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Introduction

In this article I wish to discuss the scholarly communities of RE in Finland during the comprehensive education era from the 1970’s. This is done by describing the contextual developments in RE in Finland during the past 40 years from the time the comprehensive school was introduced in Finland. The description of the contextual elements focuses on the interplay between curriculum development and research of some of the key actors in the field due to their contributions to RE didactics, and supports the presentation with a description of RE didactic books and selected PhD research since the 1980’s. The “didactic books” refer to academic books on RE that have a scientific basis and have been used primarily for teacher education, and research. A more extensive analysis of the didactical models and the respective books concerning Finnish RE have been analysed and published earlier (Kallioniemi & Ubani, 2010; Ubani, 2014). As the clear causalities are difficult to establish and verify for the topic, the article wishes to open a discussion about the topic by describing the connections between the aforementioned aspects – the next possible step would be to verify observations with interviews from the scholars from the presented era. Thus, bearing in mind the restrictions of the approach, the research questions for this article is: "How have the scholarly communities contributed to RE didactics in Finland in the past decades?"

In Finland, curriculum development, scholarly communities, didactic textbooks and teacher education form a complex inter-related totality. There are many reasons for this but perhaps one reason is that often the same people have been responsible for RE related research into curriculum development and teacher education: for instance, Tamminen (1970), Niemi (NCCBE 1985), Kallioniemi (NCCBE 2004) and Ubani (NCCBE 2016) have taken part in all three. Furthermore, many of the researchers, such as Pyysiäinen, Niemi and Tamminen, have also produced school books and RE didactic book.

While studying the topic I distinguish between

- RE – the school subject,
- RE didactics and didactics of RE as a research-based theoretical educational/pedagogical model for teaching RE
- Religious Education as a discipline with university chairs, and
- Religious Education as a field with influences from various disciplines and contributions from different scholarly communities.

In the next discussion of the main scholarly communities of the Finnish field of Religious Education, I will refer to Education, Theology, Religious studies and Anthropology. Each of these have contributed to the development of the field in some capacity. In the Finnish field of religious education the scholarly community of Education is involved with generic theories in educational sciences, multicultural education and subject didactics. The scholarly community of Theology includes the theological fields in general and Religious Education as a theological discipline. The
scholarly communities have contributed to Finnish RE in different ways. The generic theories of education have provided RE the conceptual tools and outlook on educational practice for the past decades substituting the German didactics on RE gradually by the late 1990’s. Multicultural education has provided the concepts for discussing plurality in religious education. In the following discussion I will in principle refer to ‘Religious Education’ when discussing the academic discipline, and to ‘RE’ when discussing the school subject. The scholarly communities will be discussed by providing first an overview of the historical developments in religious education as an academic discipline and the role of Kalevi Tamminen in shaping its basis in the psychology of religion. After this the ‘turn’ that took place in the 1980’s and 1990’s is described which highlights the influence of Hannele Niemi. After this the recent developments are discussed.

The background for Religious education as an academic discipline: Tamminen’s era

It can be argued that the role of Professor of Religious Education Kalevi Tamminen in shaping the field and academic discipline of Religious Education and RE is integral for many reasons. It cannot be overlooked that during Tamminen’s era from the late 1960’s until the mid 1990’s religious education as an academic discipline and field took shape and developed laying the basis for international networking and characteristically empirical research-based grounding. In addition, during this time the subject of RE was formulated anew as part of the new comprehensive school system in Finland that begun from the 1970’s onward.

In Finland, just as in most Western societies, Religious Education as an academic discipline was originally placed within the scholarly community of Theology and Practical Theology in the 1960’s. In general, theology as a field has been education and teaching oriented: for instance the Faculty of Theology at the University of Helsinki had established a professorship of didactics and education already in 1852 but it had later been moved over to the Faculty of Philosophy and later became a chair for the educational sciences (Kansanaho, 1988). Originally the discipline of religious education was based on two academic traditions: one being Church didactics or catechesis and the other from Germany was reform pedagogy (Rothgangel, 2012). The German reform pedagogy for RE originated in the early 1900’s parallel to other progressive reformist movements in education. In general, the emphasis in the reform pedagogy for RE was on child-centred approaches to school education instead of catechesis (Kansanaho, 1988). Theology in general has provided religious education with much of its conceptual justification until the late 1980’s and arguably much the typology for the content of RE in schools up to today.

In Finland research in religious education was under the purview of Theology during the late 1960’s until 1980 and later. Traditionally and since then Finnish religious education has relied much on research into the psychology of religion. Kalevi Tamminen’s (1991) influential studies on the development of religious thinking influenced by Goldman’s (1964) work based on cognitive developmental
theory (see Kallioniemi, 2004) provided confessional school RE with a scientific basis in line with German currents in RE didactics (Kallioniemi & Ubani, 2010).

We can notice a few interesting trends in the development of Finnish scholarly emphases concerning didactics of RE when examining some of the major Finnish scholars concerned with religious education over the past decades (Table 1). Many researchers did their dissertation research within the framework of religious education as a field but the actual contribution to Finnish didactics of religious education came in a different piece than the dissertation study and the two had little or nothing to do with each other. Such is the case with Hannele Niemi (1978, 1991) and Martin Ubani (2007; 2013) as is later described.

To this group of researchers belongs for instance the first chair of Religious Education, Kalevi Tamminen. Tamminen was appointed Professor of Religious Education in 1968. Tamminen’s thesis research focused on the curricula in religious education in basic education between 1898-1939. The story goes that his initial study was extensive and as a result his supervisor instructed him to split his thesis into two parts (Tamminen, 2004). His thesis in Theology was in the field of Church History and focused on the years 1898-1912 (Tamminen, 1967b). The thesis in educational sciences focused on the years 1912-1939 (Tamminen, 1967a). Tamminen defended both theses successfully in 1967. The next year he was appointed the first professor of religious education in Finland.

Tamminen’s 25 years as a professor of religious education established the psychology of religion as the main scholarly field partnering with educational sciences in religious education. Regardless of his vast knowledge in the history of the curriculum in religious education he based his developing of religious education on the empirical studies into the development of religiousness and religious thinking of children and youth. While arguably inspired by the increase in knowledge of the cognitive psychological processes of the individual at that time, Tamminen included other somewhat more sociology of religion viewpoints i.e. those of Glock and Starck (1965) and Ninian Smart (1978), into children’s and youth’s religious lives than Ronald Goldman’s (Tamminen, 1991). Goldman (1964) based his work on the religious thinking of pupils mainly from the Piagetian cognitive psychology. Perhaps Tamminen’s best known contribution is his longitudinal research into the development of religiosity among Finnish children and youth: a research study that spanned data from the late 1960’s to publications in 1990’s (Tamminen, 1968; Tamminen, 1991; 1994; 1996).

Tamminen’s era gave the foundation for the international nature of religious education research in Finland. Tamminen’s work was internationally recognized and he received a prize from APA for his research in 1994. Some of his important connections included Ernst Nipkow from Germany and John Peatling from the United States of America, both known for their important research into the cognitive psychology of religion. Tamminen also cooperated with Nordic researchers and especially with Sven Hartman. As further evidence of his international networking and appreciation, in 1978 Tamminen was invited as one of 40 delegates from the US and Europe to arguably the main international conference in religious education, the first
International Seminar on Religious Education Values. He participated actively in the succeeding conferences, too. Tamminen also published in English (1991; 1996) and followed the international discussion concerning religious development. One interesting piece is his evaluation of Oser’s and Fowler’s developmental stages using his data (Tamminen, 1994). Tamminen’s work established a strong emphasis on the psychology of religion in the field of religious education. Some of his students published dissertations based on the cognitive psychology of religion, especially stages of development, such as Oikarinen’s (1993) systematic analysis on the coherence of Fowler’s (1981) theory on the formation of faith. There were some theses on the curriculum of RE (Pyysiäinen, 1982) but for 20 years most of the research concerning RE was based on the cognitive psychology of religion.

Since Tamminen’s time to the present, the field of Religious Education has acted as a loose meeting point for ideas and views from different scholarly communities concerning religious education as a subject, however, the developing independence of didactics of RE has to some extent acted in this manner as well (Ubani, 2013). For the past decades in this developing independence the role of subject didactics from the scholarly community of Education has become increasingly the substitute point of identification for the didactics of RE instead of the theological discipline; Religious Education. Within Theology, the Psychology of Religion provided a basis for Religious Education in Finland, the views concerning learning in RE and the descriptions of the developing processes of students being taught (Tamminen & Vesa, 1981) but during the past decades the conceptualization of learning processes has moved towards a more humanist outlook (Niemi, 1991), and finally to educational sciences (Kallioniemi & Luodeslampi, 2005; Ubani, 2013) these shifts can be seen in the theoretical background of the didactic textbooks in RE (Table 3). Until 2010, the Religious Studies and Anthropology scholarly communities mainly offered supplemental content for RE as a school subject but they seem to have increased their presence in the content of the last national curriculum (NCCBE 2016; NCCUSE 2016).

The emergence of new scholarly communities is connected with societal and individual changes to religion in Finland that is exemplified in the curricular changes (Table 1). Table 1 presents the main curricular development of RE in schools from the viewpoints of the objectives of instruction and confessionality. In short, the objectives of RE curriculum have shifted from an emphasis on personality development (1970), values education (1985) to roughly 20 years of emphasis on general knowledge about religions (1994, 2004, 2014). The confessional nature of the subject has also been reduced. Instruction in the 1970’s was based on the Bible: in other words the Bible was used more or less as the justification, measuring stick and content of instruction.
The ‘turn’ in the late 1980’s and 1990’s concerning the scholarly basis of RE: Humanistic psychology and Niemi’s influence

In the 1980’s and 1990’s there were changes concerning RE that encompassed not only the RE subject but also RE didactics. These changes were to provide the bases for future developments of the subject and RE didactics, and arguably most of the changes were at least connected to the work of Hannele Niemi. Finland saw a change in the nature of RE confessionality subject in 1985. While the contents of the Bible were still important, the student-centred approach prevailed. The idea was that the Bible’s contents would give material for the development of the personal conviction of the pupils. In 1994 the curriculum clearly emphasized that confessionality was at the heart of RE aims and objectives. As the objectives emphasized the development of knowledge about religions, it meant that the majority of the content used were based on Christianity. Arguably the theological disciplines still provided the school subject with a typology for what sort of knowledge should be gained and for developing and examining the validity of the curricula. However, this curricular change signaled a change toward the recognition of scholarly approaches other than Theology to RE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Main development of Finnish State Curricula in Basic Education</th>
<th>Confessionality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Culturally equipped person, developing personality, responsibility for one’s neighbour</td>
<td>Bible based (general) Christian teaching, broadening the conception of confessionality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Developing and forwarding values and value systems</td>
<td>Offering Biblical themes to develop one’s own personal conviction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Comprehensive religious general knowledge and knowledge of religions</td>
<td>Confessionality is applied to the objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Religious general knowledge and knowledge of religions</td>
<td>Teaching with an emphasis on one’s own religion, pedagogical confessionality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Religious general knowledge and knowledge of religions and non-religious convictions, religious pluralism within and outside traditions</td>
<td>Teaching with an emphasis on one’s own religion and the many forms it takes shape, pedagogical confessionality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interestingly this emerging change in emphasis on research into RE still included a psychological input. In addition to Tamminen’s approach, during 1980 there was also an increasing contribution from humanistic psychology to RE and RE didactics (Niemi, 1991; Kallioniemi & Ubani, 2010). Evidently this rise was connected with a broader movement within education towards holistic education which was connected with the romantic humanism (Miller, 2005) and global awareness concerning children’s rights that provided justification for the previous educational initiative.
These both were recognized and exemplified in the work of Hannele Niemi, who held various Professor of Education posts, with his last appointment being at the University of Helsinki. Niemi’s interest in personal psychology was already apparent in her dissertation on student anxiety in confirmation schools. Her dissertation was based on Raymond Cattell’s Sixteen Personality Factor model (see Cattell, 1990) and she used it for developing the confirmation school curriculum (Niemi, 1978). In the 1985 national core curriculum for basic education in Finnish schools (NCCBE 1985) Niemi was part of the development group of the curricula for RE - a curriculum that recognized holistic development and children’s rights explicitly.

It should be noted that regardless of Niemi being a master’s graduate in religious education, from the Faculty of Theology, and her focus on confirmation school in her thesis, she defended her thesis in the Faculty of Education. It is of interest that over 15 years later Kirsi Tirri (1993) with the same academic background whose PhD topic was not concerned with religious education but was about teachers’ pedagogical thinking defended her thesis also in the Faculty of Education. Actually, the first female PhD to defend her dissertation in the academic field of religious education was Kati Niemelä in 1999 with her study on theology students career motives and professional orientation (Niemelä, 1999). This study combined Niemelä’s previous expertise and qualification in student school guidance counselling with theology.

This link between personality psychology with education and didactics was present in Niemi’s subsequent works, too, for instance Niemi’s studied student teachers personalities and interaction attitudes (1984). Subsequently, Niemi (1991) based her RE didactics approach on those of various pioneers in humanistic psychology and education, such as Rollo May, Carl Rogers and especially Viktor Frankl. This was an important development that still has an effect on religion as a discipline. For instance, among recent professors of religious education Tirri and Kallioniemi represent Niemi’s approach to religious education. Also from a later generation Ubani (2007) has been influenced by Niemi’s thinking as he was a student of Tirri and Kallioniemi and due to the dominant position of Niemi’s (1991) book on the didactics of RE during the 1990’s. In contrast Antti Räsänen’s (2002) research into religious judgement is based on Fritz Oser’s theory of religious judgement and more represents the research tradition established by Tamminen.

The ‘turn’ of the 1980’s and 1990’s in exemplified didactic models of RE

One way to make concrete the ‘turn’ that came into effect in research concerning RE is to examine the RE didactics books. I use the concept “RE didactics books” in the sense defined in the introduction section: as research based theoretical model teaching RE in schools. Table 2 presents the different RE didactics books used during the past 40 years in Finland (see Kallioniemi & Ubani, 2010). Table 3 includes the authors, didactical approach, the school levels the approach was purpose for, the main theories behind the model, the countries from where the main influences were
drawn from and finally the disciplines and scholarly communities from where the argumentation was drawn. Table 3 includes compilation books as well. However, Table 3 also shows how the argumentation changed from Theology to Humanistic and then to the educational sciences.

### TABLE 2

The didactical approaches presented in the books

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>View of human</th>
<th>View of education</th>
<th>View of religion</th>
<th>Educational aim</th>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>Contents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contextual RE (Tamminen &amp; Vesa 1981)</td>
<td>Religious-cognitive The child as a religious thinker with religious experiences</td>
<td>Teaching on issues that match the cognitive developmental phase (+motivation and life questions)</td>
<td>Learning religion, religion is internalized and then applied in life</td>
<td>Perception of one’s religious worldview and conviction</td>
<td>Comprehensive general pedagogical methods</td>
<td>Theological disciplinary approach to curriculum content, world religions, life questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existential-analytical didactics (Niemi 1991)</td>
<td>Franklian-humanistic: The child as a meaning seeker</td>
<td>Holistic school pedagogy</td>
<td>Learning from religion, religious tradition as a tool to support the holistic development</td>
<td>Becoming the subject in life: consciousness of responsibility and significance in a shared world</td>
<td>Comprehensive general pedagogical methods</td>
<td>Holistic humanistic view to curriculum content: knowledge, social, identity, meaning of life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didactics for religious and values education (Tirri &amp; Kesola 1998)</td>
<td>Humanistic-Existential The relationship between existential experiences and religious concepts, the developmental phase</td>
<td>Learning from religion, the relationship between religion and one’s life</td>
<td>The development of existential thinking and relationship to the Church</td>
<td>Comprehensive general pedagogical methods, media education</td>
<td>Life questions and the Church calendar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE classroom culture (Ubani 2013)</td>
<td>Socio-holistic The classroom community cultivates the relationship to religion</td>
<td>Learning from religion, active recognition of diversity</td>
<td>Becoming a cultivated and engaged person with regards to religion</td>
<td>Functional approach to methods</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first didactic book is “This is how I teach Religion” by Kalevi Tamminen and Laulikki Vesa (1981). The second book is “Didactics of RE. Students developing into subjects in life” by Hannele Niemi (1991), the third is “Didactics for religious and values education” by Kirsi Tirri and Anne Kesola (1996) and the last one is “Religious Education (RE) in Basic Education” by Martin Ubani (2013a). These books have acknowledged status and they are used as didactic books in the fields of religious education and RE teacher education and have a unified science-based approach to RE. The compilation works are excluded as their contributors may represent contrasting viewpoints to RE within the volume. While they are of a very high level, these are more didactic handbooks on integral topics related to RE without an explicit theoretical framework (Pyysiäinen & Seppälä, 1998; Kallioniemi & Luodeslampi, 2005). In addition, there is one book that has been used in RE teacher education: a book based on problem-based and imaginative approach education (Heinonen, 1993) that is omitted from this examination due to its broad focus on values education – not exclusively on religious education.
The change that occurred in 1985 was also exemplified in the didactical textbooks of religious education. Table 2 describes the different Finnish didactical approaches to RE. In the tables also the respective views of mankind, education and religion are described along with the educational aim, description of methods and contents presented in the textbook. In general, while Tamminen and Vesa’s (1981) contextual RE approach draws from research into cognitive psychology of religion and uses theological disciplines the organizing principle of the content, Niemi’s (1991) existential analytical didactics represents the infusion of humanistic psychology into religious education. This approach was to some extent present in Tirri and Kesola’s (1998) didactics for religious and values education but the latter also had a strong educational sciences outlook by combining constructivist learning theory with the existential RE theory of Grimmitt (1987) on religious education – the former relied on holistic and cognitive learning theories (Niemi 1991).

Gradually during the 1980’s and 1990’s but especially during the 2000’s there was a development of subject didactics in religious education that drew increasingly from the educational sciences and humanistic psychology. During those times the ‘learning from religion’ emphasis has emerged as an independent viewpoint from the traditional ‘learning religion’ approach in Finnish religious education (Niemi, 1991; Puolimatka & Tirri, 2000). This turn was exemplified by the book “Didactics of RE” by the previously introduced Niemi in 1991. Her views have been influential for RE in many

### TABLE 3

*Descriptions of all the RE didactics workbooks since the 1980’s*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Didactics</th>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>Theories</th>
<th>Influences from</th>
<th>Emphasis</th>
<th>Argumentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Kalevi Tamminen &amp; Laulikki Vesa</td>
<td>Contextual RE</td>
<td>Basic education, upper secondary education</td>
<td>Problem based RE, Cognitive psychology (of religion)</td>
<td>Germany, Sweden, UK</td>
<td>Theoretical - practical</td>
<td>Theological</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Hannele Niemi</td>
<td>Existential analytic didactics</td>
<td>Basic education</td>
<td>Humanistic psychology, logotherapy</td>
<td>United States, UK</td>
<td>Theoretical - practical</td>
<td>Humanistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Kirsi Tirri &amp; Anne Kesola</td>
<td>Didactics for religious and values education</td>
<td>Primary education</td>
<td>Cognitive psychology of religions, existential RE</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Practical - theoretical</td>
<td>Educational sciences, RE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Arto Kallioniemi &amp; Juha Luodeslampi (Eds.)</td>
<td>(Religious education in the new Millennium)</td>
<td>Basic education, Upper secondary education</td>
<td>Generally constructivist learning theory</td>
<td>Comprehensiv</td>
<td>Educational sciences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Martin Ubani</td>
<td>Didactics in the RE classroom</td>
<td>Basic education</td>
<td>Dialectic: Educational</td>
<td>Theoretical, comprehensiv</td>
<td>Educational sciences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ways. The book was still in use until 2010’s in a few of the teacher education institutions in Finland. In addition, Niemi was also involved in the national curriculum work in religious education for the 1985 curriculum. Furthermore, she was the supervisor or mentor at some point of their careers of two of the three professors of Religious Education of 2000’s: Arto Kallioniemi from the Department of Teacher Education and Kirsi Tirri from the Faculty of Theology. Connected to her views, the denominational elements become increasingly a source for reflection on personal meaning at schools (Kallioniemi & Ubani, 2008). In fact the emphasis of meaningfulness has ever since been very strong in Finnish RE. As has been indicated, this approach has drawn from existential philosophy and humanistic psychology (Niemi, 1991).

The shift in the didactics of RE from a theological conception to Niemi’s humanistic approach to RE together with the 1994 curriculum change (Table 1) that emphasized general knowledge of religions as the main objective arguably came together to produce the main shift in RE. Subsequently, in the 2000’s as part of the freedom of religion debate the legislation underlined that RE in school should not be confessional (Ubani, 2013a; Ubani & Tirri, 2014). The Finnish Board of Education issued a statement that the change in wording from “confessional instruction” to “instruction according to one’s own religion” would not cause any changes in content: it was made to seem that the change in wording reflected the change that had taken place earlier already in the nature of the subject (Board of Education, 2006).

Table 4 depicts the completed PhD studies that have relevance for Finnish RE. In the table are also listed the dissertations that are mentioned in this article. While some, especially the later, works, focus on RE and on some intrinsic questions concerning the subject, the others merely give implications for schools and for RE but their focus is not on RE.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Scholarly community keywords</th>
<th>Implications and discussion concerning RE at schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tamminen, Kalevi</td>
<td>Education and Faculty of theology, University of Helsinki</td>
<td>The curriculum of RE in grammar school during 1898-1912 and 1912-1939</td>
<td>Theology, Curriculum studies, Educational history, Church history</td>
<td>Description of the content and processes of previous curricula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niemi, Hannele</td>
<td>Education, University of Helsinki</td>
<td>The personality of confirmation school students</td>
<td>Education, Educational psychology, Psychology, Didactics</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyykkönen, Markku</td>
<td>Religious Education, Theology, University of Helsinki</td>
<td>Confessional, non-confessional and objective RE</td>
<td>Theology, Curriculum studies, Educational history</td>
<td>Gives conceptual clarification for RE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okurinen, Lauri</td>
<td>Religious Education, Theology, University of Helsinki</td>
<td>Theoretical consistency of Fowler’s stages of faith</td>
<td>Theology, Psychology of religion</td>
<td>Recognition of religious psychological development phase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kallionemi, Arto</td>
<td>Religious Education, Theology, University of Helsinki</td>
<td>The professional image of RE teachers</td>
<td>Teacher education, Didactics</td>
<td>Mainly teacher education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frängen, Marianne</td>
<td>Religious Education, Theology, University of Helsinki</td>
<td>The personal worldview of Finnish and Swedish children and youth</td>
<td>Theology, Psychology of religion</td>
<td>Mainly recognition of importance in RE for student well being</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saine, Harri</td>
<td>Education, University of Turku</td>
<td>RE at Finnish schools in 1900’s</td>
<td>Education, Curriculum studies and Educational history</td>
<td>None, but description of the developments in RE during 1900’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puukki, Lassi</td>
<td>Religious Education, Theology, University of Helsinki</td>
<td>The relationship between faith and education in Haavo’s thinking</td>
<td>Theology</td>
<td>Gives understanding on fundamental issue in RE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Käräinen, Antti</td>
<td>Religious Education, Theology, University of Helsinki</td>
<td>The developmental path of religiosity of adults</td>
<td>Theology, Psychology of religion</td>
<td>Little, in principle recognition of faith formation processes of students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ubani, Martín</td>
<td>Education, University of Helsinki</td>
<td>Spirituality of the academic gifted sixth graders</td>
<td>Education, Psychology of religion</td>
<td>Recognition of spiritual and holistic development in RE practice and curricula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hella, Elina</td>
<td>Religious Education, Theology, University of Helsinki</td>
<td>Perceptions of Lutheran RE teachers and students on Lutheranism</td>
<td>Education, Educational psychology, Religious education</td>
<td>Development of Lutheran RE practices, student growth and learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuusisto, Arnika</td>
<td>Education, University of Helsinki</td>
<td>Adventist youth’s identity development and socialization</td>
<td>Sociology of religion, Religious education, Multicultural education</td>
<td>Recognition of contextual aspects in socialization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holm, Kristiina</td>
<td>Education, University of Helsinki</td>
<td>Ethical, intercultural and interreligious sensitivities of Lutheran and other students</td>
<td>Education, Multicultural education</td>
<td>Recognition and acceptance of the diversity of religions, values and cultures in a relativistic framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulter, Saira</td>
<td>Education, University of Tampere</td>
<td>The role of RE in civic education</td>
<td>Education, Curriculum studies, Educational history, Didactics</td>
<td>Development of philosophical and societal basis for RE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virvalainen, Reijo</td>
<td>Religious Education, Theology, University of Eastern Finland</td>
<td>Kurt Fehr’s views on Evangelical RE in Germany from 1930’s to 1970’s</td>
<td>Religious Education</td>
<td>Recognition of confessional basis of RE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rissanen, Inkeri</td>
<td>Religious Education, Theology, University of Helsinki</td>
<td>Identity processes for girls in Islamic RE</td>
<td>Religious education, Multicultural education</td>
<td>RE as a space for reflection on one’s own religion, the importance of RE teacher’s ethics for sound teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hokkanen, Pete</td>
<td>Law, University of Tampere</td>
<td>Freedom of religion in an increasing multicultural school</td>
<td>Law, religious education, Multicultural education, Didactics</td>
<td>Revision of Finnish RE model towards value inclusive and integration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zilliacus, Harriet</td>
<td>Education, University of Helsinki</td>
<td>Teacher’s and coordinator’s views on supporting identity in minority RE and ethics</td>
<td>Education, Multicultural education, Religious education</td>
<td>Development of RE practices in light of identity development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The late 1990’s: RE becomes educational sciences driven

In the late 1990’s, it can be argued that the developments that were represented by Niemi’s work continued to the extent that RE became educational sciences driven and RE didactics differentiated itself from earlier theological and psychological influences. The dissertation that represents a change toward didactics in RE that is referred to here is Arto Kallioniemi’s (1997) dissertation on the occupational profile of practicing RE teachers. Kallioniemi’s research exemplifies the rise of education as an integral scholarly community for religious education. Kallioniemi defended his thesis in religious education for the Faculty of Theology in 1997 under the supervision of Tamminen’s successor Professor of Religious Education Jarkko Seppälä. However, the dissertation was published in the research series of the Department of Teacher Education. While research into professionalism in Theology was then as extinct as today, it is noteworthy that the dissertation’s theoretical discussion focuses mainly on general research into professionalism and especially into research on teachers’ professionalism in education and applies these concepts to the profession of the RE teacher. The discussion portion in the dissertation solely addresses issues related to generic educational literature and especially research on professionalism (Kallioniemi 1997). Arguably Kallioniemi can be described as the first researcher of religious education whose empirical dissertation focused exclusively on the generic educational literature and where RE at schools was the primary contextual framework. In fact, the term ‘applied educational research into RE’ and ‘RE subject didactics’ seems most appropriate when describing Kallioniemi’s dissertation and his subsequent works (Kallioniemi 2004; Åhs, Poulter & Kallioniemi 2016). It should be noted though that Pyysiäinen’s (1982) thorough dissertation on the confessionality of RE, albeit not empirical, was similarly to Tamminen’s (1967a; 1967b) dissertations focused on RE at schools. However, Kallioniemi’s work used educational theories as the basis of the study and implemented it within a RE context. In other words: it was more a study of teacher’s professionalism in the context of RE and the lack of reference to RE, conviction or other issues relevant to Theology seems to prove this point (see Kallioniemi 1997). Needless to say it was very fitting that Kallioniemi’s career has been in teacher education and not in theology.

However, it would not be correct to describe changes in religious education research as a total paradigm shift after Tamminen’s immediate era: research into the psychology of religion has continued under the umbrella of the academic discipline of religious education to the present time. Research in this vein is exemplified by the empirical and psychometric work done by Räsänen on religious judgment in different age groups that is based on the work of Oser and Gmünder (1991). Antti Räsänen’s (2002) dissertation focused on the religiousness of adults. The study’s framework is cognitive psychology research into religiousness and moral thinking. Understandably the research does not put much emphasis on school education. The one important notion is in the discussion chapter (p. 261) where Räsänen acknowledges the processual nature of religiousness in instruction in schools and in confirmation education. However, Antti Räsäsen’s research on religiousness was published in a
different era than Tamminen’s: it is fair to describe that the research field for RE became more diverse and dialectical during the 2000’s and late 1990’s.

Although published in 2002, the next dissertation study referred to here can be seen as the last dissertation that belongs to Tamminen’s era as he supervised the very first research projects and influenced the topic of the study (Pruuki, 2002). In 2002 Lassi Pruuki (2002) defended his dissertation on the thinking of Finnish theologian and education philosopher, priest and professor of Education Martti H. Haavio (1897-1966) in the discipline of Religious Education, at the Faculty of Theology, University of Helsinki. The focus of the dissertation is the relationship between faith and education in Haavio’s pedagogy. As Haavio did not specifically differentiate between Christian education and school education, and was arguably the central figure in the early forming of Finnish religious education pedagogy through his involvement in curriculum development, several education textbooks on the topic, school books for RE that was used from the 1950’s until the 1970’s, that is, until the evolving of basic education, and his involvement in teacher education. What makes this research stand out among other dissertations is its systematic analysis of Haavio’s work: often the dissertations especially on religious education in schools have used empirical methods. Pruuki (2002) clearly operates within the scholarly community of Theology. However, while it makes a very elaborate analysis of Haavio’s thinking, the study itself does not carry any implications for school education.

However, arguably the connection with the disciplines of Theology were still visible in the 2004 national curriculum for RE in upper secondary education. The Exegetics was concretely reflected in the Biblical content, Church History in the history of Christianity and Lutheranism, Systematic Theology in the contents on doctrine and Ethics, Practical Theology in the contents related to Church life and religiousness, and Religious Studies in the World Religions contents. It should also be noted that prior to 2004 the five courses of Religious Education given in upper secondary school reflected these Theological disciplines almost per se (NCCUSE 1985). However, it can be concluded that from 2004 onward the content has increasingly included materials from other religions and in 2016 the diversity of one’s own tradition has also been recognized. In addition to some increase in the importance of religious studies as a scholarly community in RE, in 2016 cultural anthropology has visibly emerged as a viable discipline that can contribute to the knowledge matter and organization of the content of RE.

From the turn of the 2000’s we can describe subject didactics in RE as an independent and autonomous research field that has distanced itself from Theology. It can be said that religious education subject didactics in Finland became an applied science of Education as constructivism (and to some extent socio-cultural learning theories) dominated the theoretical discourse in religious education. Thus issues such as our relationship with God and the religiousness of the child were rarely mentioned in discussions concerning RE from 1998 onwards. This was when a compilation course book of religious education in school RE was published (Pyysiäinen & Seppälä, 1998). This distancing supported by the establishing of a professorship of religious education (the actual translation would be ‘didactics of RE’ but ‘professor of
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religious education is the official translation”) at the Department of Teacher Education at the University of Helsinki. As was described earlier the holder of the professorships own dissertation from 1997 was about the professional images of the RE teachers and the theoretical background was solely from educational sciences and related fields of professional development (Kallioniemi, 1997).

In the early 2000’s there were also global developments within the Psychology of Religion that became evident in RE research (Oser, Scarlett & Buchner, 2006). This view challenged the traditional institution bound study of religiousness with a more post-modern, culture-relativist and universal conception of spirituality (ibid.; Hay, 1998). In the field of religious education in Finland this “spiritual child movement” (Oser & Scarlett, 2006) drew influences for instance from holistic education and religious studies. Consequently, there was also a shift in Finnish studies of students’ religiousness to spirituality. This change was similar to what had been witnessed globally. Spirituality became central to the research activities of Finnish researchers in the field of religious education. It emphasized an inclusive and universal interpretation of spirituality instead of religiosity (Tirri, 2004; Ubani, 2007; Tirri & Ubani, 2013; Ubani & Tirri, 2014).

This change coincided with the aforementioned trends in Finnish state religious education in the early 2000’s where the confessional nature of the subject was questioned and eventually narrowed (Ubani 2013a). This also coincided with the “new internationalization” of Finnish religious education research. The research into what was spirituality was relatively fruitful (cf. Ryhänen, 2006; Ubani, 2007) but short-lived and today studies on spirituality are among various alternatives for studying personal beliefs and related processes and phenomena. There are, however, still some on-going studies on the topic (Murtonen, 2015).

Ubani’s (2007) dissertation in English focused on the spirituality of gifted sixth grade pupils (Table 4). While the study was defended in Education, it was completed as a research project located in the Faculty of Theology and was supervised by both Kallioniemi and Tirri. The study resembles the research approach present in Niemi’s dissertation, where personality psychology and in this case the psychology of religion/spirituality is researched in a school context. Ubani’s dissertation represents the aforementioned phase of the discipline of Religious Education in Finland in the first decade of the 2000’s as it derives its concepts from the international discussions within Religious Education discipline, such as, holistic development (Best, 2000; Erricker & Erricker, 2000), spiritual child movement (Hay, 1998) and spiritual intelligence (Gardner, 1999; Emmons, 2000). With regards to scholarly communities this dissertation with its multiple viewpoints on spirituality is at the intersection of humanistic/personality psychology and psychology on religion and uses education mainly as a research context and a context for the implementation of its results. In other words, there is little empirical evidence of the psychological phenomenon studied (spirituality) to be actualized in educational situations, yet the dissertation makes a case for several recommendations concerning educational policy and practice. The study discusses its findings in relation to holistic education and curricula in general and also to the Finnish national RE curriculum. Ubani’s subsequent work on
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Didactics has had little to do with the dissertation, although he has discussed existentially sensitive education (Ubani, 2013b) and researched spiritual sensitivity in the RE classroom context (Ikonen & Ubani, 2013) in his later works. Especially the latter study represents a study where a psychological phenomenon (spirituality) is researched in an authentic research setting – an approach that is becoming more and more distinctive of the research carried out in the field of Religious Education at the University of Eastern Finland during Ubani has held the Chair of Professor of Religious Education from 2013 onward.

Later developments concerning the scholarly fields: the emergence of Multicultural Education

Today, it can be argued that research into RE is in a situation where the pluralist reality in Finnish society and schools has an influence on the discussions and research concerning RE. Currently the research in RE continues to draw dominantly from aspects of generic educational sciences and from multicultural education. This can be seen in Ubani’s (2013a) RE didactics textbook’s (Tables 2 & 3) socio-holistic approach to classroom culture where educational theories are used as the basis for conceptualizing religious education. It seems that RE subject didactics does not seem to have developed a strong identity or a paradigm of its own but is dialectical and context sensitive in nature utilizing theories from many fields with the exemption of the German didactics tradition.

However, what it distinctive is the recent rise of the role of *multicultural education* from Educational Sciences as a scholarly community in the field religious education can be witnessed so that three of the more recent dissertations in Finland concerning education in schools are to some extent grounded in theories of multicultural education (Rissanen, 2013; Holm, 2012; Zilliacus, 2014) or secularization (Poulter, 2013). It is not so much that multicultural education as a field partakes in the discussions concerning Finnish RE but rather that most of these researchers draw from these influences when discussing Finnish religious education. In some ways it seems that multicultural education and not religious studies of education has gained a foothold through the pluralism and diversification of religious demographics in Finland. Rissanen’s (2013) thesis in English on Religious Education in Theology focuses on the identity negotiation of Muslim students in Islamic religious education, Holm’s (2012) thesis in English for the Faculty of Education, which began in the Faculty of Religious Education, discusses the ethical, intercultural and interreligious sensitivities of Lutheran students, and Saila Poulter’s thesis in Finnish for the Faculty of Education is about the role of religious education in civic education and uses for instance RE didactic text books and various documents relevant to school policy concerning school education and RE in particular. In a way Poulter’s thesis represents a return to the school history research that was employed by Tamminen in his dissertations (1967a; 1967b), albeit there is a stronger use of theories for interpretation, secularization and particularly civic education. The theoretical
approach aids the argumentation whose purpose is the justification of religious education in today’s school. The element of justification that was not present in Tamminen’s work in Poulter reflects the need for RE to justify and rephrase the legitimacy of its existence in modern school education.

However, as the scholarly communities that affect religious education vary and as there are only a few practicing researchers in the field with fewer research projects, the construction of knowledge remains fragmented (see Poulter, 2014. In addition, there are only a few studies that are based on previous studies so that there is not much of a build-up of the construction of knowledge within a research track or focus. Perhaps the most notable and exceptional studies in this sense are the studies on multiculturalism and religion in public education that have centered around Arniika Kuusisto (Kuusisto, Riitaoja & Poulter, 2011; Kuusisto & Benjamin, 2015; Kuusisto & Lamminmäki-Vartia, 2013), Antti Räsäsen’s development work and data gathering with the Religious Judgment Test (Räsänen, 2002; 2006 & 2015) and Kirsi Tirri’s work with the spiritual sensitivity scale along with moral and other sensitivities (Holm, Tirri & Nokelainen, 2013; Tirri, Nokelainen & Ubani, 2006).

Of these initiatives it is the first one, multiculturalism and religion in public education, that has had the strongest ties to the practice concerning religions, too. Furthermore, it has the potential of developing into the primary scholarly community for RE. Arguably one of the reasons for the emergence of multiculturalism and religion as the legitimate framework for RE is the orienting of research and networking with the international REDCO-community that was influenced by Robert Jackson and Kallioniemi during the 2000’s. Subsequently many researchers in Finland have discussed issues related to multiculturalism and religion such as integrated RE (Åhs, Poulter & Kallioniemi, 2016), minority RE and identities (Rissanen, 2014, Zilliacus, 2014) or confessionality (Kimanen, 2016), the intercultural and interreligious sensitivity of RE students (Holm, Nokelainen & Tirri, 2013; Holm, 2014), classroom dialogue and religion and conflict in schools (Ubani, 2016; Ubani, Kosunen, Keränen & Ovaskainen, 2015). The number of researchers centered around the topic is exceptional in the Finnish context and this movement may provide a basis for dialogue and knowledge construction within the field in future.

Concluding remarks

This article has focused on the question of "How have the scholarly communities contributed in RE didactics in Finland during the past decades?" While this is an issue that with many aspects it is possible to describe three main phases in the developments. The first phase is the phase of Tamminen that depicts RE as a subject that is very much under the influence of the scholarly community of cognitive psychology of religion and theology. The second phase is defined by the work of Niemi concerning RE and is characterized by the application of humanistic psychology to RE and the increasing role of the Education scholarly community in RE. The third phase is characterized by the dominance of educational sciences in RE
and the rise of multicultural education within the scholarly community of education to provide conceptual understanding for meeting the questions of pluralism, dialogue and diversity. On the other hand, the field of religious education was not very cohesive before the latest phase where inter-religious dialogue and inter-cultural education are beginning to provide shared conceptual bases for half a dozen researchers and may provide RE with an accumulation of research-based knowledge.

In addition, examination of the scholarly communities from a historical perspective gives an understanding of the interplay between the curricular development of religious education and its respective didactics and research. The relationship between these aspects is complex. For instance, theories and models of didactics of religious education are developed within a certain curriculum. The curricula may also restrict possible didactical developments etc. and brings challenges for the implementation of European and international developments. This can be exemplified in the lack of recognition of spirituality in Finnish curricula and didactical models during the early 2000’s, and implementation of dialogue, regardless of the domestic and international trends in religious education and research.

On the other hand, curriculum development and research is also a question of power and recognition. Such an issue is the role of female researchers and their views in shaping the subject – the first dissertation in Religious Education in Theology came just before the turn of the Millennium: interestingly Education seems to have been more inclusive in this sense, even if the backgrounds of the researchers were in Theology.

Another issue of power is the recognition of other scholarly communities in RE. It is interesting to note that the professors of Religious Education in Finland in general have a Doctoral degree and Masters’ degree in Education and in Religious Education, although the higher degree of the two may vary. Arguably this may also affect the research done in the field making it remain relatively conservative and inside-the-box. It would therefore be worth investigating what kinds of mechanisms have made Theology dominate RE research. For instance, Religious studies and Anthropology have been restricted in their contribution to the subject matter taught but except in the past few years (Sakaranaho & Jamisto, 2006), they have not made many acknowledged contributions to the scientific discussion concerning RE. Furthermore, the emergence of multicultural education as an integral scholarly movement seems to have surpassed the contributions made by Religious Studies and Anthropology and it already has relatively high a density of researchers working on issues related to schools and religion. This development may provide Finnish didactics of RE something it has not had before: a scholarly dialogue and knowledge building that is based on multidisciplinary research by a variety of actors.
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