointly taught by historians and history educators that explore the history and historiography of a particular topic or theme
while also working with students to create lessons, activities, and resources to use with students is something more universities should consider in their teacher education program.

As mentioned in Chapter 2, very few conceptions or theories of historical thinking except the 1996 U.S. National Standards for History in the Schools, the work of Barton and Levstik (2004), and the historical thinking framework outlined by Seixas (1996; 2006) for the Historical Thinking Project include ethical judgments as an important concept. Given that ethical judgments were so prominent in the four classes that focused on ethically controversial events, and the ability to identify and make implicit ethical judgments are closely linked with other second-order concepts, they deserve to be included as a significant second-order concept in other conceptions of historical thinking.

Furthermore, like Barton and Levstik (2004), my findings suggest that ethical judgments are inescapable and form a major component of history education in schools and should be included in any history and social studies curricula. Not only should students be taught to make reasonable ethical judgments, but they should also be taught how to recognize ethical judgments in a variety of accounts, and determine our responsibilities to remember and respond to the contributions, sacrifices, and injustices of the past. Recently, two of the most populous Canadian provinces, Ontario and British Columbia have included ethical judgments in their recently released K-12 social studies and history curricula. However, in B.C. ethical judgment is included as one of the six disciplinary thinking concepts included in the curriculum, whereas in Ontario ethical judgments are not one of the disciplinary thinking concepts included in the curriculum, but are included as one of eighteen outcomes in the Citizenship Education Framework. It is expected that including ethical judgments as a part of the curriculum could influence teachers to focus more regularly on teaching students about ethical judgments as part of their regular
teaching practice. Once teachers begin teaching about ethical judgments they will increase their knowledge and understanding of ethical judgments in their practice, which could have an impact on their teaching colleagues' beliefs and practices. Several teachers indicated on the survey that their beliefs about ethical judgments in history and history education were influenced by their teaching colleagues. Furthermore, mentorship opportunities for pre-service and in-service teachers, or demonstration lessons, units, projects might be fruitful opportunities for influencing teachers' beliefs about including ethical judgments their history teaching practice.

Teaching students about ethical judgments in high school history and social studies classes could also have important consequences for individuals' sense of citizenship and identity. Seixas and Morton (2013) discuss how learning about ethical judgments and how to make them fairly can contribute to the development of students' historical consciousness. Learning how to make fair and reasoned ethical judgments about the past can help students come to terms with the repercussions of, "the past in the present" and make connections between the past, present, and future. Deciding what past events and actions should be remembered, how they should be remembered, and what should be memorialized, commemorated, or celebrated helps students learn to appropriately respond in the present, and negotiate the ethical controversies they encounter in the future. Barton and Levstik (2004) argue that ethical judgments are an important part of participatory democracy because the ethical judgments we make about the past focus on our vision of the common good and what we hope to achieve as a society. Furthermore, learning how to make reasonable ethical judgments can also make an important contribution to inter-group relations in the present and future. Making reasonable ethical judgments about events like the Chinese Head Tax, internment of enemy aliens during World War One, or the legacy of Canada's system of residential schools could help improve understanding and relations amongst
different groups in the present and future. When students make decisions about a nation's responsibility to remember and respond to the past, they identify how the consequences of past actions can have an impact on the present, and take steps to make sure that the consequences are appropriately responded to.

6.7 Limitations of the Study

Several limitations were encountered when conducting this research study. The first limitation involves the size and diversity of the student and teacher sample. The school district where the study took place is ethnically homogenous, especially when compared to other more urban areas of the province. The majority of the students who participated in the study were born in Canada, as were their parents, they spoke English at home, and there were very few English as a Second Language (ESL) students. As a result, their responses and approaches to ethical judgments cannot be assumed to apply to other Grade 11 Social Studies students in the province, or in Canada more generally, where there are radically different demographic profiles. The study might also have had different findings had there been students in the classes who identified ethnically (or otherwise) with the historically marginalized groups.

The small sample sizes of teachers for both the survey and case study also have an impact on the ability of the study findings to be generalized to teachers who differ from the teachers who took part in the study. The sixteen teachers who completed the survey featured greater diversity in education, experience, beliefs, goals, and practices than the four teachers who were selected purposively for the case study. I selected the case study teachers because I wanted to understand how the most experienced history teachers handled ethical judgments, teachers who had established teaching methods for teaching about a variety of topics, and who would be the
most likely of teachers to have an established and effective approach for teaching about ethically controversial historical events. If the experienced teachers could not manage ethical judgments in their history classes, then it was unlikely that other teachers with less training or experience teaching history would approach ethical judgments more effectively. The sample size for the survey and the case study were chosen to help me understand what teachers believed about ethical judgments, how teachers' approached ethical judgments when teaching about one ethically controversial event, and what impact this had on students' responses. Teachers' and students' approaches to ethical judgments might look very different in other classrooms, school districts, provinces, countries, or when focusing on different ethically controversial topics. What this study contributed is a deepened understanding of what ethical judgments are, how to identify them, how teachers' approach ethical issues, questions, and judgments, and how students' respond to different questions and issues.

The potential influence the teachers' survey might have had on the four teachers' approaches to ethical judgments during the lesson observations is another potential limitation. Asking teachers questions about their beliefs about ethical judgments in the discipline of history and history education might have changed their attitudes and approaches to how they address them in their teaching because some of the teachers may not have considered the issue of ethical judgments in history, or how they approach them in their classes prior to completing the survey. It is possible that some of the teacher participants in the case study might have altered their approaches to ethical judgments based on how they think they are supposed to approach them, rather than how they actually approach them in their actual daily practice.

Another limitation is related to the previous concern, and focuses on whether the four teachers' changed their approach to ethical judgments because their lessons were being observed
by a researcher. I gave the four teachers a list of the five ethically controversial topics that I would be focusing my observations on, and I reminded them that it was important they approached and taught the lessons in a similar manner to what they normally do in order for the observations to be as natural as possible. Despite instructing the four teachers to teach the five topics as they normally would, it is possible that they prepared special lessons and activities that were different than their typical approach because they knew they were going to be observed by a researcher. In order to address this issue, I ensured that the four case study teachers understood that the purpose of the research study was not to judge their teaching practices, but to understand how different teachers approach ethical judgments when teaching about ethically controversial topics.

6.8 Future Research

History education scholars have paid little attention to ethical judgments, despite evidence that it is, and has been an important part of history education for over a century. As a result, my first recommendation is a call for more research on ethical judgments, more specifically research that attempts to gain a deeper understanding of the connections between teachers' beliefs about ethical judgments, teachers' practices regarding ethical judgments, and students' responses to ethical judgments. I concur with Wilson (2001), who called for more research studies that explore a wider range of factors that shape history teaching including the connection between teacher beliefs and teaching methods, and student beliefs and learning. Although my research focused on understanding how teachers' beliefs and instructional approaches affected students' thinking and learning, this research merely scratched the surface, and more research is required.
There are a number of potential directions for research on ethical judgments. Further studies on teachers' beliefs about ethical judgments are recommended in order to determine whether other groups of teachers have similar beliefs about ethical judgments as the group of teachers I surveyed. Furthermore, a study that investigates whether teachers in different countries have similar or different attitudes and beliefs about ethical judgments would also be important for improving understanding of ethical judgments. A study that replicates my research methodology and procedures, but focuses on different teachers and other historical topics might deepen the understanding of ethical judgments. For example, my research study focused on experienced teachers with undergraduate degrees in history, but it would be interesting to see if inexperienced teachers with less of a background in history have the same beliefs, understandings, and approaches to ethical judgments in their classroom practice. It would also be important to compare inexperienced teachers with teachers who regularly utilize historical thinking approaches in their history classes to highlight the similarities and differences in their beliefs about ethical judgments, approaches to ethical judgments in their classroom practice, and their students' responses to ethical judgment questions.

My study focused on understanding ethical judgments when teachers taught about JCI, but it is important to compare my findings with similar studies that focus on other ethically controversial events in Canadian history. Although the historiography revealed some debate about whether JCI was justified, there was no debate about whether the removal, relocation, dispossession, and deportation of Japanese Canadians were justified. It would be worthwhile to study how teachers approach other events in Canadian history that are either more or less ethically controversial than JCI. Another potential direction would be to investigate what teachers in other countries believe about ethical judgments and how they approach ethically
controversial topics in their country's history, or how teachers in several countries approach the same ethically controversial historical event. For example, how do teachers in the United States teach about Japanese American Internment and how does this compare with how JCI is taught in Canada?

Other potential directions for future ethical judgment research studies would be to develop a typology or progression model that differentiates less sophisticated student responses from more sophisticated student responses. The development of a progression model would be helpful in developing assessment tools designed to assess students' abilities to make reasoned ethical judgments. It would also be important to compare the written responses of students who were taught how to make ethical judgments with students who were not offered any instruction in order to determine if the instructional practices had any impact on students' historical thinking.

6.9 Final Thoughts

My overall purpose in undertaking this research was to deepen my understanding of ethical judgments in history education because I felt that ethical judgments were an important, but unacknowledged part of history education, and I wanted to know more about what teachers believed about them, how they approached them in their teaching, and what impact, if any, did teachers’ approaches have on students’ responses to ethical questions. I also recognized that during the boom in historical thinking research conducted over the last thirty years, researchers have paid little attention to ethical judgments, and I thought my research could make a meaningful contribution in this area.

Osborne (2003b) argues that the best hope for improving history education is the international research being done on the teaching and learning of history that provides “an
empirical and conceptual base that has the potential to transform a debate that to date has been strong on polemic and exhortation but short on evidence” (p. 610). If history teachers understand the nature, unavoidability and importance of ethical judgments for doing and understanding history, then they will be better equipped to teach history to their students, and will focus more on teaching students about ethical judgments and how to make them more reasonably. Increased understanding of teachers’ ethical judgments thus has the potential to enrich the teaching and learning of history in Canada and internationally. Furthermore, if students are able to identify ethical judgments in others’ accounts, and make their own reasoned ethical judgments, they will be better equipped to deal with ethical judgments about the past and the contemporary world they encounter as part of their daily lives. Lastly, the ability to make reasoned ethical judgments might also help Canadians and other countries around the world make decisions about how to remember and respond to historical injustices that have taken place in their country's history, and about the issues they currently face.
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Appendices

Appendix A: Parent Consent and Student Assent Form for Surveys And Observations

October 9, 2012

Centre for the Study of Historical Consciousness
Faculty of Education
2125 Main Mall
Vancouver, BC, Canada V6T 1Z4
Tel: (604) 822-8104

Parent Consent and Student Assent Form for Surveys and Observations
“Understanding Ethical Judgments in Secondary School History Classes”

Principal investigator:
Dr. Peter Seixas, Department of Curriculum and Pedagogy

Co-investigator:
Mr. Lindsay Gibson, Department of Curriculum and Pedagogy

Purpose: This research study is being undertaken as part of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D) for Mr. Lindsay Gibson. This research project is aimed at improving the understanding of historical thinking in Canadian secondary schools. Your child has been selected to take part in this study because he or she is in the classroom of a participating teacher.

Research Procedures: This research involves two parts. In the first part students are asked to complete a survey that will take approximately 20-30 minutes during a social studies class period. The survey asks students about the activities, goals and historical judgments that take place in their Social Studies 11 class. Those students who do not provide consent will not complete the survey. They will be given time for review or other regular social studies work, while participants complete the questionnaire. The second part of the research involves classroom observations in which the researcher will observe and videotape five to seven social studies classes in which the teacher focuses on ethically controversial events in Canadian history. During the observations the researchers will make extensive notes to determine how both students and teachers respond to the ethically controversial topics. The video camera will be set up on the side of the classroom and will focus solely on the teacher, not individual students, although some student's voices will be recorded. The purpose of the video-taping is to help the researcher verify the observations and field notes that were made during the observations. The video-tapes will not be transcribed and will only be viewed by the Principal investigator and the Co-investigator. Students who do not have consent or assent to participate will not be video recorded.

Confidentiality: Students’ identities will be kept strictly confidential. Each student will be assigned a code number. All materials handled by researchers will be identified only by code numbers: no computer files will include any student’s names. Only the researchers (not the teachers) will have access to the survey. The surveys will be kept in a locked filing cabinet.
Videotapes will be labelled by the Research Code Number and date and stored in a locked filing cabinet. The video files will also be uploaded to an external hard drive that will be locked in the filing cabinet and stored on a password protected computer. Additionally, data will be stored on password protected computers, without any student identifiers other than their research code number. No data will be posted to the web. Participants will also be assigned pseudonyms which will be used in all written work related to this research. Students will not be identified by name in any reports of the completed study. No images or video will become public.

**Contact for information about the study:** If you have any questions or desire further information with respect to this study, you may contact Dr. Peter Seixas at 604 822 5277 or by e-mail at peter.seixas@ubc.ca or Lindsay Gibson at 250 717-3213 or by e-mail at lindsay.s.gibson@gmail.com

**Contact for concerns about the rights of research subjects:** If you have any concerns about your child’s treatment or rights as a research subject, you or your child may contact the Research Subject Information Line in the UBC Office of Research Services at 604-822-8598.

**Consent:** Your child’s participation in this study is entirely voluntary. You or he/she may refuse to participate or withdraw from the study at any time without jeopardy to their class standing.
Your signature below indicates that you have received a copy of this consent form and kept Page 1-2 for your own records (Please keep a copy of Page 1-2 of the consent form for your records).

SURVEY AND OBSERVATIONS CONSENT/ASSENT

PARENTS/GUARDIANS

I consent/I do not consent (circle one) to my child's completing the survey and participating in the classroom observations for the research study, “Understanding Ethical Judgments in Secondary School History Classes.”

I understand that by consenting to my child participating in the research study they will

a. Complete a survey: _________ (initials)

b. Be observed participating in 5-7 Social Studies 11 classes: _________ (initials)

c. Be video or audio-taped participating in Social Studies classes: _________ (initials)

__________________________
Parent or Guardian Signature

__________________________
Date

__________________________
Printed Name of the Parent or Guardian signing above.
SURVEY AND OBSERVATIONS ASSENT

STUDENTS

I assent/I do not assent (circle one) to completing the survey for the research study, “Understanding Ethical Judgments in Secondary School History Classes.”

I understand that by assenting to participate in the research study I will

a. Complete a survey: __________ (initials)

b. Be observed participating in 5-7 Social Studies 11 classes: __________ (initials)

c. Be video or audio-taped participating in Social Studies classes: __________ (initials)

____________________________________________________
Student Signature                        Date

____________________________________________________
Printed Name of the Student signing above.

(Note: In order for a student to participate in the study, both parent’s and student’s consent/assent are needed.)
Appendix B: Teacher Consent Form for Survey

September 26, 2012

Centre for the Study of Historical Consciousness
Faculty of Education
2125 Main Mall
Vancouver, BC, Canada V6T 1Z4
Tel: (604) 822-8104

Teacher Consent Form for the Survey
“Understanding Ethical Judgments in Secondary School History Classes”

Principal investigator:
Dr. Peter Seixas, Department of Curriculum and Pedagogy

Co-investigator:
Mr. Lindsay Gibson, Department of Curriculum and Pedagogy

Purpose: This research study is being undertaken as part of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D) for Mr. Lindsay Gibson. This research project examines history teachers’ beliefs about ethical judgments and the factors that influence these beliefs, the different ways that ethical judgments are present in history classes, and how teachers and students approach and handle ethical judgments in their classes. The results of this study will help educators further understand an aspect of historical thinking in a classroom context and will support educators in the development of strategies for improving the teaching of history.

Research Procedures: This part of the research study invites Social Studies 11 teachers in School District #23 to complete a survey in which teachers are asked to share their views and attitudes about history and history teaching, and also about the place of ethical judgments in teaching history. The survey will take approximately 45 minutes to complete and teachers are free to determine the location and time when they would like to complete it. The completed surveys will be collected by the researcher, or participants will be provided with a self-addressed envelope and postage to be mailed to the researcher.

Confidentiality: Teachers’ identities will be kept strictly confidential. Each participant will be assigned a code number. All research materials handled by researchers will be identified only by code number: no computer files will include any names. The original surveys will be kept in a locked filing cabinet. Participants will not be identified by name in any reports of the completed study.

Contact for information about the study: If you have any questions or desire further information with respect to this study, you may contact Dr. Peter Seixas at 604 822 5277 or by e-mail at peter.seixas@ubc.ca or Lindsay Gibson at 250 717-3213 or by e-mail at lindsay.s.gibson@gmail.com
Contact for concerns about the rights of research subjects: If you have any concerns about your treatment or rights as a research subject, you may contact the Research Subject Information Line in the UBC Office of Research Services at 604-822-8598.

Consent: Your participation in this study is entirely voluntary. You may refuse to participate or withdraw from the study at any time.

Your signature below indicates that you have received a copy of this consent form for your own records (Please keep a copy for your records).

(1) SURVEY CONSENT

I consent/I do not consent (circle one) to completing the survey for the research study, “Understanding Ethical Judgments in Secondary School History Classes.”

____________________________________________________
Signature Date

____________________________________________________
Printed Name

**********************************************************************

**********************************************************************
Appendix C: Teacher Consent Form for the Case Study and Interviews

October 9, 2012

Centre for the Study of Historical Consciousness
Faculty of Education
2125 Main Mall
Vancouver, BC, Canada V6T 1Z4
Tel: (604) 822-8104

Teacher Consent Form for the Case Study and Interviews
“Understanding Ethical Judgments in Secondary School History Classes”

Principal investigator:
Dr. Peter Seixas, Department of Curriculum and Pedagogy

Co-investigator:
Mr. Lindsay Gibson, Department of Curriculum and Pedagogy

Purpose: This research study is being undertaken as part of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D) for Mr. Lindsay Gibson. This research examines history teachers' beliefs about ethical judgments and the factors that influence these beliefs, the different ways that ethical judgments are present in history classes, and how teachers and students approach and handle ethical judgments in their classes. The results of this study will help educators further understand an aspect of historical thinking in a classroom context and will support educators in the development of strategies for improving the teaching of history.

Research Procedures: In this part of the study, three to five social studies 11 classes will be selected for case studies. For each of the case studies I will observe five to seven lessons that focus on events in Canadian history that address ethical issues. During the observations of each case study, I will collect a variety of data including: pre-and post-lesson audio recorded interviews with teachers, field notes from classroom observations, video recordings of classroom observations, analysis of collected artifacts, resources and documents from teachers and students, a survey of students' observations about their teacher's approaches to ethical judgments, and audio recorded interviews with students. In addition to teacher consent, students will also need to provide informed consent to take part in the survey, observations and interviews. The student surveys (distributed and collected by a researcher) will take place during social studies class period and will take approximately 20-30 minutes to complete. The teacher may assign those students who do not participate to do alternative work or review, while students complete the survey. If some students decline to participate, this will not affect the teacher’s ability to participate in the study.

Confidentiality: Teachers and students’ identities will be kept strictly confidential. Each participant will be assigned a code number. All research materials handled by researchers will be identified only by code number: no computer files will include any names. The original questionnaires will be kept in a locked filing cabinet. Participants will not be identified by name.
in any reports of the completed study. Students who do not provide consent to participate in the study will not be videotaped.

**Contact for information about the study:** If you have any questions or desire further information with respect to this study, you may contact Dr. Peter Seixas at 604 822 5277 or by e-mail at peter.seixas@ubc.ca or Lindsay Gibson at 250 717-3213 or by e-mail at lindsay.s.gibson@gmail.com

**Contact for concerns about the rights of research subjects:** If you have any concerns about your treatment or rights as a research subject, you may contact the Research Subject Information Line in the UBC Office of Research Services at 604-822-8598.

**Consent:** Your participation in this study is entirely voluntary. You may refuse to participate or withdraw from the study at any time.

Your signature below indicates that you have received a copy of this consent form for your own records (Please keep a copy for your records).

(1) **CASE STUDY AND INTERVIEW CONSENT**

I consent/I do not consent (circle one) to participating in the case study and the interviews for the research study, “Understanding Ethical Judgments in Secondary School History Classes.”

____________________________________________________
Signature Date

____________________________________________________
Printed Name

**********************************************************************

(2) **STUDENT PARTICIPATION CONSENT**

I consent/I do not consent (circle one) to having students take part in the case study for the research study, “Understanding Ethical Judgments in Secondary School History Classes.” I understand that in addition to teacher’s consent, students and their guardians will also need to provide informed consent in order for students to take part in the study.

____________________________________________________
Signature Date

____________________________________________________
Printed Name
Appendix D: Teacher Survey: Understanding Ethical Judgments in Secondary School History Classes

Teacher Survey: Understanding Ethical Judgments in Secondary School History Classes

Please circle the option that corresponds to your answer. A few questions require your open-ended responses. For these questions enter your answers in the spaces provided.

A. YOUR BACKGROUND:

1. How many years of social studies teaching experience (including this year) do you have?
   
a. Up to 3 years
b. 4 to 8 years
c. 9 to 15 years
d. 16 to 25 years
e. More than 25 years

2. What subject or disciplines did you specialize in during your undergraduate degree (Bachelor's degree)?
   
a. History major
b. History minor
c. Major in geography or some other social science
d. Major in some other humanities
e. None of the above

3. What is the highest degree that you have achieved?
   
a. Bachelor's degree
b. Master's degree
c. Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D)
B. YOUR SCHOOL

4. Check all the special challenges that apply to your school’s neighbourhood?
   
   a. High rates of people not fluent in either official language  
   b. Significant rates of poverty  
   c. High crime rate  
   d. None of the above  
   e. Other (Please specify in the box below)

5. Comparing your classes with other students you have taught in the past, what are the academic standards of these classes? (Use one column for each social studies/history class you are teaching).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class #1</th>
<th>Class #2</th>
<th>Class #3</th>
<th>Class #4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Lower than average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Higher than average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C. YOUR TEACHING PRACTICE

Question 6 to Question 15: How often do the following activities take place in your history classes?

6. Students listen to me talk about historical events.
   a. Never/Once or twice a year
   b. A few times a year
   c. Every month
   d. Weekly
   e. Almost every class

7. Students are told what was good or bad, right or wrong in history.
   a. Never/Once or twice a year
   b. A few times a year
   c. Every month
   d. Weekly
   e. Almost every class

8. Students discuss and debate different interpretations of what happened in the past.
   a. Never/Once or twice a year
   b. A few times a year
   c. Every month
   d. Weekly
   e. Almost every class

9. Students analyze historical sources, e.g., letters, old documents, or photographs from the past.
   a. Never/Once or twice a year
   b. A few times a year
   c. Every month
   d. Weekly
   e. Almost every class

10. Students watch historical videos and films.
    a. Never/Once or twice a year
    b. A few times a year
    c. Every month
    d. Weekly
    e. Almost every class
11. Students use the textbook and/or worksheets related to the textbook.
   
   a. Never/Once or twice a year
   b. A few times a year
   c. Every month
   d. Weekly
   e. Almost every class

12. Students use a range of activities, e.g. role play, local projects or visiting museums/sites.

   a. Never/Once or twice a year
   b. A few times a year
   c. Every month
   d. Weekly
   e. Almost every class

13. Students write their own interpretations of past events and people.

   a. Never/Once or twice a year
   b. A few times a year
   c. Every month
   d. Weekly
   e. Almost every class

14. Students use the internet or library to do historical research.

   a. Never/Once or twice a year
   b. A few times a year
   c. Every month
   d. Weekly
   e. Almost every class

15. Other activities not listed, which you do often or very often (please specify in the box below).
D. YOUR GOALS FOR TEACHING HISTORY:
Question 16 to Question 27: How important are the following goals in your history teaching?

16. I want my students to know the key facts of history.
   a. Not at all important
   b. Somewhat important
   c. Important
   d. Very important

17. I want them to be able to judge historical events in terms of right and wrong, good and bad, and fair and unfair.
   a. Not at all important
   b. Somewhat important
   c. Important
   d. Very important

18. I want them to imagine what life was like for people in the past.
   a. Not at all important
   b. Somewhat important
   c. Important
   d. Very important

19. I want them to understand the values and decisions of people living in different situations.
   a. Not at all important
   b. Somewhat important
   c. Important
   d. Very important

20. I want them to use history to understand today’s world.
   a. Not at all important
   b. Somewhat important
   c. Important
   d. Very important
21. I want them to see their own lives as part of a larger historical picture.
   a. Not at all important
   b. Somewhat important
   c. Important
   d. Very important

22. I want them to value Canadian traditions and identity.
   a. Not at all important
   b. Somewhat important
   c. Important
   d. Very important

23. I want them to value the preservation of historical sites, artifacts and old buildings.
   a. Not at all important
   b. Somewhat important
   c. Important
   d. Very important

24. I want them to learn basic democratic values.
   a. Not at all important
   b. Somewhat important
   c. Important
   d. Very important

25. I want them to be able to analyze and judge various historical sources critically.
   a. Not at all important
   b. Somewhat important
   c. Important
   d. Very important

26. I want them to understand diverse interpretations of history.
   a. Not at all important
   b. Somewhat important
   c. Important
   d. Very important
27. Other history-related goals that you concentrate on for your students (Please specify in the box below).

E. INFLUENCES ON YOUR TEACHING PRACTICE AND GOALS FOR TEACHING HISTORY

Question 28 and Question 29: What are the important influences on your teaching practice and goals for teaching history?

28. Which of the following have influenced your teaching practice and goals for teaching history? (You can circle more than one).

   a. Experiences as a student in high school history/social studies classes
   b. Experiences as a student in university or college history classes
   c. Experiences as a student in university or college teacher education program
   d. Teaching experience and practice
   e. Teaching colleagues
   f. Professional development experiences
   g. Students
   h. School administrators
   i. Curriculum documents
   j. Required final exams or tests
   k. Other (Please specify in the box below)
29. Which of the influences listed above have most influenced your teaching practice and goals for teaching history? Briefly describe how it has influenced your teaching practice and goals for teaching history.
F. ATTITUDES TOWARDS ETHICAL JUDGMENTS

Question 30 to Question 39: What are your attitudes towards ethical judgments?

Ethical judgments are statements of praise or blame based on standards of good or evil, right and wrong, and virtue or vice, that comment on the behavior, actions and character of individuals or groups.

30. Agree or disagree with the following statements about ethical judgments in history and provide a brief explanation of why you agree or disagree with each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Historians make ethical judgments when they research, write, and teach history.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Explanation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. History is not about making ethical judgments, but about learning the facts about the past.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Explanation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. History teachers should not make ethical judgments because they need to be as objective as possible.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Explanation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. It is a historian's job to make ethical judgments in history, not the teacher’s or student’s job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Explanation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethical judgments should not be made in history because times were different in the past and there is no point condemning individuals for the circumstances in which they found themselves.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Explanation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethical judgments are the end results of historical inquiry.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Explanation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There may be several plausible ethical judgments about the same event, person or time period.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Explanation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethical judgments have been an important part of history education since history was included in public schooling over a century ago.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Explanation:</strong></td>
<td>253</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
31. Which of the following have influenced your attitude and beliefs about whether ethical judgments are an important part of the discipline of history? (Circle all that apply)

a. Experiences as a student in high school history/social studies classes
b. Experiences as a student in university or college history classes
c. Experiences as a student in university or college teacher education program
d. Teaching experience and practice
e. Teaching colleagues
f. Experiences in professional development workshops or seminars
g. Books or films
h. Other (Please specify in the box below)

32. How important is it for teachers to tell students what was right or wrong, fair or unfair, or right or wrong in the past?

a. Not at all important
b. Somewhat important
c. Quite important
d. Very important

33. How often over the past year have you made ethical judgments about historical events, people, or institutions when talking with students?

a. Never
b. Less than once per month
c. About once per month
d. Several times per month
e. Several times per week
f. Several times per class
34. How important is it that teachers invite students to decide what was right or wrong, fair or unfair, or right or wrong in the past during class discussions or activities?

   a. Not at all important  
   b. Somewhat important  
   c. Quite important  
   d. Very important  

35. How important is it that students are taught how to make their own reasonable ethical judgments about historical events, people and institutions in your classes?

   a. Not at all important  
   b. Somewhat important  
   c. Quite important  
   d. Very important  

36. Over the past year, how often have students been asked to make an ethical judgment about a historical person, event or institution in a class assignment, activity or test?

   a. Never/Once or twice a year  
   b. A few times a year  
   c. Every month  
   d. Weekly  
   e. Almost every class  

37. In the space provided, describe an assignment or activity that you have given to students that requires them to make an ethical judgment, or learn to identify others' ethical judgments. If you have not given an assignment or activity to students that requires them to make an ethical judgment then leave the section blank.
38. How important is it that students learn to identify ethical judgments located in textbooks, films, books, articles, or teacher lectures?

a. Not at all important
b. Somewhat important
c. Quite important
d. Very important

39. Which of the following have influenced your beliefs about whether teachers should make ethical judgments when teaching history? Circle all that apply

a. Experiences as a student in high school history/social studies classes
b. Experiences as a student in university or college history classes
c. Experiences as a student in university or college teacher education program
d. Experiences as a teacher
e. Teaching colleagues
f. Professional development experiences
g. Knowledge of students' abilities and interests
h. Concerns about offending a student or family of a student.
i. Worries about getting into trouble with the school administration for taking a controversial position
j. Whether it is included in curriculum documents or final exams or tests
k. Books or films
l. Other (Please specify in the box below)
40. In the space below, briefly describe how you would teach students about an ethically controversial historic event, for example whether Japanese internment was justified during World War II.


41. Would you be interested in participating in a more extensive study of the teaching of ethical judgments in secondary history classes?

   a. Very interested
   b. Somewhat interested
   c. Not interested
Appendix E: Student Survey: Understanding Ethical Judgments In Secondary School History Classes

History Classes

School Code: ______________
Teacher Code: ______________
Student Code: ______________
Date: ______________

Student Survey: Understanding Ethical Judgments in Secondary School History Classes

Instructions:

• Enter the School, Teacher and Student codes on the questionnaire (above).
• Most of the questions ask you to circle the letter that corresponds to your answer.
• A few questions require written responses. For these questions write your answers on the questionnaire, in the space provided.

1. Age
   a. 15 years old or younger
   b. 16 years old
   c. 17 years old
   d. 18 years old or older

2. Gender
   a. Male
   b. Female

3. Place of Birth
   a. Canada
   b. Outside of Canada

4. Mother’s place of birth
   a. Canada
   b. Outside of Canada

5. Father’s place of birth
   a. Canada
   b. Outside of Canada
6. Have you lived in British Columbia all of your life?
   a. Yes. I was born in British Columbia
   b. No. I moved to British Columbia before elementary school
   c. No. I moved to British Columbia during elementary school
   d. No. I moved to British Columbia after elementary school

7. Which language is most commonly used in your home?
   a. English
   b. French
   c. Mandarin or Cantonese
   d. Punjabi
   e. Other (Please specify here): ______________________________

8. How often do people in your home talk to each other in a language other than English?
   a. Never
   b. Once in a while
   c. About half of the time
   d. All or most of the time

9. What is the highest level of schooling that either of your parents completed? Select only one response (for the parent that received the highest level of schooling).
   a. Less than high school graduation
   b. High school graduation, but no more schooling
   c. Some college or vocational training, but not a university degree
   d. Bachelor's degree (for example, B.A., or B.Sc.)
   e. Graduate or professional degree (for example, Master's, Ph.D, or M.D.)

10. What mark do you usually get on social studies tests and projects?
    a. A
    b. B
    c. C+
    d. C
    e. C-
    f. I
Question 11 to Question 20:
How often do the following activities take place in your history classes?

11. We listen to the teacher talk about historical events.
   a. Never/Once or twice a year
   b. A few times a year
   c. Every month
   d. Weekly
   e. Almost every class

12. We are told about what was good or bad, right or wrong in history.
   a. Never/Once or twice a year
   b. A few times a year
   c. Every month
   d. Weekly
   e. Almost every class

13. We discuss different explanations of what happened in the past.
   a. Never/Once or twice a year
   b. A few times a year
   c. Every month
   d. Weekly
   e. Almost every class

14. We analyze historical sources such as letters, old documents, or photographs from the past.
   a. Never/Once or twice a year
   b. A few times a year
   c. Every month
   d. Weekly
   e. Almost every class

15. We watch historical videos and films.
   a. Never/Once or twice a year
   b. A few times a year
   c. Every month
   d. Weekly
   e. Almost every class
16. We use the textbook and/or worksheets related to the textbook.
   a. Never/Once or twice a year
   b. A few times a year
   c. Every month
   d. Weekly
   e. Almost every class

17. We use a range of activities, e.g. role-plays, local projects or visiting museums/sites.
   a. Never/Once or twice a year
   b. A few times a year
   c. Every month
   d. Weekly
   e. Almost every class

18. We write our own interpretations of past events and people.
   a. Never/Once or twice a year
   b. A few times a year
   c. Every month
   d. Weekly
   e. Almost every class

19. We use the internet and library to do historical research.
   a. Never/Once or twice a year
   b. A few times a year
   c. Every month
   d. Weekly
   e. Almost every class

20. Other activities not listed, which you do often or very often (please specify in the box below).
Question 21 to Question 32:
How important are the following goals in your history classes?

21. To learn the key facts of history.
   a. Not at all important
   b. Somewhat important
   c. Important
   d. Very important

22. To judge historical events in terms of right and wrong, good and bad, and fair and unfair.
   a. Not at all important
   b. Somewhat important
   c. Important
   d. Very important

23. To imagine what life was like for people in the past.
   a. Not at all important
   b. Somewhat important
   c. Important
   d. Very important

24. To understand the values and decisions of people living in different situations.
   a. Not at all important
   b. Somewhat important
   c. Important
   d. Very important

25. To use history to understand today’s world.
   a. Not at all important
   b. Somewhat important
   c. Important
   d. Very important

26. To see our own lives as part of a larger historical picture.
   a. Not at all important
   b. Somewhat important
   c. Important
   d. Very important
27. To value Canadian traditions and identity.
   a. Not at all important 
   b. Somewhat important 
   c. Important 
   d. Very important 

28. To value the preservation of historical sites, artifacts and old buildings.
   a. Not at all important 
   b. Somewhat important 
   c. Important 
   d. Very important 

29. To learn basic democratic values.
   a. Not at all important 
   b. Somewhat important 
   c. Important 
   d. Very important 

30. To learn how to analyze and judge various historical sources critically.
   a. Not at all important 
   b. Somewhat important 
   c. Important 
   d. Very important 

31. To understand diverse interpretations of history.
   a. Not at all important 
   b. Somewhat important 
   c. Important 
   d. Very important 

32. Please list any history-related goals, not mentioned above, that are important in your history class in the space below.
Question 33 to Question 37:

Ethical judgments in your history class

Ethical judgments are statements of praise or blame based on standards of good or evil, right and wrong, and fair or unfair, that comment on the behavior, actions and character of individuals or groups.

33. How often over the past year has your teacher made ethical judgments about historical events, people, or institutions when talking with students?
   
   g. Never
   h. Less than once per month
   i. About once per month
   j. Several times per month
   k. Several times per week
   l. Several times per class

34. How often over the past year has the teacher invited students in the class to make an ethical judgment about a historical person, event or institution in a class assignment, activity or test?

   a. Never/Once or twice a year
   b. A few times a year
   c. Every month
   d. Weekly
   e. Almost every class

35. How often over the past year has your teacher specifically taught you how to make ethical judgments about historical events, people and institutions in your classes?

   a. Never/Once or twice a year
   b. A few times a year
   c. Every month
   d. Weekly
   e. Almost every class

36. How often over the past year has your teacher specifically taught you how to identify ethical judgments located in textbooks, films, books, articles, or teacher lectures?

   a. Never/Once or twice a year
   b. A few times a year
   c. Every month
   d. Weekly
   e. Almost every class
37. In the space provided, name a historical topic that was focused on in your class in which ethical judgments were an important part. Describe what kind of activity or activities were used to teach about the topic. If you cannot recall a topic in which ethical judgments were an important part then leave the section blank.
Appendix F: Semi-Structured Interview Protocol for Teachers' Post-Observation Interviews

Interviews

Semi-Structured Interview Protocol for Teachers' Post-Observation Interviews

The list of questions below is meant to provide a loose structure for an interview, and every question is not meant to be asked during each interview. It is expected that interviewers will use these questions as a starting point before asking more specific questions that focus on events that took place during the classroom observations.

Questions for Interview:

- What was the purpose of the lesson today? Were you able to achieve the purpose of your lesson? What evidence do you have that you achieved your purpose?
- What activities did students work on today? How did you think students responded to the lesson? How did you want students to respond to this topic?
- Did students make any ethical judgments? If students made ethical judgments about the historical topic what did they say? Were students' ethical judgments reasonable/plausible?
- What do you personally think about the historical topic? Who was right/wrong, fair/unfair, just/unjust?
- Did you offer any ethical judgments about the topic in the lesson today?
- Did you avoid making ethical judgments for any reason, and if so, what were the reasons?
- What resources did you use to teach about the historical topic? Were the resources that you used successful? How do you know? What effect did they have?
- Were there any ethical judgments present in the resources that you used today?
- Would you do anything differently the next time you taught this topic?
- Did you gain any new insights about the historical topic from the class today? Did anything that you thought about or heard in the class today change your thinking about the topic?
Appendix G: Letter of Initial Contact

September 27, 2012

Dear Colleague,

We are writing to invite you to participate in a study aimed at improving the understanding of how ethical judgments, an important historical thinking concept, are present in the day to day teaching of history in our schools. We appreciate your willingness to read through this letter before deciding on your participation in this study.

This project focuses on examining history teachers' beliefs about ethical judgments and the factors that influence these beliefs, the different ways that ethical judgments are present in history classes, and how teachers and students approach and handle ethical judgments in their Grade 11 social studies classes.

The study includes two parts; in the first part you are invited to complete a survey about your teaching practice and goals for teaching history, the influences on your practices and goals, and your views and attitudes towards ethical judgments when teaching history. In the second part I identify three to five teachers to conduct case studies with to gain a deeper understanding of the different ways that ethical judgments are present in history classes and how teachers and students approach ethical judgments in these classes.

If you would like to participate in this research, or if you have any questions or need further information with respect to this study, you may contact the Principal investigator of the study, Dr. Peter Seixas at (604) 822 5277 or by e-mail at peter.seixas@ubc.ca or the Co-investigator of the study Lindsay Gibson at (250) 717-3213 or by e-mail at lindsay.s.gibson@gmail.com

Sincerely,

Peter Seixas, Ph.D.          Lindsay Gibson
### Appendix H: Comparison of the Four Teachers' Lessons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mr. Arbour</th>
<th>Mr. Bay</th>
<th>Mr. Hunter</th>
<th>Mr. Mahoney</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>56 minutes</td>
<td>30 minutes</td>
<td>37 minutes</td>
<td>2 hours 14 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students read Canadian Encyclopedia article on Japanese Internment (9 minutes)</td>
<td>Teacher went over PowerPoint on Japanese Internment while students wrote notes (8 minutes)</td>
<td>Teachers and students read two photocopied textbook pages &quot;Evacuation of the Japanese Canadians&quot; together (10 minutes)</td>
<td>Teacher and students analyzed two primary sources together (23 minutes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class discussion about the points of interest or questions that emerged from the Canadian Encyclopedia article (3 minutes)</td>
<td>Teacher showed CAPH Video &quot;The Dispossessed&quot; (7 minutes)</td>
<td>Teacher showed CAPH Video &quot;The Dispossessed&quot; (7 minutes)</td>
<td>Teacher introduced the ethical judgment question that students were expected to answer at the end of the lesson (3 minutes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher read Living Landscapes secondary source to describe Japanese internment (3 minutes)</td>
<td>Teacher showed photographs of Japanese internment and the Holocaust (4 minutes)</td>
<td>Students were assigned and completed two questions from the textbook (20 minutes)</td>
<td>Teacher discussed Japanese Internment PowerPoint slides #1, 2, and 4 and told personal stories about internment (11 minutes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class discussion continued (12 minutes)</td>
<td>Students were assigned and completed a writing assignment (11 minutes)</td>
<td>Teacher showed CAPH Video &quot;The Dispossessed&quot; (7 minutes)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher showed CAPH Video &quot;The Dispossessed&quot; (8 minutes)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher showed Japanese Internment PowerPoint Slide #3 (4 minutes)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students were assigned and completed questions from the textbook</td>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher and students read the first section of Japanese Canadian Internment Backgrounder together</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 minutes</td>
<td>Students worked read the rest of the backgrounder individually and classified the events as justifying or not justifying internment (17 minutes)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher re-introduced the ethical judgment question that students were asked to respond to (3 minutes)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher showed the historical photograph of the city welcome sign (3 minutes)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher further explained the assignment to students (3 minutes)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students wrote and submitted written assignment (42 minutes)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>