



RETURNING MATERIALS:
Place in book drop to
remove this checkout from
your record. FINES will
be charged if book is
returned after the date
stamped below.

--	--	--

**EDUCATIONAL SAGA:
DOING PHILOSOPHY WITH CHILDREN IN ICELAND**

**By
Hreinn Palsson**

A DISSERTATION

**Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of**

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Teacher Education

1987

ABSTRACT

EDUCATIONAL SAGA: DOING PHILOSOPHY WITH CHILDREN IN ICELAND

By

Hreinn Palsson

What are the basic conditions for operation of communities of inquiry? This question was fundamental to the research. The research purpose was to document the presence, absence, or the genesis of communities of inquiry among twelve year old students in two classrooms in Iceland taught by two teachers with ten years of experience in teaching. The research was conducted as participant observation for a period of sixteen weeks in the fall of 1986. Each group had 26 lessons on a philosophical novel by Lipman.* Documentation of observations was made in fieldnotes, recordings and in transcripts. Researcher's participation included being a teaching consultant, a coach, a model teacher, and a substitute teacher.

Lessons were evaluated in terms of content, application of philosophical discussions as a method of instruction, and the teachers' perceptions, i.e. whether they were pleased or disappointed with their lessons. The students' reasoning improved considerably as assessed through pre- and post-tests with the New Jersey Test of Reasoning Skills.

Communities of inquiry were not found to be present in the classrooms studied. In one of the classrooms such a community was established and major interactional changes took place in that classroom. Students accepted responsibilities for setting an agenda to their lessons and they monitored their own procedures;

they questioned and reprimanded one another, they reminded the teacher of who should really be holding the floor. Although on its way, a community of inquiry was not established with the other group, but that group showed more rapid growth in performance on the reasoning test. The study indicates that students' reasoning can be improved, for example by drill and practice, without the community of inquiry being at work.

The teacher that succeeded in creating a community of inquiry claimed having matured and that her everyday thinking was sharper because of her participation in the project. To this the other teacher agreed and both claimed having learned a lot through the project.

* Lipman, M. (1982). Harry Stottlemeier's Discovery. New Jersey: First Mountain Foundation.

**Copyright by
HREINN PALSSON
1987**

In honor and memory of my parents

Páll Jóhannes Þorsteinsson
(1900-1981)

and

Júlfana Jóhannsdóttir
(1915-1987)

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my most sincere thanks to the members of my dissertation committee: Drs. Martin Benjamin, Doug Campbell, Perry E. Lanier, Matthew Lipman and Michael Sedlak. Dr. Lanier deserves special thanks for leading the committee and for his thoughtful guidance as my academic advisor.

Special thanks go to Dr. Ann M. Sharp of the Institute for the Advancement of Philosophy for Children, New Jersey. If not for her and Mat's encouragement I would never have ventured into doctoral studies in teacher education.

My friends, housemates and fellow students Eugenio Echeverria, Helga Loebell, and John Zeuli have a big place in my heart. I doubt that I would have made my first year through at Michigan State without them. I often recall our suppers and discussions that sometimes led into the night at our home in Haslett.

In particular, I thank John Zeuli and Linda Versteeg for their support during the summer of 1987.

Last, but by no means least, I thank my wife, Arna, and two daughters, Ásta Brynja and Sigurlaug María, for putting up with me while in front of my computer all the time.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

BACKGROUND.....	1
THE PHILOSOPHY FOR CHILDREN PROGRAM.....	5
Novels and Literature.....	5
Instructional Features.....	6
The Teacher's Role.....	7
Children.....	8
Review of Research.....	9
Needed Research.....	12
COMMUNITY OF INQUIRY.....	14
Inquiry.....	14
Reflective Thinking.....	19
The Social Development of Self.....	22
Why Communities of Inquiry in Classrooms?.....	27
RESEARCH PLAN.....	29
The General Questions.....	32
The Middle-level Questions.....	32
Thematic Questions.....	32
Analysis.....	33

CHAPTER II: SETTING AND ACTORS

THE EDUCATIONAL SCENE IN ICELAND.....	34
THE TRAINING SCHOOL.....	38
Negotiating Entry.....	39
THE ACTORS.....	44
Linda's Background.....	44
Linda's Pupils.....	48
Summary.....	54
Helga's Background.....	56
Helga's Pupils.....	58
Summary.....	65

CHAPTER III: INTERPRETATION OF CLASSROOM INTERACTIONS AND DIALOGUE

Introduction.....	67
SEPTEMBER 1-22: GETTING READY.....	68
Basic patterns.....	71
Central Reflections.....	82
SEPTEMBER 23 - OCTOBER 14: UPS AND DOWNS.....	85
Introduction.....	85
Week one: Mixed reactions.....	88
Reflections on week one.....	96
Week two: Difficulties.....	97
Reflections on week two.....	103
Week three: Retreat.....	104
Reflections on week three.....	116
Week four: A turning point.....	117

OCTOBER 14-22: MODELING.....	121
Week four continued.....	121
Reflections on practice.....	136
Modeling continued.....	138
Reflections on week four.....	158
Week five: Modeling and experience.....	159
OCTOBER 22 - NOVEMBER 27: MORE UPS THAN DOWNS.....	169
Week five continued.....	169
Reflections on week five.....	180
Week six: Moving forward.....	182
Reflections on week six.....	198
Week seven: Helga's class takes off.....	199
Reflections on week seven.....	213
Week eight: Spontaneity versus convention.....	214
Reflection on week eight.....	233
Week nine: Community of inquiry at work.....	234
Reflection on week nine.....	246
Week ten: Commitment to the procedures of inquiry.....	247
Reflections on week ten.....	265
LOOKING BACK: AGENDA FOR PARENTAL MEETING.....	268
RECREATION AND POSTSCRIPT.....	271
Reflections on postscript.....	276
Looking back with Helga and Linda.....	277

C H A P T E R I V : C O N C L U S I O N

Improved reasoning.....	279
Reasoning and conduct.....	285
Review of research questions.....	288
The general questions.....	288
The middle-level questions.....	297
Questions to begin with.....	299
Weaknesses of the study.....	301

APPENDIX A: A distant perspective on Iceland.....	302
APPENDIX B: Individual students' performance.....	305
REFERENCES.....	309

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE I: A SCHEDULE OF TEACHING HOURS FOR PRIMARY SCHOOLS.....	37
TABLE II: SOCIAL TAXONOMY OF LINDA'S PUPILS.....	54
TABLE III: SOCIAL TAXONOMY OF HELGA'S PUPILS.....	65
TABLE IV: SUMMARY OF TEACHING FACTORS IN HELGA'S CLASSROOM.....	86
TABLE V: SUMMARY OF TEACHING FACTORS IN LINDA'S CLASSROOM.....	87
TABLE VI: DISTRIBUTION OF SCORES IN PRE- AND POST-TESTS.....	280
TABLE VII: DISTRIBUTION OF ERRORS.....	281
A. DISTRIBUTION OF ITEMS ON N.J. REASONING TEST BY SKILL AREAS.	281
B. DISTRIBUTION OF ERRORS BY SKILL AREAS AND CLASSES.....	281
TABLE VIII: LINDA'S STUDENTS' REASONING SCORES.....	305
TABLE IX: HELGA'S STUDENTS' REASONING SCORES.....	306
TABLE X: LINDA'S STUDENTS' PERFORMANCE WITHIN SKILL AREAS ON THE NEW JERSEY TEST OF REASONING SKILLS.....	307
TABLE XI: HELGA'S STUDENTS' PERFORMANCE WITHIN SKILL AREAS ON THE NEW JERSEY TEST OF REASONING SKILLS.....	308

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

BACKGROUND

Thinking is in, riding as it has come to on the latest educational bandwagon. Even those who claim that thinking has always been in now recognize that we have begun to overcome the fragmented understanding of the thinking process that limited its teaching. Among others, Glaser is optimistic about the increasing likelihood "that we can move to a new level of application" (1984, p. 102) in teaching of thinking.

The trend has escalated to such an extent that people who work at the pre-college level who want to intellectually empower their students are faced with the dilemma of choosing between several programs that have been specially designed for this purpose, e.g. Cort (Cognitive Research Trust) developed by deBono, SOI (Structure of the Intellect) developed by Meeker, Instrumental Enrichment developed by Feuerstein, Philosophy for Children developed by Lipman; Chicago Mastery Learning Reading Program developed by Jones, Strategic Reasoning developed by Glade. In a thorough review of three programs, Sternberg endorsed one of them in particular: "No program I am aware of is more likely to teach durable and transferable thinking skills than Philosophy for Children (1984, p. 44). As I have studied and taught the Philosophy for Children program I chose to focus on it in this dissertation.

Even if the present emphasis on thinking is just the latest fad for professional educators, philosophers have taken an interest in the issue for over 2500 years. The question of how thinking and talking relate is a classical question among philosophers. Of course they have not been able to reach a final conclusion, but few, if any, would claim that

thinking and talking are unrelated. Thinking is not only related to talking but also to knowledge.

Philosophers value good thinking, but they don't agree on what exactly it is that makes or characterizes a good thinker. In general they see good thinking as something that can be taught or fostered, the basic disagreement is on whether it must be done within the disciplines (Ryle 1968: McPeck, 1981), whether we can teach good thinking across the disciplines (Snook, 1974) or whether we need both (Passmore, 1972). In other words, philosophers disagree on how, when, and where good thinking should be taught as well as on the nature of good thinking. So despite their interest in thinking, philosophers are not of much help when it comes to classroom practice or actual interactions with children. Their professional interests are primarily in conceptual analysis without relating the results or their implications concretely to classrooms.

Benjamin and Echeverria (in press) point out that conventional teaching rests on a traditional conception of knowledge, dating back to Descartes, where the spectator's mind is supposed to mirror nature as it "Really" is (cf. Rorty, 1979). The person that acquires knowledge, the learner, is on this view a passive receiver of the knowledge he or she is to acquire. Benjamin and Echeverria remind us, furthermore, that the arrangement of having students learn in groups does not mean that they learn as a group. Teaching students as individuals in groups rest on the same traditional conception where thinking and knowledge acquisition are ultimately considered to be a personal affair.

Supporting their argument with references to Kuhn (1962), Rorty (1979, 1982), and Bernstein (1983) Benjamin and Echeverria (in press) maintain, that a different conception of knowledge needs to be taken into account in teaching. A conception that sees knowledge and thinking as being

essentially social and inescapably linguistic in nature as we cannot get outside of language to get to know the world. Dialogue resting on mutual trust and respect in a classroom community of inquiry would be at the center of such teaching, they claim.

Benjamin and Echeverria are inspired by Lipman's Philosophy for Children program, who first tried his approach to the teaching of thinking via a community of inquiry with children when he was a philosopher at Columbia University. His trials led to the foundation of the Institute for the Advancement of Philosophy for Children at Montclair State College, New Jersey.

The differences between Lipman and mainstream philosophers are important and some of them will now be highlighted. First, Lipman agrees that formal and informal logic, skills and dispositions are important components of good thinking (1984, Mars, personal conversation; cf. also 1985b). He is not willing, however, to rank them in hierarchical order and he denies that they are all important. His difference lies in giving those components in his curricula equal status.

Second, for Lipman practice comes before theory. For example, he did not publish anything on the possibilities or the justification of teaching philosophy, thinking, or reasoning to children until after he had himself tried it out using his own materials. Philosophers usually have a more distant perspective on the classroom.

Third, both philosophers in general and philosophers of education in particular usually do not design curricula. Snook, for example, stated simply that: "the task of devising a curriculum is one which is beyond the scope of a philosopher of education" (1974, p. 146, see also p. 161). During the past 18 years Lipman has devoted much of his energy to designing and writing curricula.

Fourth, Lipman assumes that it is as much of a responsibility for professional philosophers to work with young children (K-12th grade) as it is to work with college students. He points out that philosophy has been conceived of as putting the final touch on the educational process. To change this, and "to enter the elementary school, philosophy has not had to change itself so much as its image of itself" (1985b, p. 20). However, it is Lipman, not philosophy, that has created this different image of the responsibility of his discipline.

Thus, according to Lipman, philosophy does not have to lose its integrity as a discipline when done with children; the ideas, the logic, the method or the dialogue remain the same (1985b, p. 20). This should be of some comfort to those that claim that thinking can only be taught within the disciplines (McPeck, 1981; Ryle 1968). But Lipman also claims that students' work in philosophy carries over in a positive manner to other disciplines, i.e., thinking in philosophy is a preparation for thinking in other disciplines (cf. 1985b, p. 21, see also Appendix B in Lipman, Sharp & Oscanyan, 1980, and Lipman 1985c, p. 101). In short, if the aim of education is to promote children's thinking, then

knowledge acquisition and subject-specific problem solving readily assume a subsidiary status; they remain valuable functions but are no longer the focus of learning. Philosophy must be taught as a subject in its own right, rather than ignored or taught only as a subcomponent of other academic knowledge acquisition and problem-solving activities (Lipman, 1985c, pp. 100-1).

Lipman's argument is twofold: on the one hand it is claimed that philosophy prepares the ground for thinking in other disciplines. On the other hand, philosophy deserves no subsidiary status and deserves to be taught to children as a subject in its own right.

Finally, Lipman has mapped out the skills that his program fosters (1985c, pp. 88-96). He claims that this is more of a postscript to the

program so far than a prescription for classroom practice. He also admits that there is a certain arbitrariness to his list as there is with any list of cognitive skills that are said to be promoted (p. 87).

THE PHILOSOPHY FOR CHILDREN PROGRAM

Novels and Literature

Since the novel Harry Stottlemeier's Discovery was first published in 1974, Lipman has written five other novels constituting the Philosophy for Children program: Lisa (1976/1985), Suki (1978), Mark (1980), Pixie (1981), and Kio and Gus (1982), intended for use in K-12th grade. Each novel is accompanied by an extensive manual. The manuals' names are descriptive of the program, but they are, in the same sequence as above: Philosophical Inquiry (1975/1979/1984, with Sharp and Oscanyan), Ethical Inquiry (1977, with Oscanyan and Sharp; 1985, with Sharp), Writing: How and Why (1980b, with Sharp), Social Inquiry (1980a, with Sharp), Looking for Meaning (1982, with Sharp), and Wondering at the World (1986, with Sharp).

Each novel avoids traditional philosophical terminology. Perplexities within students' own experiences are emphasized instead. Readers of the novels are provided with alternative examples of how different participants reflect on their experiences and how they make sense out of it. The characters have many different styles of thinking with no one style portrayed as the correct one.

Lipman and Sharp (1978, p. 368) argue that "only literature has shown the delicacy and flexibility needed to penetrate and communicate the many-layered multiplicity of human relationships." Consequently they argue that the novel is of central importance in bringing philosophy to children as well as in motivating them and in giving context to the ideas under scrutiny.

Instructional Features

A Philosophy for Children lesson often begins when the classmembers form a circle and read aloud, by taking turns or by role-reading, a chapter or a piece from one of the novels. After the reading, the teacher usually opens the discussion by asking the class whether any idea interested them, or whether there is something else in the chapter that they would like to talk about. Thus, a philosophy lesson starts with the children's own experience in a twofold sense: first, the novels are written for children about children at a similar age. Second, the teacher elicits the discussion agenda from the children; there are no detailed lesson plans to be followed step-by-step. Lipman et al. (1980), while admitting that the effects of the program are not precisely known, claim that "learning to think philosophically takes place primarily in the process of interpersonal discussion, and the reflection that follows such a discussion" (p. 65). But the discussion also brings other advantages:

in particular, it promotes children's awareness of one another's personalities, interests, values, beliefs, and biases. This increased sensitivity is one of the most valuable by-products of classroom communication. Unless children have some insight into the nature of the individuals with whom they share their lives, they are not likely to make sound judgments regarding them (p. 65).

What is at stake here is cooperation which requires listening as well as self-corrective communication. After the discussion opens, the class becomes engaged in a student-to-student dialogue with the teacher guiding students' inquiries and participating as one of the class.

The Teacher's Role

"Teachers who can model an endless quest for meaning...are the most important ingredient in the philosophy for children program" (Lipman et al. 1980, p. 84). Such teachers have partly to improvise their activities as they direct discussions along philosophical lines by the questioning technique employed, and by bringing up exercises and discussion plans from the manuals where they are appropriate. The discussion plans and exercises are of such nature that they operationalize concepts presented in the novels and help students understand what the ideas mean and how they work. The teacher does not bring up exercises if they do not relate to what the students want to discuss. In other words, the reading in the beginning of the lesson and the ideas presented serve as a springboard for discussions of things that matter to students. However, if the students do not catch on, the teacher has to elicit themes through questioning or, at last resort, simply point them out as a member of the classroom community. But by no means is the teacher's role to import answers into the classroom. Addressing the teacher directly, Lipman et al. (1980, p. 90) explicitly state: "It is not your role to dictate to children what their philosophies of life should be." In the same place they advise the teacher to take cues from the novels where children struggle to understand as well as to learn from experience.

Although a variety of topics are discussed in a Philosophy for Children classroom, it is not the case that these topics can be discussed in simply any form. It requires both knowledge and skill on the part of the teacher to keep the discussion integrated with the students' ideas and the ideas in the novel. Although the following questions are simple, it takes great skill on the teacher's behalf to use them on appropriate

occasions in the dialogue.

What reasons do you have for saying that?
 Why do you agree (or disagree) on that point?
 How are you using the term you just used?
 What do you mean by that expression?
 Could you clarify that remark?
 (Lipman, et al. 1980, p. 112).

Apart from this "philosophical" list, the program also calls for questions that are directed at communicative interactions, such as: Did all of you hear what was just being said? Can somebody repeat what was just said? Questions of this kind are asked to increase the student-to-student interactions as well as to foster listening skills.

Children

In the Philosophy for Children program children are seen as being intellectually lively and as having a natural curiosity for philosophical ideas such as friendship, truth, beauty, and fairness. It is often said that philosophy and childhood both begin in wonder. This does not mean that the philosophical questions of children are "childish." On the contrary, philosophers and children can be of great help to one another if their relationship is cultivated on mutual grounds (cf. Matthews, 1980; Pritchard, 1985). Children offer deep philosophical insights but they do need help with making sense out of their everyday puzzles and wondering. Philosophy is useless for this task if it is reduced to a mere memorization of "who, what, when." "It takes on significance only when children begin to manifest the capacity to think for themselves and to figure out their own answers about life's important issues" (Lipman et al. 1980, p. 83). Sense is certainly not made by simply telling or describing to children how things are; the problem is not that children do not believe what they are told but that often what they are told has

no meaning to them.

Children do not question the truth of much of what they are told, but they do contend that it is often meaningless to them. It is unlikely that an educational process can work if it fails to take this craving for meaning into account (Lipman, 1985, p. 100; see also Lipman, Sharp, & Oscanyan, 1980, ch. 2).

Review of Research

Several studies have been done to assess the educational significance of Philosophy for Children. They have centered on the impact of Harry Stottlemeier's Discovery since that novel was the first one to be written in the program and is still a central part of it. These studies vary greatly in scope and effort.

The first study was done by Lipman and Bierman in 1970, (reported by Lipman in Metaphilosophy, 1976). The study involved 40 5th graders who were assigned randomly to two groups. Lipman taught Harry to the experimental group and the control group was assigned to a social science project. In his teaching "there was no homework, no grades, no written classwork - it was all discussion" (Lipman 1976, p. 33). After nine weeks the experimental group had gained 27 months in mental age compared to the control group and as measured by the California Test of Mental Maturity ($p < .01$). This study was replicated by Cummings (1980) and again with significant ($p < .05$) gain on the California Test of Mental Maturity. However, the studies were done on different grounds. For example, although not having any experience in teaching children Lipman was a professional philosopher with fifteen years of teaching experience at the college level. Also, after analysis a graduate assistant lost all the data collected for the Lipman/Bierman study. Cummings's teaching was, on the other hand, 50% paper-pencil exercises some of which she designed herself, 40% discussion and 10% lecture (1980, p. 90). The retreat into

sheetwork was partly because of serious discipline problems that she ran into "from the very first day" (1980, p. 91).

Simmon (1979) found Harry to be effective in working with emotionally handicapped students (n=5). Higa (1980) did a study in Hawaii involving twelve elementary school classes. Positive impact on reasoning skills were reported but there was no control group involved in the study. Karras (1980) did a study involving six hundred 5th and 6th graders and found significant improvements in reasoning. Yeazill (1981) found significant gains ($p < .01$) in 6th graders' reading comprehension in using Harry as contrasted with students that did not use Harry. Burnes (1981) also reported significant improvement in reading comprehension as well as in reasoning. Reed and Henderson (1981) used two 4th grade classrooms as experimental groups, and two as control. They reported significant gains ($p < .001$) in reasoning for the Harry group. Weinstein and Martin (1982) also reported improvement in reasoning skills for students that used Harry. Cinquino (1981) used Harry with academically talented 5th graders with positive results.

Three more extensive studies stand out among the research that has been done on Philosophy for Children. The first major study was done in 1975 in the Newark, New Jersey public schools and directed and designed by Hope Haas of the Institute for Cognitive Studies at Rutgers University (see Appendix B in Lipman, Sharp & Oscanyan, 1980). Four hundred 5th and 6th graders in sixteen different classrooms, in two control schools and two experimental ones, were involved in the study. Over ten months the experimental students gained eight months on the Metropolitan Achievement Test (MAT) in contrast to a five month gain of the control students.

A second study was designed and carried out by Virginia Shipman (1978) at the Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey. This study

was more extensive and took two years (1976-78) at Pompton Lakes and Newark, New Jersey. In brief, in Newark the conclusions gave indication of a carry over effect from philosophy to other disciplines; in mathematics the experimental gain was 36% larger than control and in reading the experimental gain was 66% larger than control (significance at .0001 and measured by MAT). The Pompton Lakes groups did not show such drastic improvements; this was explained by the Educational Testing Service as being due "to the overflow of program effects into the control group, causing the latter's performance to improve along with that of the experimental group" (Lipman, Sharp, & Oscanyan, 1980, p. 225). It was during the first year of this study that Shipman developed a criterion-referenced formal reasoning test known as Q-3 and designed to assess improvements in students' thinking. Later Q-3 became Q-4 and finally it was copyrighted in 1983 as the New Jersey Test of Reasoning Skills (for more details, see Morante and Ulesky, 1984).

Following the Newark/Pompton Lakes' study

the Philosophy for Children program received Title IV-C validation in New Jersey. After a 2-day review of the data by a team of out-of-state educators, the program was given 124 of a possible 126 points for effectiveness and 45 of a possible 45 points for exportability (1985b, p. 105).

Lipman and Gazzard (1986, p. 82) report that "in 1986, the U.S. Department of Education's Joint Dissemination Review Panel identified Philosophy for Children as a meritorious educational program and granted it 'national validation'."

The third and most extensive evaluation was done in New Jersey and Pennsylvania in 1980-81 and involved over three thousand students. Again, Shipman designed and evaluated the experiments using the Q-4 test. In New Jersey Shipman found the experimental group's gain of 5.23 to be 80% greater than the 2.91 gain of the control group. Of 32 classrooms

that received philosophy in Pennsylvania 29 showed significant ($p < .05$) improvement, 19 of which were significant at the .005 level. For the remaining three classrooms the improvements ranged between .06 and .10 (Shipman, 1982).

Needed Research

Despite favorable evaluations, such as Sternberg's (p. 1), detailed descriptive and scholarly case studies of how the Philosophy for Children program works in ordinary classrooms are not available. The more substantive studies on the program in general, have been arranged in such a way that working with Harry Stottlemeier's Discovery (Lipman, 1974) has constituted an independent variable, while academic achievement, however measured, has been used as the dependent variable. This has led to interesting conclusions, but the investigators have not reported in details what (except using Harry as a "treatment,") happened in these classrooms. In other words, research has been focused on reasoning as measured by tests; such assessment rest ultimately on each individual's isolated performance, rather than on thinking in a classroom community. Consequently, it is questionable whether communities of inquiry were at work in the studies that have been conducted on the program thus far.

Originators of the Philosophy for Children program claim that not only does the program improve students' reasoning skills, but also that classmates will increase their respect for one another as well as for themselves in a philosophical community of inquiry (Sharp, 1986). This is supposed to take place within a specific classroom context or within a classroom frame of reference, in which teaching and/or learning activities can be understood, just as books provide the context for sentences to be understood.

One of the characteristics of a Philosophy for Children classroom is to deal openly with the question: "Who are we and what are we doing now?" The first part is dealt with by asking questions that have to do with personal identity, such as: "What makes you you? Is it your name? Is it your clothes? Is it your thoughts?" The second part is dealt with by asking questions such as: "What makes you say that? How do you know? What do you mean by that?" (see Lipman et al. 1979/1984 p. 11, 10, 35 and 1980 ch. 7). Thus the Philosophy for Children program attempts to create a context for open inquiry where the context itself does not escape scrutiny. Thinking is seen to be interwoven and inspired by the context at hand. This happens to be in line with Rogoff (1982, p. 149), who defines context as "a web of relations interwoven to form the fabric of meaning. People create and are part of context (and vice versa), rather than being separate entities influenced by contexts."

This community of inquiry, assumed and frequently described in literature on the Philosophy for Children program, is portrayed as an important component of the program as indicated by the following:

When children are encouraged to think philosophically, the classroom is converted into a community of inquiry. Such a community is committed to the procedures of inquiry, to responsible search techniques that presuppose an openness to evidence and to reason. It is assumed that these procedures of the community, when internalized, become the reflected habits of the individual (1980, p. 45, emphasis added).

Interestingly none of the studies nor the New Jersey Test of Reasoning Skills have been designed to investigate that phenomenon of the community of inquiry. I want to explore the ways that ordinary K-12 teachers create communities of inquiry when working with Philosophy for Children. Also, I want to understand how individuals in such a community internalize and reflect habits.

My interests do come in line with what Lipman sees as needed, but after

looking at the evaluation data on his program he stated:

additional evaluation data on three facets of the program would be of great value. It would be desirable to look more closely at the kinds of attitudinal changes that may occur as a result in participation in the program. More attention also needs to be paid to obtaining in-depth assessment of children's thinking processes, as opposed to merely assessing thinking outcomes. Finally, a great deal of attention needs to be devoted to determining which pedagogical techniques successfully elicit cognitively meaningful dialogue, as contrasted with mere verbalization (1985c, p. 106).

What I want to know cannot be addressed without carefully considering attitudinal changes, thinking processes, and pedagogical techniques.

COMMUNITY OF INQUIRY

The notion of community of inquiry is of central importance to the study and now we will step back to its theoretical underpinnings by surveying C.S. Peirce, J. Dewey and G.H. Mead among others. The purpose being to get clearer on what kind of inquiry and reflective thinking it is that Philosophy for Children aims to enforce.

Inquiry

According to Peirce, (The Fixation of Belief, 1877), believing is a state of feeling which indicates that a habit, which shapes our actions and guides our desires in the concerning domain, has been acquired. As such, belief is a satisfactory and a calm state we all strive for. Doubt, on the other hand, is a dissatisfied and an uneasy state which we struggle to free ourselves from as we want to enjoy the peace of believing. For Peirce the "struggle" from doubt to belief is "inquiry."

In How To Make Our Ideas Clear, Peirce (1878) enumerated three characteristics of a belief: We are aware of it; it appeases irritation of doubt; and it leads to formation of habits which is the essence of

belief. As a habit belief is thought at rest, which can be set in motion by doubt, which in turn can be calmed by belief. Perhaps a threefold simile will make the point more clear: Belief is like a boat in a harbor; doubt is like getting ready or finding an opportunity to take the boat out of the harbor; inquiry is like the act of sailing which comes to rest when harbor is reached again.

Peirce (1877) described four methods by which we form opinions and thus our thoughts and beliefs are stabilized permanently or for the moment. First is the method of tenacity where the practitioners are convinced of their beliefs by constantly repeating them to themselves without being open to different views; they never take their boats out of the harbor. This method gives peace of mind, but it is anti-social in character as it rests with "your" or "my" beliefs but not with "our" beliefs. Second comes the method of authority which has traditionally been used by various institutions to give and teach correct beliefs to people as well as to prevent them from inquiring into "incorrect" opinions; the subjects travel by big liners in a state of relaxation while the crew takes care of the sailing. Although this method leads to intellectual impotency of the passengers it gives social stability and unity. The third method, the a priori method, is deductive in character. This method rests on our natural inclinations to hold opinions that we find "agreeable to reason" regardless of whether they contradict facts of the matter; instead of actually sailing the sailor takes a glass of rum and studies the maps and daydreams a complete tour on the boat. According to Peirce this method has been favored by metaphysicians in building their "systems." Although being superior in theory the failure of this method in practice has been most evident of all the three methods: inquiry has turned into something like a development of taste according to the latest fashion.

A fourth method, the method of science, needs to be established according to Peirce. This method is to provide an external and a stable basis for our beliefs and would thus allow for correct distinctions between right and wrong opinions. If such a scientific inquiry is pushed far enough it yields to the same conclusions for all practitioners; the core of the matter does not rest with short-time consequences or with private feelings or purposes, but with the method itself. The first three methods are all delusive in character, only the method of science reveals the nature of things as they really are; science is supposedly to function as an automatic pilot which constantly corrects the course of the boat.

Peirce can be criticized for a naive belief in the unlimited powers of the method of science which he pictured (1877) as the right bride for man which he should choose and stand by through good and bad times. We do not need to condemn the other brides, the methods of tenacity, authority and the one of a priori nature, as respect to them leads only to a deeper honor of the superior bride, Peirce maintained.

Skúlason (1985) accepts Peirce's analysis, but argues that it is not a matter of choice to select one correct method, the method of science, and simply respect but repudiate the other methods. The other three methods also have their procedures of distinguishing between right and wrong and they all refer to external facts, Skúlason maintains. Implicitly Skúlason claims that Peirce's "scientific method" should be replaced by what he calls "the principle of critical thinking" which he takes from Clifford's * Ethics of Belief: "It is wrong, everywhere and for anyone, to believe anything upon insufficient evidence."

 *William Kingdon Clifford (1845-1879). English mathematician and philosopher.

Skúlason claims that the principle of critical thinking can never be applied in isolation from Peirce's first three methods, but has to be used in combination with them as the three methods are indeed applied in all possible fields of inquiry.

The reader may already have objected, most likely on two grounds: (1) Peirce was right in stressing that we have to choose and stand by the method of science. (2) Skúlason's reading of the maps is inaccurate in claiming that the first three methods are applied by scientists in all fields. Both objections can be met by referring to Kuhn's (1962) analysis which shows that the boat of science cannot just be sailed on automatic pilot as the waters of "normal sciences" become roaring high when anomalies increase within scientific communities. In such circumstances scientists have to choose between competing theories and there is no method available that would lead each scientist to the same decision (cf. 1970, pp. 199-200). But while fashionable, "normal" opinions (i.e. thought at rest or accepted habits) are of no less importance to scientists than to teen-agers and Kuhn's analysis gives an authoritative status to normal science. The opportunity for a scientific revolution to occur may come with new or unexpected cases that cannot be accounted for according to normal science. But if scientists think critically in a community of inquiry it should help them to accept the existence of anomalies within their fields and ease for their self-correction when facing new or unexpected circumstances.

In the spirit of Kuhn we can also turn to the scientists themselves to reject the two objections above. In an article by Malcolm W. Browne in The New York Times (February 11, 1986) we can see that scientists do indeed use the methods described by Peirce when it comes to settling opinions on the nature of reality. The scene is a debate that occurred

at a meeting where:

several hundred physicists and natural philosophers from around the world found themselves in agreement that quantum theory is a proven cornerstone of modern science and technology. But disturbing philosophical questions raised by quantum theory about the nature of reality remain unresolved, and debates at the meeting...were sometimes heated.

Among the issues in this debate is the very essence of existence: "In the ordinary world," reports Browne, "...existence is a definite state; an object either exists or it does not exist, one or the other. But quantum theory provides that something can both exist and not exist, simultaneously." The content of the debate is of no further interest here, but only an analysis of the meeting by one of the participants, Dr. N. David Mermin of Cornell University, as reported by Browne:

In Dr. Mermin's view...physicists fall into three categories. The first, a minority, is troubled by the philosophical implications of the E.P.R. paper and Bell's theorem. The second group is not troubled by such issues, Dr. Mermin says, because its members have devised explanations 'that tend either to miss the point entirely or to contain physical assertions that can be shown to be false.' The last group is not troubled by the philosophical problems of quantum theory, but members refuse to say why they are not troubled. 'Their position is unassailable,' Dr. Mermin adds.

Mermin's description fits right in with Peirce's analysis: Members of the first group seem to have worked primarily by the a priori method, but doubt has awakened in their minds as they admit the anomalies of the accepted theory. Members of the second group work in the tradition of authority which they will defend at whatever cost, the "correct" theory

* A full reference is missing from the Browne article but they are: Einstein, A., Podolsky and Rosen (1935): Can Quantum-Mechanical Description of Physical Reality Be Considered Complete? Physical Review, 47. "E.P.R." refers to the initials of the authors. Bell's theorem was presented in Bell, J.S. (1964): On the Einstein Podolsky Rosen Paradox. Physics, pp. 195-200.

I'm indebted to Ann M. Sharp of the Institute for the Advancement of Philosophy for Children for mailing me the Browne article without me asking for it.

must be held onto! The third group applies the method of tenacity, it must give them peace of mind although inviting problems in interactions with the scientific community.

Having drawn the description above of different methods of settling opinions with reference to physics, a similar picture could surely be drawn of education. Just as "normal science" has an authoritative status within the scientific enterprise so has schooling within education, even to the degree that education is identified with schooling. But it is hard to imagine schools serving any society without authoritatively passing "correct" beliefs to the young ones, both openly and in the hidden curriculum. The problem is not to run schools without authority but how to leave room for correction and improvements as any democratic society should demand.

Reflective Thinking

Dewey (1916) admitted the value of passing the cultural heritage between generations through schooling but he argued for education that would constantly reconstruct or reorganize experience, including "correct" beliefs. Dewey's educational stance was that of reflective or critical thinking because "he claimed," according to Bernstein (1967), "that all philosophy can be conceived of as the philosophy of education" (pp. 383-384).

Earlier it was suggested that Peirce's "method of science" should be replaced by critical thinking. Skúlason would suggest using "critical thinking" in place of "scientific" in the quote below, but I think Peirce, Dewey and Skúlason can be brought together by substituting "reflective thinking" for "scientific" in this quote:

The scientific attitude may almost be defined as that which is capable of enjoying the doubtful; scientific method is, in one aspect, a technique for making a productive use of doubt by converting it into operations of definite inquiry. No one gets far intellectually who does not 'love to think,' and no one loves to think who does not have an interest in problems as such (Dewey, 1929, p. 228, emphasis added).

Dewey's scientific method, or reflective thinking, was not meant to serve an elite of scientists but all circles of intellectually active people. The method is of particular importance when it comes to teaching and now I suggest the reading "reflective" instead of "intellectual."

Only a teacher thoroughly trained in the higher levels of intellectual method and who thus has constantly in his own mind a sense of what adequate and genuine intellectual activity means, will be likely, in deed, not in mere word, to respect the mental integrity and force of children (1965/1904 p. 161, emphasis added).

Dewey studied with Peirce at Johns Hopkins University and there is no doubt that his theory of inquiry was inspired by Peirce's. Bernstein (1967) enumerates three stages in Dewey's version of the theory. The first stage is one of "felt difficulty" which includes doubt and formulation of what it is that requires resolution. Various hypotheses or suggestions to solve the problem are introduced at the second stage. This may include hypothetical-deductive reasoning to refine the hypotheses and to draw out logical consequences. The last stage is one of experimental testing which seeks to disconfirm or confirm the proposed hypothesis.

The theory of inquiry just described is of much interest here as the very first Leading Idea in the manual Philosophical Inquiry (Lipman, Sharp, & Oscanyan, 1984) is labeled: The process of inquiry. The outlined steps in the process of inquiry are eight in number and the main character, Harry, goes through them all in chapter one of Harry Stottlemeier's Discovery. The relations to Peirce and Dewey are evident.

Bernstein (1967) points out that this pattern of inquiry refers both to "common-sense inquiry" and "scientific inquiry" and he brings out four central features of Dewey's logic: First, although the pattern is a general one for all inquiry it can still vary with different inquiries and different subjects. Second, different inquiries are interconnected. Other inquiries may provide evidences, rules and procedures, and each one can be further refined. "Third, all inquiry presupposes a social or public context that is the medium for funding the warranted conclusions and norms for further inquiry...." Dewey is thus, according to Bernstein, in agreement with Peirce in emphasizing the importance of community of inquirers. "Inquiry both requires such a community and helps to further the development of this community" (p. 383). Fourth, inquiry is self-corrective in character.

To conduct a specific inquiry, some knowledge claims, norms and rules must be taken as fixed, but no knowledge claim, norm, or rule is absolutely fixed: it may be criticized, revised, or abandoned in light of subsequent inquiry and experience (Bernstein, 1967, p. 383).

These features are of particular interest as they seem to relate easily to classrooms. I say "seem" because Dewey was not clear on by what means the process of inquiry should be carried out in the classroom, except that teachers, environment and common experience played a major role. It is ironical indeed, that Dewey overlooked the role philosophy can play in education, but not only as philosophy of education. Reflective thinking is a necessary component of schoolwork which is not simply learning but also education and no discipline is as closely related to reflective thinking as philosophy is. However, Dewey must be credited for realizing that improvement of education comes down to "changing the conception of what constitutes education" (1965/1904, p. 171). "What is needed is the habit of viewing the entire curriculum as a continuous growth, reflecting

the growth of mind itself" (1965/1904 p. 165). But for him:

Mind is not a name for something complete by itself; it is a name for a course of action in so far as that it is intelligently directed; in so far, that is to say, as aims, ends, enter into it, with selection of means to further the attainment of aims (Dewey, 1916, p. 155).

The Social Development of Self

Speaking of Peirce, Dewey and "mind," George H. Mead should come next to mind. Mind is essentially a social phenomenon for Mead. It arises and develops through a process of social internalization as individuals take the attitudes of others towards themselves as well as towards the issues that are reflected on (cf. 1972/1934 p. 192 for example). This process is not a question of mechanics as individuals react in unpredictable ways to social stimuli but the quality of their response rests with their reflective thinking. According to this analysis two main options are seen for the betterment of human practice: (1) The social environment can be improved and in turn that affects the individual. (2) Reflexivity, the platform for individual action that in turn changes the community, can be improved.

Mind in a community is a self-conscious self and it has two phases according to Mead: The "I" and the "me." The "I" is a source of spontaneity which allows individuals to react and change the community they belong to. The "I" is neither predictable nor present to us until we act and without it there would be neither creativity nor inquiries. The "me" is the constant part of the self; it is imported, in a sense, from fellow human beings in the process of viewing things from the perspective of the "generalized other." (It may help the reader to think of the "I" as the subjective part of the self and to think of the "me" as the objective part.)

A quote from Mead will bring the issue to sharper focus:

We speak of a person as a conventional individual; his ideas are exactly the same as those of his neighbors; he is hardly more than a "me" under the circumstances....Over against that there is the person who has a definite personality, who replies to the organized attitude in a way which makes a significant difference. With such a person it is the "I" that is the more important phase of the experience (1972/1934 p. 200).

The conventional individual is the one who has lost his ability to reflect, the opinions of such a person are most likely a matter of fashion or traceable to authorities.

Assuming that the authors just surveyed have a point, the question still remains: How can we practice reflective thinking in classrooms to prevent compulsory schooling from "producing" conventional individuals? Is the heart of the matter that by its nature school-learning serves the "me" and neither school-teachers nor anyone else are able to educate the "I" as no one can teach reflective thinking to another person? (Cf. Ryle, 1969) In this context it is necessary to note that schools and school-learning have no other nature than the one we give to it, and if it is the case that the "I" is ignored in schools we have all the needed resources to correct the course. Also, even if reflective thinking cannot be taught in itself, just like art cannot be taught in itself, teachers can still teach pupils to teach themselves. But this is taking the issue to extremes, it would be unfortunate to overlook that there is a craft element to all art and to all thinking, which can be taught with patience and rigor through modeling and coaching.

Perhaps some people cannot help reflecting at times but reflective thinking can be practiced with all speakers through a disciplined use of their language.

Language being essentially in its nature thinking with the child is rendered concrete by taking on the form of conversation....This can take place only when the thought has reference to a real problem in the experience of the child (Mead, 1979/1910 p. 25).

Lipman meets this requirement in a twofold sense, as already has been indicated: The novels are about characters at a similar age as the target readers and the students are themselves invited to suggest points for discussion. But Mead also argues in the spirit of Dewey that:

Instruction should be an interchange of experience in which the child brings his experience to be interpreted by the experience of the parent or teacher. This recognizes that education is interchange of ideas, is conversation - belongs to a universe of discourse (Mead, 1979/1910 p. 25).

"Conversation" should not be taken to mean just chat or talking because if talking is not pushed to a level of a dialogue, to a genuine discussion, it often ends in a flounder. This requirement Lipman meets by modeling dialogues in the novels as well as through modeling and coaching in teacher training.

Matthews (1980) puts forward the central thesis that "children of five, six, or perhaps seven years are much more likely to ask philosophical questions and make philosophical comments than children of twelve or fourteen years" (p. 73). Matthews admits that this is a complex phenomenon to explain, but he suggests two parts of an explanation.

First:

There is a certain innocence and naiveté about many, perhaps most, philosophical questions. This is something that adults, including college students, have to cultivate when they pick up their first book of philosophy. It is something natural to children.

Another part of the explanation has to do with the socialization processes in our society that turn children into adults. Adults discourage children from asking philosophical questions, first by being patronizing to them and then by directing their inquiring minds toward more "useful" investigations. Most adults aren't themselves interested in philosophical questions. They may be threatened by some of them (p. 73).

Later on Matthews states that to do philosophy "is simply to reflect on a perplexity or a conceptual problem of a certain sort to see if one can remove the perplexity or solve the problem" (1980, p. 83). Sometimes this works out, but often it does not. But the basic equipment needed for philosophical inquiry, according to Matthews, is the understanding that comes along with command of a language and the concepts it expresses. Accompanying this needs to be great patience and a willingness to think about simple and fundamental questions. An adult also needs to get rid of all defensiveness; not knowing an answer or an analysis of a philosophical concept is no reason for embarrassment. It is an advantage to adults that they usually have a better understanding of language and concepts than children do (cf. pp. 84-85). But "it is the child, however, who has fresh eyes and ears for perplexity and incongruity. Children also have, typically, a degree of candor and spontaneity that is hard for the adult to match" (p. 85).

Matthews' remarks about the equipment needed to do philosophy with children are to the point, I believe. However, Matthews ignores the practical matters of how teachers can best go about doing philosophy with their ordinary classes of 20 students, more or less. For example, the philosophical anecdotes that Matthews works from in Philosophy and the Young Child (1980) are mostly from one-on-one interchanges between an adult and a young child (three to seven years old) and from a class of seven (eight to eleven year old) students in Dialogues with Children (1984). While these books portray to us examples of children's philosophical thinking and how adults and children can be of mutual help in investigations of philosophical questions, Matthews does not address ordinary classroom teachers that face the challenge to work with maybe

twenty kids at a time.

Regardless of working arrangements in classrooms, another way of describing young children's perspective would be to point out that they have no premises to close themselves off with the methods of tenacity, authority, or the a priori one. Their standpoint is a combination of freshness (every situation is a new situation to them) and reflexivity as they cannot but 'love to think'. Their opinions have neither settled to be "normal" (cf. Kuhn's "normal science") nor "conventional" (cf. Mead), but rather they are engaged in a continuous reflective inquiry as their thoughts are seldom at rest.

We have enough material, I think, to present a kind of dialectical (Hegelian) stage theory based on Mead's theory of the development of the self. (The "I" and the "me" can be seen as thesis and antithesis brought to synthesis or "self" by the Hegelian spirit or socialization.) In children at the first stage, from approximately the age of five, the "I" has come to be the dominating phase of the self. Around the age of ten the phase of the "me" comes to the front and becomes the dominating one in the years of puberty. The "me" is mainly imported from the peer-group and the mass media. The dominating phase of most adults' selves is the "me" phase, which does not prevent them from high I.Q. scores nor from owing and losing things nor from manipulating fellow beings. But domination of the "me" is an obstacle to contributions towards correcting our course. I am not arguing for brakeless competition between "I's," what is needed is an equilibrium between the social stability that the "me" provides against the reconstruction contributed by the "I". The point being that schools have traditionally done too much of a service to the "me" and too much suppression of the "I". In this vein schools hinder growth and prosperity among individuals and nations. All nations

need more individuals at stage three where "I's" and "me's" constitute healthy and creative selves. Such a third stage is not a final one, reached once and for all times in a person's life, as there is no one proper and fixed balance between "I" and "me." Neither is growth limited to some of the young people that are in schools; there are enough examples around to show that healthy humans can grow in various ways mentally for as long as they live. But to grow they need to inquire on their doubts!

Why Communities of Inquiry in Classrooms?

From the sections above, it can be seen that a community of inquiry has a value in and of itself; it is not simply an instrument for boosting performance on reasoning tests. It is of value in itself because it puts democratic values, the values that are so widely appraised among various nations, to practice in education. The ideal behind any democratic society is to have subjects that are autonomous, that control themselves as reasonable people. In such a society the authoritarian role of the state, or the government, is minimal as subjects identify with the values that hold their societies together. They take rules and procedures on themselves and thus they submit to internal authority. In education for, but not only about, self-corrective democracies it is therefore of general importance to create communities of inquiry within classrooms.

To generalize, schoolwork is too often not only based on misconceptions about the nature of knowledge and learning, but the challenge to create communities of inquiry within classrooms is bypassed. That challenge should be accepted because students do not only need to learn by heart the characteristics of a democracy, but to experience it and conduct themselves accordingly. Dialogue, as a method of teaching, is of utmost

importance for the purpose of creating communities of inquiry. It is through dialogue that the "I" listens and responds to others' and its own "me" and thus the gap is bridged between the two phases of the self.

A classroom community of inquiry cannot operate without nurturing social togetherness and intellectual openness among its members which, in turn, prepares them for active participation in the larger community. Educational success of such a community has not only to do with outcomes, but with the very nature and quality of the educational process itself. If cooperative reflective thinking is not at the heart of it, it cannot be successful as a community of inquiry.

RESEARCH PLAN

The purpose of the study was to document the presence, absence or the genesis of communities of inquiry among twelve year old students in two classrooms in Iceland taught by two teachers with ten years of experience in teaching. The study was meant to provide the reader with a wider understanding of how such communities can be established in classroom settings.

My research questions suggested an ethnographic approach. The context of classroom dialogue and interaction was needed to answer both my general and specific questions. According to McDermott, Gospodinoff, and Aron (1978, p. 245), "the object of any ethnography is to describe some people's activities and to locate these activities within the various contexts for their occurrence." As this was not a collaborative research project my opportunities to inquire about "various contexts" were limited to an exclusive case study of the implementation of the Philosophy for Children program in two classrooms in Iceland. Further, since this investigation involved not only a study of a particular educational context, but also an attempt to study and bring a new context about, it does not constitute an ethnography. However, particular attention was given to the context that emerged as philosophy entered the classrooms, in the sense that: "contexts are constituted by what people are doing and when they are doing it" (Erickson and Schultz, 1981, p. 148). In this sense, the underlying philosophy of the described approach to analysis of the data is in line with Taylor who claims that:

We have to think of man as a self-interpreting animal. He is necessarily so, for there is no such thing as the structure of meanings for him independently of his interpretation of them, for one is woven into the other.... [the] self-interpretation ...is embedded in a stream of action (1979, pp. 37-38).

The data came from two 6th grade classrooms with 19 and 20 students at the Experimental and Training School* of the Icelandic College of Education. Apart from the connection to the College of Education the Training School serves as an ordinary elementary school for its neighborhood, but it was selected as a site for the study because of its experimental role. With the understanding that their participation was completely voluntary, the two teachers that participated to the study were appointed by the Training School's principal who was eager to have the philosophy program introduced to his students and staff. Both teachers had been teaching the same age group for several consecutive years. Neither students nor their parents were asked in advance whether they wanted to participate in the study as research activities are carried out on a regular basis at the Training School.

Students and the two teachers were observed at their regular work for the first three weeks of the school-year in early September 1986. Then each teacher was observed with her class over a period of twelve weeks in over 20 lessons on Lipman's Harry Stottlemeier's Discovery. After Harry had been in use for three weeks the researcher stepped in and gave a couple of model lessons with each group. In four lessons he served as a substitute teacher in philosophy, but altogether each group received 26 lessons on the subject.

There was no homework assigned to the students for their philosophy lessons. The materials used included Harry Stottlemeier's Discovery by Lipman (1982), which was translated from English to Icelandic and published by the researcher; portions of the accompanying teaching manual, Philosophical Inquiry by Lipman, Sharp and Oscanyan (1984), was

* Hereafter referred to as the Training School which is the "ordinary" name used by most people.

translated by the researcher and his colleague and made available as a draft. Also, the New Jersey Test of Reasoning Skills was translated by the researcher and used to assess the students' reasoning improvement through pre- and post-tests.

In preparation for teaching and to discuss the evolution of the project the researcher had 26 40-minutes meetings with the teachers. Informal interviews were often a part of the meetings and four of them were one-on-one interviews. During observation handwritten fieldnotes were taken and word processed later the same day. Almost all meetings and lessons were recorded, transcribed and translated when needed from Icelandic to English by the researcher.

As the enumeration above indicates the research activities were of various nature; translation and publication of teaching materials being one area, transcribing recordings was another one, staff development was a third one which included being a teaching consultant, a coach, a model teacher, and a substitute teacher. All these different roles related to my research role as a participant observer and, as could be expected, some conflicts between the roles occurred. The basic conflict was between an advisor in teaching philosophy and a researcher of what children and teachers do when working on philosophy.

As a participant observer, the researcher's actions, ideas and interpretations have shaped this study, often in an egocentric way. The objective was not just to select and express thoughts of which I am certain "but the very opposite: to fasten upon the difficulties and obscurities in which...[I find myself] involved, and try, if not to solve or remove them, at least to understand them better" (Collingwood, 1931. Quoted from Thinking 5(4), 1985, p. 45).

In order to focus the research three sets of general questions were

formulated. Two sets of less general questions were also formulated: middle level questions and then questions on particular aspects.

The General Questions

My first set of general questions has to do with the formation of a community of inquiry in general. To what extent, if any, is such a community already in place in the ordinary classroom? How are rules and roles negotiated? How do the participants view themselves? How does the development of the community contribute to the development of good thinking? Does working with philosophy trigger its formation?

Second, how do teachers create a community of inquiry? What pedagogical techniques are used? Is it simply a matter of technique? What techniques? If no, what else is needed? How are students viewed in such a community from the teacher's perspective?

Finally, how do students react to doing philosophy? Do they see their role as being different in philosophy from other classes?

The Middle-Level Questions

Here the concern was with the participants talking in the classrooms. Who does the talking? What kinds of questions are being asked? Who is being asked? Who responds to questions? How do they respond? Are the discussions philosophical in nature, semi-philosophical or "mere talking?"

Thematic Questions

Originally I had questions under the heading: Questions on the particular, which were focused on habits and dispositions created in a community of inquiry. However, more observations over a longer period of time than was available, would have been needed to answer these questions.

The thematic questions that replaced the particular ones were only stated after the analytic phase of the study was entered. They are quite simple: What are the subjective conditions under which a community of inquiry operates? What are the objective conditions for its operation?

Analysis

The lessons were analyzed in terms of: content, dialogue as a teaching method, and the teachers' perceptions. Specifically, each lesson was assessed for the level of success in the teaching of philosophy as a content (discipline), and as (dialogical) practice. Also, the teachers' expectations and perceptions about their own performance was used in the evaluation of each lesson. These three criteria and the several questions, but especially the thematic ones, guided the analysis of the data.

Recordings of lessons and meetings were done on 31 90-minutes cassettes (2x45). Recordings of the first ten lessons, with each group, were too hard to transcribe. Most other recordings were transcribed and together with fieldnotes, the word processed manuscript counts roughly 600 pages referred to as Notes.

To summarize, this dissertation study was designed to give an historical account of an attempt to create communities of inquiry in two classrooms, an account which hopefully can help teachers who are starting to do philosophy with their students to "improve their practice," the purpose of doing social research (Rorty, 1982; Bellah, 1982).

CHAPTER II: SETTING AND ACTORS

THE EDUCATIONAL SCENE IN ICELAND^{*}

Iceland's 250,000 people live on an island of 39,768 square miles. In terms of size it is comparable to Kentucky, Virginia and Cuba, and it is 8,000 square miles larger than Ireland. The density of the population is similar to Australia, both have approximately 6-7 inhabitants per square mile. About half of the population lives in Reykjavik and surrounding areas. Almost 90 percent (88.6%) of the population lives in towns of 300 or more inhabitants, the rest is scattered around the coastline. Given these figures, it is not surprising that examiners from the United Nation's Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) stated: "Ensuring that there are equal educational opportunities for education and that it is of equal standard throughout the country is a major problem" (Arango Vila-Belda, Faulkes and Robinson, 1987, p. 2).

Iceland is divided into eight Education Districts; all but Reykjavik have 13-29 School Districts, which total 152. The education districts have 17-33 primary schools (grade 1-9, for seven to sixteen years old pupils), or 210 schools in total; they enroll 40,785 students altogether; and they employ 2,569 teachers in all. There are only six private schools with 721 students and 34 teachers. Pre-school is not compulsory; classes for six year olds are usually offered at all schools, but classes for five year olds are usually not offered. The picture in this paragraph is drawn from Josepsson (1985, pp. 15, 52) and although the figures are for 1982-1983, the overall situation should be similar four

^{*} This section should be read in comparison with Appendix A: A Distant Perspective on Iceland.

years later.

Among other things, Reykjavik is different from other places in Iceland for constituting by itself one of the Education Districts with only one School District within its boundaries. That one school district has about half of the total population of students and teachers. The district has 22 different schools, one of which is the site for this project.

The operational year for primary schools in Reykjavik is nine months: 165 days for teaching and examinations and nine extra "staff days," meant for staff development or for individual preparation for teaching. This results in a 174 day operating year (cf. Ministry of Education, special printing nr. 473/1986). In rural areas the school year can be up to two months shorter. Legally there are 40 hours in a regular working week in Iceland. For teachers the working week is 45 hours; the extra 5 hours are meant to count for having the month of June off. Regular summer holidays count for 4-6 weeks (or for July). In August teachers are expected to spend 153 hours on their own in preparation for upcoming teaching; no one checks on whether this work is done or not. Because of the unique working arrangement in August, teachers can be required to attend re-educational courses every other year; for the most part that requirement is only in theory because of limited financial resources.

Each "teaching hour" is 40 minutes long and for every 100 minutes of teaching there is a 15 minute break. In the first six grades teachers are given 30 teaching hours a week; in the last three grades the requirement is 29 hours. Thirty teaching hours add up to 20 sixty-minute hours, adding two hours per day for breaks leaves teachers at school 30 hours per week. Teachers, consequently have 15 hours every week to prepare their lessons, which they do either at school or at home. The

ratio of teaching to preparation is accordingly 4:3; if preparation in August is added there are 18.5 hours in preparation to every 20 hours (60 minutes) of teaching.

Teaching is low-paid: a beginning teacher in the primary school earns \$800 (US) a month. After five years of experience the salary increases to \$950; teachers with ten years of experience earn \$1037. Comparative figures for medical technologists also working as state employees are: \$813; \$888; and \$970* (cf. Ministry of Finance, Schedule of Salaries #108, in effect from Dec. 1, 1986). Examiners from OECD noted:

The rapid growth of the economy of Iceland [from pre-industrial to post-industrial,] in the last half-century has resulted in its now being among the wealthiest of the OECD countries in terms of per capita income, though oddly enough the actual hourly wages for various occupations (including that of teaching) seem to be rather low. In other words, the high level of personal affluence is largely maintained by long working hours, with many people having more than one job (Arango Vila-Belda, Faulkes and Robinson, 1986, p. 2).

When it comes to teaching the examiners note:

The position described is one of a generally depressed profession. A majority up to 70 per cent, we are told, of the young people who finish their teacher training either never enter the profession or leave it early to go on to other employment. There is a high turnover of teachers in most schools, and applications for teacher training have dropped recently. A large proportion of them seem to be over-worked because they take on overtime teaching, and also often undertake other work outside the school to supplement their salaries (Arango Vila-Belda, Faulkes and Robinson, 1986, p. 26).

* Most comparisons that have to do with money are risky concerning Iceland because of inflation and unstable economy, both internally and externally. For example, in the beginning of 1986 minimum salary per month was \$475, after December first it increased to \$650, (with 40 Icelandic kronas to 1 U.S. dollar). At the same time teachers got a 4.9% increase in their wages. It should also be noted that state employees have a lower pay in general than employees of similar status in the private sector.

Since these calculations, in January 1987, teachers have received a 20% increase in wages. So have many other groups, and there seems to be considerable agreement that teachers have fallen behind in terms of general wages.

The following table presents a time schedule of subjects issued by the Ministry of Education (nr. 212/1984) for students in the primary school.

TABLE I: A SCHEDULE OF TEACHING HOURS FOR PRIMARY SCHOOLS

SUBJECTS	GRADES						
	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th	1st-6th
Icelandic	7-10	7-10	7-10	7-9	7-9	6-8	45-52
Danish				0-2	2-3	2-3	4-6
English						2-3	2-3
Mathematics	3-4	3-4	4-5	4-5	4-5	4-5	25-28
Social studies	2-3	2-3	2-3	3-4	3-4	3-4	18-21
Religion	1/2-1	1/2-1	1-2	1-2	1-2	1-2	7-8
Science				2-3	2-3	2-3	8-9
Arts and crafts	2-3	2-3	4-5	4-5	4-5	4-5	22-24
Home economics	1/2-1	1/2-1	1	1	1	1.5-2	6-7
Music	1-2	1-2	1-2	1-2	1-2	1-2	6-8
Physical education	2	2	2-3	2-3	2-3	2-3	14-15
Additional hours	4	4	4	4	5	5.5	26.5
=====							
Total hours	22	22	26	29	32	34	165
Total yearly hours*	726	726	858	957	1056	1122	5445

* With 33 weeks of operation.

The variable figures refer to minimal and maximal teaching hours. The additional hours indicate how many total hours are recommended within each grade on top of the minimal offerings. Proportions between subjects are meant to be the same in all schools within the limits above, but teaching methods and actual time schedules are left to individual schools and teachers to decide on.

By the 6th grade a student has spent 5445 teaching hours at school, i.e. 3630 regular hours, adding breaks to this figure gives a total of 4175 hours at school. If the organization of school work paralleled requirements in the U.S., the 6th grader would have spent 2125 more hours

in school than his or her U.S. counterpart.* This contrast becomes even sharper if students are compared in terms of age and if kindergarten in the U.S. is accounted for: A twelve year old 6th grader in Iceland entered first grade at seven after one year in kindergarten, while the eleven year old 6th grader in the U.S. entered first grade at six after one year in kindergarten. Disregarding kindergarten, a twelve year old student in the U.S. has spent 7350 hours in school while an Icelander the same age has spent 4175 hours. These figures give a difference of 3175 hours in favor of U.S. students, and, if schools are pleasant places to be where pupils get educated, this comparison is clearly inflattering for the Icelandic school system.

THE TRAINING SCHOOL

The Training School was built in the 1960's and the first students, in grades one through six, entered in the fall of 1968. The 7th grade began in 1974, and the Kindergarten** for five and six year olds was started in 1975. It was not until 1976 that the school became a complete primary school offering classes for 5-16 year olds, from kindergarten through grade nine. Presently there are 33 teachers at the school, 9 males and 24 females. There are 390 students and they are divided into 21 integrated classes, (students are not grouped according to abilities).

Ordinary primary schools in Iceland are served by the Department of Primary Education in the Ministry of Education. The Training School is the only primary school served by the Department of Higher Education and

* This assumes that U.S. schools operate for 35 weeks and that students spend an average of 30 hours per week at school.

** According to Josepsson (1985, p. 15) there are only five schools in Iceland where 5 year olds are admitted and all of them are in Reykjavik. Remember also that kindergarten is not compulsory.

International Education. According to its headmaster (Interview, 11/18 /86) although this division is beneficial in negotiating matters of small importance, bigger problems are more difficult to solve than in ordinary primary schools. For example, neither the playground nor the school's parking lot have been finished since the school opened.

Twelve of the 33 teachers at the Training School have a special appointment as teacher trainers which means that they work with students at the College of Education in their in-service training and they teach courses in educational theory of their respective fields at the College. Due to their work at the College, teacher trainers serve 26 teaching hours per week in the Training School, which is 3-4 teaching hours less than the other 21 teachers.

Because of its relation to the Ministry of Education and the Icelandic College of Education the Training School has a unique administrative position among primary schools in Iceland. Also, more small scale educational innovations are tried out at the Training School than at regular primary schools. Compared to other primary schools, the Training School has two extra teaching positions meant for educational innovations. Currently these two positions are used to arrange for teaching in the Kindergarten that was started in 1975! To secure that its pupils receive instruction in areas of importance the Training School is operated under the same co-ordinated syllabus (cf. Table I) as other primary schools.

Negotiating Entry

The first steps in negotiating entry to the site occurred during a small meeting in late spring of 1981 at the Training School. There were three of us responsible for introducing the Philosophy for Children

program, two B.A.'s in philosophy, myself and Asgeir Beinteinsson, and Dr. Arnor Hannibalsson, a professor of philosophy at the University of Iceland. Among others, both the Headmaster at the Training School and the Dean at the College of Education, attended the meeting which was lively. Problems with implementation contributed to our failure to get the Philosophy for Children program instituted during this initial effort.

Both because of this background and because the Training School is meant to support research (cf. #54 in Act on the Icelandic College of Education), I approached its headmaster in September, 1985, and he was at once interested in trying Harry out again.

My original idea was to bring in two philosophy students in their last year of undergraduate studies and have the research focus on their efforts in teaching eleven and twelve year old pupils. I intended to prepare the students through a workshop that would be arranged for other philosophy students as well; all this and more was meant to take place from January to May 1986. Privately, I thought that the college students' lack of teaching experience would not be of major concern since doing philosophy with children is very different from ordinary teaching and their background in philosophy would also help them. The headmaster pointed out to me that it would be unlikely that the philosophy students would stay with teaching in the Primary School and therefore he suggested I should work instead with two of his teachers, Helga and Linda, who were teaching the appropriate age-group.

If Philosophy for Children were to be implemented on a general scale in Iceland, one the first problems that would be encountered is the fact that those who have a basic background in philosophy usually do not teach in the primary school. Those who do teach there do not, in general, have

a formal academic background in philosophy. However, care is needed in not overestimating the importance of "formal" background in philosophy on the one hand, and "practical" experience in teaching on the other hand. "Formalities" or theoretical backgrounds tend to be out of touch with teachers' experiences whereas "practicality" in teaching supports status quo (cf. Lortie, 1975; especially "Apprenticeship of Observation" as well as his 3rd chapter in general).

I initially anticipated that most of January 1986 was to be spent in negotiating entry. I intended to "hang around" at the school and observe the students and the teachers who were to work with me. In addition, I expected review and polish my translation of Harry Stottlemeier's Discovery; arrange a workshop, translate and pre-test with the New Jersey Test of Reasoning Skills. In the very beginning of February I hoped to start doing Harry 2 or 3 times a week with 11 and 12 year old students in two classrooms led by two teachers. When the Icelandic school-year ended in late May there would have been at least 15 weeks of instruction. The summer of 1986 was to be spent on analysis.

In retrospect, this plan was awfully naive and it is amazing how long it took me to realize it. In a letter to Lipman from January 24, 1986 I complain that my entry for the dissertation work is slow and a postscript dated on the 27th ran:

BAD NEWS: Just had a meeting with the teachers and the principal where I intended to do the research. They are very much interested indeed, but because of lack of time and problems with scheduling Harry in, it was decided to postpone the research to this fall 1986.

For various reasons it was not possible to schedule a meeting with Linda and Helga until in late January 1986. After that meeting I was relieved as Helga and Linda pointed out the difficulties with my rushing and that it would come at the expense of the quality of the research. I

suggested they read my proposal to see what was at stake and how I intended to conduct the research.

It was pointed out in the proposal that the teachers to be worked with neither have formal background in philosophy nor training in teaching Philosophy for Children. But Lipman et al. (1980) emphasize that teachers should be taught with the same methods as they are supposed to use. They also claim that "three components - explanation, modelling, and experiencing - are indispensable in preparing teachers to teach philosophy on the elementary grade level" (p. 125).

It was furthermore stated in the proposal that regardless of whether Philosophy for Children is done with young or old, it requires a group of people. Therefore it was suggested that the participating teachers would meet with me and a group of people interested in philosophy, i.e., philosophy students working towards their B.A's. or holding higher degrees in the subject. These meetings would be modeled after on-site workshops that the Institute for the Advancement of Philosophy for Children offers in teacher education. At the workshop I would explain and model how to use Harry and then the participants would get experience with adult-peers in leading philosophical discussions springing from the novel. The plan was to pace the workshop a week ahead of the classroom practice and the idea was neither to work on teachers nor children, but to work with them. Methodologically this process is supported by Erickson, who stated: "If our aim is to study working rather than works, then we must join in the work" (1979, p. 9).

Erickson was quoted further in the proposal: "Teachers in public schools have not been asked...to reflect on their own practice, to deepen their conceptions of it, and to communicate their insights to others" (1986, quoted from 1985 draft p. 175-6). It may be neat and nice to

involve teachers, for Erickson it is a necessity if teachers are to grow up from "institutional infancy" to "professional adulthood."

"Teachers need to take the adult responsibility of investigating their own practice systematically and critically, by methods that are appropriate for their practice" (1986, quoted from 1985 draft p. 177).

I used the extra time provided by a delay in the project for various preparation, such as making arrangements to teach a course on Philosophy for Children at the College of Education. Verbally and in letters, I communicated to appropriate administrators that I wanted Helga and Linda to attend this course.

In late February 1986 I gave a lecture (Pálsson, 1986a) on possible gains resulting from philosophical discussions with children in a school setting. I came to the speculative conclusion that the main gains could be put under three headings: (1) In the long term, philosophical discussion serve as preparation for active participation in a democratic society. (2) Empirical studies indicate that philosophical discussions can increase students' reasoning abilities. (3) Philosophical discussions may improve morality, or social interactions among students, through their internalization of habits and skills exercised in a community of inquiry.

Before fall I deepened my exposure to philosophy for children by drafting a short ethical novel for the 8th grade, Gunni (1986b), for the National Center for Educational Materials of Iceland. In an introduction to an accompanying Manual I tried to focus on the major phases and moves in conducting a philosophical discussion. But for most of the summer 1986 I worked with Beinteinsson on translating Philosophical Inquiry.

From the time we had our first meeting on January 27, 1986, I was not in contact with Helga and Linda until Monday morning September 1, 1986,

when Linda called me up to suggest I would meet with them the next day so that we could make necessary arrangements. In retrospect I see my lack of contact with the teachers during the summer of 1986, as the most serious flaw in my preparation for the study. Contacting administrators and leaving a copy of the proposal proved to be insufficient to launch the research project.

THE ACTORS

In the next four sections I introduce the teachers and discuss their educational background. Most attention is devoted to the students and their social relations. The sections are based on data that was collected relatively late in the research period. Interviews with Linda about her background were taken November 20, and December 15 and about the social relations among her students on October 10. Helga was interviewed on her background December 17 and on the social relations among her students on November 14. The three of us spent a meeting on December 11 to reflect on the students' performance in both classes.

Although I had loosely structured the interviews, they took a life on their own to a certain degree. For example, the issue of in/dependence was not planned for in either interview about the social structure in the classrooms. In Helga's case this issue just arose and grew as the interview progressed. In the interview with Linda it never came to as much focus.

Linda's Background

Linda is in her mid 30's. She was born and raised in a small fishing village in a rural section of Iceland. She went to school in her home village until 16 years of age when she completed a co-ordinated state

examination* at the end of upper primary school. By fall that year she moved to Akureyri in North-Iceland to study at the grammar school there. In her second year she selected the division of languages.

After grammar school Linda moved to Reykjavik and signed up for courses in social sciences at the University of Iceland where she studied for one year before moving over to the Icelandic College of Education.

When asked why she entered education as a professional field, she said:

Well, I always did well at school, being at school was great fun to me. Actually I didn't intend to become a teacher to start with, I intended to study Icelandic at the University and become a journalist or something like that. But all of a sudden I got this overwhelming interest in teaching, it just eliminated all other options (Notes 11/20 p. 422).

The next question was on what had awakened this interest; whether it had been some single thing or just accidental. In response she recollected having assisted a boy in her family with his reading and having been excited about it. Also, this was the second year that teacher education at the College was operated on a university level or as higher education instead of being at upper secondary level. She thought this would be "good education" but the primary reason could still be traced to her interest.

After graduation in the mid 1970's she started teaching 7th grade at the Training School. The teacher who taught this class the year before had given up the class long before spring and another teacher had temporarily taken over his duties. Linda recalls that teaching this first year was "An awful experience." She had five very difficult boys

*-----
 * Until 1974 this was a challenging examination and functioned as a passport to higher education. In third grade of middle school (equivalent to 9th grade today), students could choose between practical and theoretical stream. The co-ordinated state exam was only given in the theoretical stream and if students failed they moved almost automatically to the practical stream and from there they joined the working force or moved on to vocational schools.

in the class and she survived only because of support from the principal and four other male colleagues, without their help she would not be a teacher today.

Reflecting further on this experience, she commented:

I am sure that my methods and other things I used didn't fit the kids at all. I think they were awfully insecure with me because I had just graduated and I naturally thought that kids this age should be rather independent, which they weren't at all. One needed to tell them everything. They started the first day by asking me: "Teacher, should I use a pencil or a pen for writing?" Of course, I said: "It's up to you!" The poor kids just got confused and they didn't know at all whether to use a pen or a pencil! This is somehow descriptive of how I entered as a representative of imagined freedom (Notes 11/20/86 pp. 423-424).

Linda talks about her classmates at the College as having been very idealistic: having high ideals on how to change teaching for the better which meant changing the "system." Today Linda looks at herself as a "liberal" teacher, but much firmer and more capable of adjusting to the needs of her students as she has consciously moved from "imagined freedom" by using a variety of approaches to the kids. Instead of starting from imagined freedom she wants to "go the other route" today: from discipline to more freedom.

By spring of her first year of teaching her husband finished his studies at the University of Iceland and they decided to move for a few years to Norway along with their young child. She audited philosophical propaedeutics and took a course in Norwegian at the University in Oslo during their first year.

Her second year in Norway she moved to the Norwegian College of Education and completed a one year advanced study in social pedagogy. When leaving Iceland she had not decided on taking this route although always being interested in pedagogy and advanced studies.

During her third year in Norway she worked as a supplementary teacher,

especially in math, but among other things she taught singing. In her opinion this was a traditional school and similar to most Icelandic schools except for more discipline, different ways of addressing people and different collegiality. For example, the kids had to go outside during breaks no matter what the weather was like; males were addressed as "teachers," females as Ms; and teachers were at school from 8 a.m. to 2 p.m. which is different from the situation in Iceland where teachers come to school and stay at different times.

After this the family moved back to Iceland and Linda started teaching a "lovely" 6th grade class at the Training School that she followed to the 7th grade. In 7th grade the kids were supportive of her; she would not have made it through with a "crazy class" because a second baby needed much care during nights. The next two years she took mostly off from teaching, but then she started again at the Training School. This time she taught a class of 3rd graders and Helga taught the other class in that grade. Both of them have followed this grade to their present 6th grade.

When asked about her preparation for teaching, she cited the advanced studies in Norway as having been extremely beneficial, especially as she had had a one-year experience in teaching at that time. That program explored how school related to society (parents included), whereas in the Icelandic College of Education the disciplines had been emphasized.

This year, 1987, is Linda's first year as a teacher trainer, which means that she supervises a group of students at the Icelandic College of Education in their student teaching, which they do in various schools in the Reykjavik area. The teacher trainers also form a team of lecturers to cover the theoretical side of teaching 8-11 year olds. This job has various aspects to it, including visiting classroom and evaluation of

students' papers and teaching plans, as well as of their teaching.

Asked whether she had any of her former teachers as an ideal model she mentioned a male-teacher from her hometown. I asked her to describe what had made him special:

He was our partner and I thought he was a good teacher. He explained things well and he was our partner and somehow there was never any fuzz or noise around him. He was easy going at all things and that was the way his personality affected many of us. This is the teacher who in my opinion stands out from all my teachers (Notes 11/20/86 p. 429).

Linda's Pupils

This section provides an overview of Linda's pupils based on an interview with her that started as a search for "Women's Organization" in her classroom, but it was also an open-ended inquiry on the social position of students within the class. The origin of social taxonomy can be traced to a conversation with principal Johannsson (Notes, 10/13 p. 107) when he informed me that there had always been a "core of a Women's Organization" in the present 6th grade, a core which had always been intellectually and socially more mature than the boys in that grade. This motivated me to find out who were and who were not in the core. The taxonomy is based on Linda's information, but I will contextualize the information within an analogy of my own. The key to the analogy comes in the next two paragraphs; you might keep that in mind and re-read them later. The analogy came to me early in the writing process of the study when as I was struggling to come to grips with my data.

The gods of the vikings formed a family. They had many human qualities: virtues, vices and humor included. Odinn was highest in rank of all the gods, oldest, wisest and all other gods served him "as children serve their father," or so goes the story. Odinn often played
 *-----
 Odinn and Frigg remind of TV-gods, especially Superman and Wonderwoman.

tricks on others with some kind of delusions, often by metamorphosis as he took on different bodies or somehow changed his appearance. Frigg was Odinn's wife. She was highest in rank of the female gods and most virtuous.* Frigg had many different names such as Hlin and Saga that were accompanied with different qualities. Other female gods served her, such as Snotra, Var, Sjofn, Fulla, and Gna. The Valkyries were a lower rank among the gods, (but sure they would take any wrestler nowadays to the floor, female or male). They fought at every battle that there ever was; among them were Hildur, Hrist and Hrund. An important female god was Freyja, but she was of a similar rank as Frigg and she also had many different names as she traveled among different nations in search of her husband that ran away. Syr, Gefn, and Horn were among her names.

Thor was Odinn's and Frigg's first son and strongest physically of all gods and men; he was notoriously short-tempered too. Among their many sons were Hodur, who had to rely upon others as he was blind, and Vidarr the silent one. Our last character is Loki who was a smart and mischievous god, but not wise.* Once he gave Thor's wife, Sif, such a close haircut that she was completely bald; he often got the gods into trouble, but he also had many tricks to release them. The family of the gods was much bigger and more complex but there is a basic resemblance between the relations among the gods I selected and the relations among Linda's pupils. This will now be mapped out for every student by relying on Linda's information but more support and revisions will come to the surface in the next chapter as the classroom discussions will be

Loki is really a horrible name to with which to identify a student, as the gods finally gave up on Loki and put him to torture until the end of the world. Fortunately there is nothing that indicates that our Loki's fate will be similar.

The following names have a different spelling in Icelandic: Gna=Gná; Hlin=Hlín; Sjofn=Sjöfn; Var=Vár; Horn=Hörn; Hodur=Höður; Odinn=Óðinn; Thor=Þór; Vidarr=Viðarr.

scrutinized.

When asked Linda first appointed Saga, Frigg, Snotra and Hlin, to the core of women's organization. Linda commented on them:

These are industrious girls and they are smart and they do everything that the teacher tells them to do. They sometime use an intonation of zeal when talking to the boys, because they think they are not good enough in doing this or that.

Me: Do you think somebody has the leadership within this core?

Linda: Nah, I can't say that.

Me: Equality?

Linda: I think so. Frigg and Saga are naturally, well, Snotra is not a leader at all. She is more of a follower to the others. She is one of those overly conscientious students. Doesn't talk much, does everything the teacher tells her to do. Sometimes it is too much, I think....Hlin is also one of those and Freyja too. These are prudent girls and they are smart (Notes, 10/16, 135-136).

After this Linda moves on and classifies five girls into two categories as we will see later, but after that she adds to the women's core:

Var and Sjofn I would perhaps also classify as belonging to the Women's Organization. Sjofn talks a lot.

Me: So we have a half-made Women's Organization, and then we have the organization itself: Freyja, Frigg...?

Linda: Saga, Snotra, Hlin, and Fulla relates to it, I think, and Gna too... It is questionable to put Freyja here, she is a little bit like, she is a little different from them in many different ways. Much more independent in many ways. She is more independent (Notes, 10/16, p. 137).

Linda gave Freyja a special status because although relating to the women's core she thought she was really too independent to belong totally there.

Saga has a special position within the group as she is the principal's daughter. Her attitude toward philosophy was positive and she participated often in class discussions.

In general Frigg participated often in every discussion as in other classwork. She was talkative and her sentences were awfully long and confusing; if one could identify thought with language Frigg's score on thinking tests should be very low. But in terms of conduct she is mature

and respected.

Hlin belongs to the women's core and sometimes she seemed to be bothered if other students were not taking the discussions seriously and thus she was helpful.

I label Saga, Frigg and Hlin as Chiefs within the core of Women's Organization, but Snotra does not belong with them as she is usually very quiet and as Linda said is more of a follower. Next to the Chiefs we have a rank which I label as Privates: Snotra, Var, Sjöfn, Fulla and Gna. The Privates belong to the core but they are not leaders. They are not disruptive and with the exception of Gna they are quiet. On Var Linda commented:

One can really expect good things from her, but she tends to be a little unstable in her performance. Var has changed a lot this winter.... She is starting to relate to other girls. She used to be only with Sjöfn and she never said a one single word! (Notes, pp. 540-541).

While searching for candidates for the Women's core Linda commented:

There we have the childish ones, Gefn and Syr... Syr has been quite a surprise in the philosophy. She is so open, she has the courage to come with exactly everything that comes to her mind! At first I felt like she missed the issues, going completely off the subject. I was afraid she would not come back to it, but I have reconciled with her. She often brings funny and clever points just directly into the discussion.

Me: Does she then show another side of herself as compared to other classes or what?

Linda: As well, because she, that is to say she has the courage...She doesn't have the fences that these kids are taking on now (Notes 10/16 p. 136).

After picking out the Chiefs in the women's core, Linda commented:

These three are on their own, Brund, Hrist and Hildur. Hildur is, she is very mingled. Sometimes Hildur is a lovely and delightful girl... but all of a sudden she is this big chic, she concentrates on being a chic. I always find it easy to get in contact with her (10/16, p. 136)....

Me: Do you think about those three with some special name?

Linda: These are girls that want to be chics. I don't know what one should label it.

Me: Chics!

Linda: Only chics, I think so, they put a lot of energy into that. But

poor Hrist, she is so neurotic that one needs to put her to relaxation before the day can start (10/16 p. 137-138).

Hrist, Hrund and Hildur disrupted the discussion at times, although Hrist's points were often extremely insightful and helpful in forwarding the discussions. Both because of their behavior, and because they are "on their own" I labeled them Valkyries, a most fitting name.

Now we only have one girl left, Horn. When categorization came to her Linda commented:

And then there is Horn which has a questionmark attached.... She can perhaps enter all groups and then she drops out of all of them, she is very unstable in interacting with others. I don't know how to describe it.

Me: Can we call her a wanderer?

Linda: Yes, perhaps [doubtful]. She is, Horn is clever at math....she is extremely good at sports and she is greatly appreciated because of that...I cannot locate her exactly (Notes, 10/16 p. 137).

Much later, when considering results from the New Jersey Test of Reasoning Skills, me and Linda had this conversation on Horn:

...It is quite often that she doesn't grasp the context of things. She can learn math, except if it requires reading then it all gets mixed up. She does very well in biology if it is something concrete.

Me: I don't remember her entering the discussion!

Linda: I suspect she doesn't keep up with it at all...

Me: So, she just doesn't get it, but she is not disruptive (Notes, 12/11 p. 537).

The social ties among the boys are not as strong as among the girls. To begin with, Vidarr can easily be distinguished from the other boys as well as from the class in general. He was usually silent all the time and not in any apparent social relations with the others except sharing space and time. He is even more of a loner than Horn; i.e., Horn is a traveling loner (between groups), Vidarr is an isolated loner (outside all groups).

Thor was the pupil we most often talked about. He entered the classroom in 3rd grade and at that time he had serious problems in

interacting socially with other kids, both inside and outside of school. He didn't learn to read until 5th grade, he still never reads aloud in class. But, despite all things, his comments show that he is quite thoughtful. I find it most likely that he is in a disguise like Odinn, the only difference being that he needs help getting it off or otherwise to learn to live with it.

Thor tries hard to get his father's recognition in and out of school, but without much success. Odinn is also in the disguise of a donkey in our class and his squeal was sometimes disruptive to the discussions. He seldom entered discussions unless the topics were negative such as: What makes a boring teacher? Positive things appear to be too childish to him. Physically, Odinn is most mature of the boys. No wonder that he has communicated to Linda that he feels out of place.

Hodur sometimes joined the discussions but it seemed as if he was too busy trying to be recognized by the other boys and sometimes he stayed silent because of that.

Loki is handsome although he lacks the same maturity as Odinn. Linda thinks he struggles with Odinn over leadership within the boys' group. But Odinn and Loki are Leaders among the boys whereas Thor and Hodur are Followers. Loki often joined the discussion and showed various signs of enjoying philosophy. He was as positive as Odinn was negative.

Summary

The social taxonomy in Table II below is meant to summarize the section on Linda's pupils.

TABLE II: SOCIAL TAXONOMY OF LINDA'S PUPILS

G	I	R	L	S	B	O	Y	S

WOMEN'S ORGANIZATION								

CHIEF	CHIEFS	PRIVATES	VALKYRIES	CHILDREN	LONERS	LEADERS	FOLLOWERS	
-----			-----			-----		
Freyja	Frigg	Snotra	Hrist	Gefn	Horn	Odinn	Hodur	
	Saga	Var	Hrund	Syr	Vidarr	Loki	Thor	
	Hlin	Sjöfn	Hildur					
		Fulla						
		Gna						

The origin of the taxonomy stems from the principal's comment on the "Women's organization" which he said was more mature intellectually^{*} and socially than the boys. The section above supports his conception but we have also been able to identify the members of the Women's Organization and we have found that there are really two groups within it: Chiefs and Privates. The Chiefs are leaders among the girls and there is no internal struggle among them over the leadership as there is equality among them. The Chiefs look down, in a way, on the boys when they remind them of behaving themselves. Freyja has a special status among them as she is more of a strong character than a leader. Linda considers all the Chiefs to be smart and industrious.

^{*} Results from the New Jersey Test of Reasoning Skills that are discussed in the beginning of Chapter IV support this too.

Although the Privates belong to the core of the Women's Organization they have a subsidiary status within it. They are conscientious and Snotra is overly conscientious. Linda notes that Sjöfn talks a lot but that I never noticed in my observations. Sjöfn did not participate much in our discussions and her "talk" was not interruptive to them. Although Linda did not mention it, I did notice that Gna did talk a lot. But, with the exception of Gna (and possibly Sjöfn), the Privates show their (limited?) sociability by being quiet, by not protesting on any front, by not interrupting.

Children and Loners fall under a similar description, their social behavior is stable. The exception being Horn, she is the only one of the girls that never entered discussions and as noted she travels between groups.

Except for Vidarr, that never entered any discussions, the boys, have a "them against us" attitude toward the girls in the classroom. The Valkyries were the only group to reflect the same attitude toward the boys. Virtually all disruptive behavior was associated with these two groups.

Helga's Background

Helga, in her mid 30's, and her husband who is also a teacher have two young children. She was born and partly raised in Reykjavik. Her mother's family has its roots in North-Iceland and there she stayed during summer breaks until she was nine. Her family also has roots and relatives in Norway, it is a second homecountry to her. Helga has often visited Norway and one summer she worked there on a hotel job and spent one schoolyear there as a teenage student.*

Helga completed the co-ordinated state exam in the 9th grade and studied at the Gymnasium of Reykjavik for the next four years until she graduated in the mid 1970's. She entered the Icelandic College of Education immediately and graduated as a teacher in three years.

When asked why she became a teacher, she responded:

Well, the case is a little strange! My grandfather on the mother's side was a teacher...and my mother was a teacher, and people used to tell me all the time: "You'll become a teacher!" I always said: "No! I'll never become a teacher! No way! I'll do anything but become a teacher!" But, I don't know, this is how things turned out (Notes, 12/17/86 p. 566).

In other words, after graduating from the gymnasium she chose teaching following her mother's encouragement that convinced her that teachers would get decent pay in the future.

When asked where from she had the best preparation for teaching she indicates that it is a hard question to deal with. She rephrases it: "You're asking what turned out to be most effective for me when I started teaching?" I agree, and she kept on:

There are many factors that have influenced me through the years. Studies [at the College] were a starting point, of course. But I think, when I start to think about it, that my mother influenced me a great deal. She taught school in town and I often sat in on

* Although both Helga and Linda have lived, worked and studied in Norway that is an exception for Icelandic teachers.

her...being a student at the same school myself. I always followed up with what she was doing....I really cannot enumerate more things. Then the first year was naturally a fiery trial. I had extremely difficult circumstances the first year I taught [at the Training School], I had the most difficult class I have ever had!

Me: How did you work it out? By yourself or?

Helga: No, there were two of us and it saved my mental health that we could share the problems. I have often thought about it, I wouldn't be a teacher today if I had been just by myself that winter. This was a shock just graduating and having all these problems with six year olds....But since I made it through that winter, I think I could almost go through anything [laughs] (Notes, 12/17/86 p. 568).

It turned out that this difficult class didn't calm down until individual students were taken out of it and treated at other institutions of different nature.

A little later in the interview Helga corrected herself. Her first year of teaching after graduation had really been in Norway. Her mother decided to do advanced studies in Norway, but as she did not have access to grants or educational loans, Helga decided to go with her for support. She found a job as a teacher in a kindergarten and recollects the winter as having been fun.

When asked to compare schools in Iceland and Norway, she finds them rather similar except that they are more traditional in Norway. "Things are within a firmer frame, they have firmer rules on things." But, as Linda did, she complains of having too limited experience of schooling in Norway in order to compare Icelandic and Norwegian schools thoroughly.*

The year after her fiery trial in Iceland she took over another class of six year olds that had already been at school the year before and that is the present 6th grade that we will peek in on. When it came to the third grade more pupils entered the class and so did a new teacher

*We should therefore keep in mind that their comparisons are limited to their personal experience.

which was Linda.

Me: Do you think the class was molded early as to who are the most difficult or easiest to handle as well as to who became leaders?

Helga: No, I can't say that. If I just compare them as they were younger and as they're now, for this and last year, I find individuals that have taken a completely different route from what I'd have predicted....

Me: But these unexpected changes have appeared around the age of ten?

Helga: I don't know the explanation...most likely their puberty... but circumstances at home have also been a part of the picture.

Me: Which come out for the worse?

Helga: Yes, but also vice versa....

Me: But to change the subject, do you have a favorite teacher? When you think back, is there somebody who always stands by you?

Helga [thinks for awhile]: Well, yes I think there are maybe two teachers I'm really fond of when I look back. Others disappear among memories but two of them stand out...A woman who taught me when I was 10-12 years of age, she is a little special to me, and a male who taught Icelandic at the gymnasium. He is, I have a vivid image of him especially in relation to the story of Egill, I can just see him if I close my eyes, he performed the story for us, he took on all roles! A lovely person and it was a great fun having him as a teacher.

Me: Do you think you use them as ideal teachers, or?

Helga: No, I don't think so but I have often thought: Aha, if I only could make it alive and reach the kids like...[he] did at the Grammar school, but... [the three of us] are very different teachers.

Me: Perhaps you have them [the ideal examples] from your education?

Helga: Yes, without doubt. From the education and by getting to know things. I want to mention the re-educational [summer] courses, I have been at many of them and they give me a push. (Notes 12/17/86 pp. 571-572).

Helga's Pupils

To Helga's students I gave names I thought most fitting to some of their central characteristics and I also coded them to Helga's information. Except for one Hebrew name and five Icelandic names the meanings are as follows, according to Wade (1982): Adelle: Noble; Agatha: Very kind and good; Angela: A messenger or an angel; Ari: Icelandic for Harry Stottlemeier which again is a reference to

* One of the old Icelandic sagas which were mainly written ca. 1250-1400. Egill was a son of one of Iceland's first settlers around 900. He often traveled to Norway.

Aristotle; Buena: Very good girl; Cora: A maiden; Doreen: Very serious; Erla: Icelandic name of a bird (wagtail); Leona: A woman who has lion-like courage and strength; Louise: Warrior maid; Logi: Icelandic for fire; Salome: peace and tranquillity; Tab: Illuminated or brilliant amongst all others; Thomas: A twin; Titus: Coming from the giants; Torfi: Same stem as in turf but "tor" by itself is common Icelandic prefix with negative meaning as it indicates difficulties or slowness; Trausti: same stem as in trust; Zophon: Zophonias (Hebrew) crowned with glory or disguised by god.

Like in Linda's case, the origin of the social taxonomy that will come to the surface at the end of the section can be traced to principal Johannsson's (Notes, 10/13 p. 107) comment that there had always been a "core of a Women's Organization" in the present 6th grade, a core which had always been intellectually and socially more mature than the boys in that grade.

When asked to identify the members of the Women's Organization, Helga responded:

That is not much of a problem, we have Adelle, Angela and Agatha. These girls tend to be dominant in the group.

Me: Are they good students?

Helga: Yes they are all very good students, very good! Especially Adelle and Agatha, Angela follows them a kind of, but she is clever too and she can do things. Following them comes Cora she is awfully dependent and obeys the others. If somebody [in the Women's Organization] says something she will follow just because she said it (Notes, 11/14/86 p. 379).

On November 14, when reflecting on the classes performance we noted that Angela has increasingly entered the discussion. Linda added that Angela has come up with good ideas through the years. Adelle didn't show much interest in philosophy, she chatted often while discussions were on. Angela and Cora were most often her "chat-partners" but, as noted, Angela entered the discussion increasingly as time passed.

Agatha usually showed interest and seemed to say what she had to say although not of much quantity nor substance.

After assigning Adelle, Agatha, Angela and Cora to the Women's organization, Helga came to Louise:

She is naturally a little bit on her own territory. She is, I don't know, I think she has serious difficulties in interacting, both towards herself and others.

Me: Has she been like that for many years?

Helga: Yes, she has been like that, especially last year and now this year.

Me: She seems...perverse to me.

Helga: Yes....she doesn't behave unless one uses some special tactics....Perhaps she is inside this group [Women's Organization], but she is different. And Erla, she is also like this, she follows the others, does what they tell her to do. These are the most dominant ones in the group (Notes, 11/14/86 p. 380).

Neither Louise nor Erla showed openly much interest in joining philosophy discussions.

Next Helga comes to Sophie and Salome and she comments:

Those two are on their own [both of us laugh], they have always been like that, but these days there is something happening with Sophie, and we don't quite understand what, she is starting to protest over and over again. It doesn't fit her character at all because her attitude toward school has always been very positive and she has seen the positive aspects of things.

Me: But the relation between Sophie and Salome, has that changed along with the changes in Sophie's character?

Helga: No, that I haven't noticed. Salome doesn't say much, she doesn't, so it is difficult to find out what she thinks of these changes in Sophie....Salome entered the class in 4th grade and Sophie had been here all by herself. She never related in particular to anyone. She is rather special! But they came in contact (Notes, 11/14/86 p. 380).

Two pages later in the interview Helga comments that Salome depends on Sophie to take and have the lead on their behalf and that Salome likes to have it that way. Sophie is very imaginative, but she can be very stubborn, just sticking to her point.

Concerning Doreen Helga comments that this year she is on her own territory but last year she had related somewhat to Buena and Erla. This year she is becoming more and more eccentric.

Helga: ...This week Doreen is at a table with boys and she seems to be doing fine!

Me: Perhaps relatively independent?

Helga: Yes, she is very independent that girl.

Me: And then unlike Erla and Cora in that respect?

Helga: Yes.

Me: But Louise again, isn't she independent in her perversity?

Helga: Oh, yes! She is independent. Sometimes she is. Well independent, I don't know what to call it when kids do exactly what pleases them without obeying any rules! But on good days, when she is in a good mood, at those times she is relatively independent. She is....

Helga: Buena is very independent. In a certain respect she belongs with these girls [Women's Organization]. But she has a position of her own. She entered the class when she was ten, but she should have been with the eleven year olds.... [Buena has changed schools frequently, among other places the family spent a year in Denmark, when she came back from Denmark she had bad luck with a teacher and/or her new school]....When she came to us she could hardly read and it was decided to slow her down for a year as she is born late in the year. She has done OK, she is on good terms with the kids. She is very independent. In a certain way she follows these girls here [the Women's Organization].

Me: Still she is somehow different?

Helga: Yes, she is so lovely, she is so extremely, somehow, lovely. I don't know, it makes her different.

Me: Sincere?

Helga: Yes, she is sincere, more sincere than these girls.

Me: But sometimes she chats and comes off the wall?

Helga: Yes, she is an awful chatter. Especially this winter. But if it suits her she can be very firm (Notes, 11/14/86 p. 381-382).

Now we have only one girl left, Leona, who started school a little late and was therefore by mistake not on the list of names I brought to Helga when searching for the Women's Organization. When reflecting in retrospect on Leona, we had this conversation:

Helga: When I have made negative comments on Leona you often tended to play them down.

Me: Yes, I have the feeling she is...well, you [Linda] you have a negative image of Odinn and I suspect you [Helga] of having negative image of Leona. But I can well understand why!

Linda: Yes, both of them disturb the peace [laughs].

Helga: In my opinion she has often taken the discussion and put her way down here [points to floor]. Just like that! For sure, she is very good at raising her hand!

Me: Yes, but I think you overplay this a little. It has happened, but it is not as frequent as you think!

Helga: It is my anger, of course, as I have not been able to take the discussions to a more fruitful level....

Linda: Agatha appears to be much more intelligent than Leona! Still Leona is a little unpredictable!

Helga: Yes, she is unpredictable!

Linda: She can can be a great surprise! (Notes, 12/11/86 p. 546).

As indicated Leona tended to be strict on having everybody raise their hands when wanting to enter the discussion. When present she entered most if not all discussions that way. But it was as if she wanted her remarks to be funny and that undermined their comprehensiveness (we'll see examples in the next chapter).

Me: What about the boys, can we draw them apart?

Helga: That's more difficult. Zophon, he is very special! A good student! He can adopt to whomsoever. He is so adaptable. Everybody likes him and they want to have him in their groups, so he can relate to anyone....[He is not in very good health and misses school often.] A very good student. Titus is very dependent. And he wants to follow somebody in particular... especially Tab and Thomas.

Me: He follows them but doesn't manipulate them?

Helga: Well, Titus is a nagger, but I don't think his nagging gets him anywhere. I haven't seen that. But it is remarkable that if he is into trouble, and if he thinks he is to blame,...then it shows that he is a very sensitive soul....

Helga: Tab is really a very independent individual.

Me: More independent than Thomas?

Helga: Yes he is more independent, more secure. Thomas is similar to Titus in many ways, he tends to nag on low keys, one can hear this in the background, like "mmmmmm." But they fit well together. Tab is very independent and with good explanations of things, so that he can even be classified with Zophon in some respect. Still they don't relate much, [Tab and Zophon] they don't search for one another's company. Trausti has changed a lot since I met him first. I think he is just a fine person, just fine, although he doesn't do well in our discussions. He is all the same trustworthy. Turns everything in...Those boys are rather solid, they are not much of a group, not as much as the girls, I think. They are one by one. Tab and Thomas relate and Titus is attracted [and Trausti spends much time with them]... Perhaps one can say they form one group; this is a group of friends. Torfi enters it too. Titus lives a long way from school and therefore he has been a little apart, but at school he relates to them. Tab, Thomas, Trausti and Torfi live in the neighborhood and they hang out together after school. I'm often surprised that Torfi should be one of them.

Me: How come?

* Before searching for the women's core I had asked on Trausti's background. It went like this:

Me: He seems to chat all the time! [Usually with Torfi] A disturber!

Helga: He is a disturber, yes. One can see it at the tables, one needs often to quiet him down, a lot! (Notes, 11/14/86 p. 379).

Helga: To me he seems to be a little bit different, but well, perhaps he is different outside of school. The others are conscientious, they keep on with their work, they are usually kind and manage easily.... Torfi is more careless, he forgets things and he doesn't seem to mind at all, conscienceless at times, just drags along in his schoolwork. He doesn't mind at all whether he is doing well or badly!

Me: And he doesn't try to infect the others?

Helga: No, he is, he just comes sometimes off the wall, he says: "Aha! Oh, yes!" (Notes, 11/14/86 pp. 383-385).

Like Trausti and Zophon, Torfi seldom entered the discussion and like Trausti, Titus, and Thomas he was often observed chatting.

Helga: I think I must say that Logi is rather an independent boy, I think so.

Me: But you are not quiet sure?

Helga: Well, it can perhaps be a little difficult to figure him out. Sometimes he belongs in a group with Louise.

Me: Is that because of his perversity?

Helga: Yes, he is very stubborn. One has to handle him with a special touch. It doesn't do any good to reprimand him sharply. One has to start with positive things first: My dear Logi, I know that you can do this....This boy has worked things out well, he was eight when he came to me, and he was a difficult eight year old one. He had many difficulties and was insecure of himself....He had fights with the other kids and he didn't adjust to the class....But gradually he has been gaining recognition in the class and he is handsome and that already counts because of the puberty....He can be very kind this boy. Extremely kind! Loved by everyone at times! But his extremes are so wide apart!...He likes to be praised... He's a very good soul if let alone in peace (Notes, 11/14/86 p. 385).

Logi entered the discussions sometimes, but during some of them he stayed silent and sometimes he tended to be disruptive.

Me: But how does Ari fit into the picture?

Helga: Ari is rather different. He comes and goes. He entered 4th grade late in the year, he had been living in a rural area and he comes in the spring, then he moves abroad with his father. His parents are divorced....In 5th grade he enters again late in the year, and since this fall he has been with us....He is remarkable in many ways! He is so clever in some fields! It is just unbelievable, he is a real genius at some things, but then he can be so childish and acts so stupidly. This boy has his extremes.

Me: What fields, in particular, is he good at?

Helga: Especially in math, I have to be on the tips of my toes so that he doesn't run me over. Also, in fields similar to math, where reasons are needed. But subjects like Icelandic history bore him to death! One almost has to catch a hold of him with pliers to have him get his book! It really takes him a long time to start working. But then he can just drop out in between....He is just

like a professor. He drops completely out at times and then he perhaps goes out to the hallway and is just fooling around. One day I missed him [from the classroom] so I started searching for him, I wanted to see where he would be at. He was down to the next floor and was playing with a nut, kicking it around in the middle of a lesson. I said: "Ari! What are you doing?!" and he answered: "Wha?! Yes, yes! Oh yes, I'll just go upstairs!" So he seems to be in a world of his own, but then he is OK in between.

Me: Would you label him as independent as Zophon and Tab?

Helga: His independence is different! He is not, well of course he is independent, he has to be as he comes and goes and lives here and there (Notes, 11/14/86 p. 386-387).

At that time I didn't inquire further on exactly what it is that gives him a different independence, but in the classroom Ari sometimes chatted or was not showing the discussion any apparent attention at all. He was thus unlike Zophon who was always quiet, and he was also unlike Tab who always showed interest and entered every discussion.

When it came to Ari in our November reflection on the students' performance, the following conversation took place:

Linda: Isn't Ari a classical example of a philosopher, like the ones you can read about in books: Doesn't work seriously with us on anything, but just fools around?!

Helga: You should see him! I'm sure it would be worthwhile just to sit in and observe him! He doesn't work at all, no matter what is said to him!

Linda: He just paces the floor...[all laugh]

Me: But how does he do on exams?

Helga: Extremely well!

Me: He does well on exams, but he doesn't do a thing!

Linda: He says in math, for example: "This book is boring to death! I know all this stuff!" And he is right. He knows how to do everything which is in that book!

Helga: The test on Icelandic history is another example. He had lost his book and he couldn't read a word to prepare for it! [Still he did very well.]

Me: How does he succeed? Is he, can it be that he is giving attention to things although he appears to be out of contact with the environment?

Helga: That kid is just extremely intelligent!

Linda: He knows a lot of things. He spends much time with his grandfather (Notes, 12/11/86 pp. 544-545).

Summary

The following taxonomy in Table III springs from the section above:

TABLE III: SOCIAL TAXONOMY OF HELGA'S PUPILS

G I R L S B O Y S							
	WOMEN'S ORGANIZATION			C H A R A C T E R S			FRIENDS
	CORE	ACQUAINTERS	PARTNERS	LONER	LOVER	PROF.	SPOKESMAN
Independent individuals	Adelle Agatha Angela	Buena Leona	Sophie	Doreen	Zophon	Ari	Tab
	-----Louise-----			-----Logi-----			
	FOLL- OWERS		Salome				Thomas Titus Trausti Torfi
Dependent individuals	Cora Erla						

Like with the other class the first idea to the taxonomy can be traced to the principal's comment on "Women's Organization" being intellectually and socially more mature than the boys in both of the classes. But although Helga had no problem in identifying the members of the Women's Organization, it does not hold true that its members are socially and intellectually^{*} more mature, (although physically they are more so), than the boys. On the contrary, their social interactions: chatting, listening, respectfulness, etc., were on equal grounds. As a group they do give a social counterbalance to the Women's Organization.

Socially three of Characters, Salome, Zophon and Doreen, are different from all the others as they are quiet (and thoughtful) for

*Supported by results from the New Jersey Test of Reasoning Skills.

most of the time, if not always.

Logi and Louise are both stubborn in character. Leona is coded with them ("L"), but I find Leona not as stubborn as she is a hot temper, or just plainly decisive. Still Leona is intellectually insecure (she tries to present her ideas as jokes; they come out poor and her ideas are better than the jokes).

The general attitude in the class, between individuals and groups, is friendly. Also it may be noted that independence and dependence cuts across groups, but if applied to the other class it would not, I suspect; Chiefs, Valkyries and Leaders would be independent and the other groups dependent.

CHAPTER III

DESCRIPTION OF CLASSROOM INTERACTIONS AND DISCUSSIONS

Introduction

This chapter will focus on teaching; at first in general but then the teaching of Harry will be at the focal point.

Over a period of twelve weeks, from September 23rd to December 10th, each group of students had 26 lessons in philosophy. Linda taught eleven 40-minute lessons and ten lessons in the third period from 10-10:40 a.m. which were usually 10-15 minutes shorter than ordinary lessons because of students snacking in the beginning of the hour. The researcher modeled two lessons in Linda's presence, joined a discussion once in her class and taught three lessons in her absence. Helga taught ten 40-minute lessons and thirteen lessons following the morning break which were usually, but not always, 10-15 minutes shorter than other lessons. The researcher taught one lesson in her absence and modeled two lessons in her presence. The philosophy lessons were recorded and after October 15th they were transcribed. In neither class was there any homework on philosophy.

To prepare and discuss the philosophy classes the researcher and teachers had twenty-six 40-minute meetings of which more than half were recorded and transcribed. Over 100 pages of fieldnotes were written at the site and word processed the same day or the day after. Transcripts of recordings from meetings and classes were finished as each week passed, i.e., on Sundays transcripts from the week before were usually completed. The transcripts and word-processed fieldnotes add up to roughly 600 double spaced pages, referred to as Notes.

We will now look into several periods that the 16 week research period from beginning of September to mid-December can be divided into.

SEPTEMBER 1-22: GETTING READY

This section will focus on preparation for the philosophy project as well as on the teachers' instructional style.

At a meeting with the teachers on September 2nd the research process was discussed in general. All three of us were optimistic and looking forward to the task. I learned that Helga and Linda had not heard of the course on Philosophy for Children which was about to start at the College of Education and that they would be unable to attend it. At that moment I realized I had mostly daydreamed my plan and only partially executed it: I had arranged for the course, but I had not contacted the teachers directly about it, nor had I put it down on the table as a prerequisite for doing a decent job. So, I responded: "OK, we'll just prepare for the teaching, the three of us." We decided to meet two mornings a week; on Mondays from 10:40-11:30 and on Tuesdays from 9:00-9:40. It was also decided that philosophy would be three times a week in each class: Linda's classes were scheduled in the first period on Tuesdays, third period on Wednesdays and in second period on Fridays. Helga managed to schedule her classes in the third period on Tuesdays and Thursdays and in the first period on Wednesdays.

At this meeting I speculated that "philosophy" ("heimspeki" in Icelandic which literally translates: "worldwisdom") might be too fancy a word for the subject, we might just as well use social studies which students were used to as a subject. My speculations resulted in the use of "social studies" on the students' schedule which was given to them on their first day of school, September 4th or 5th. At the meeting I left the teachers copies of the lecture Heimspeki með börnum,* (Pálsson, 1986a).

In retrospect, this was a mistake: "Philosophy" is the customary word for the subject and although unfamiliar as a word to the students it would also have referred to an unfamiliar subject. Using "social studies" is delusive: a familiar name (of a familiar subject) is used for an unfamiliar subject.

The next two weeks I spent as much time as I could observing teaching and interacting at the site. I first met the students in their classrooms in the third period on September 9th and introduced myself and the philosophy project. With both groups I noted that I was a student myself and that the project was a part of my doctorate.

A girl in Helga's class asked me whether philosophy would be like astrology, in response I asked the class: "What is astrology?" The girl referred to an Icelandic TV-show for teenagers where astrology had just been discussed. Another student said that astrology is on maps and thus indicated that philosophy was not. After these interchanges I emphasized that philosophy had to do with our thinking, how we think what we think and how we know what we know. Students sat in groups at their desks and were attentive during my presentation. After the presentation I stayed for a few minutes and my Notes (9/9/86 p. 2) said: "Pupils were a little unruly, a boy threw an empty juice paper-container at a girl. A girl pushed all the things [which were not many] off her group's table." Later I found out that the boy was Logi and the girl Louise.

When I entered Linda's classroom she was working on the blackboard, explaining how the surface area of a triangle could be calculated. The

 * Philosophy with Children The first part of the published lecture is a description of the Philosophy for Children program and how dialogue can work as a method of instruction. The second part is on possible benefits that accompany doing philosophy with children. Later that week I left them the introduction of a manual to Gunni (Pálsson, 1986b) which is concentrated on phases and moves in philosophical discussions.

pupils sat in small groups at their tables. In a few minutes Linda asked the class to form a horseshoe for my presentation, but because of limitations in space we ended up in a kind of a circle. In essence my presentation was similar to the one before except now I noted the longer I am a student, the less I learn. One of the Valkyries made a comment on my dialect (which is "hard and almost spitting" compared to the "soft and lazy" dialect in South-Iceland).

On September 10th I came to school just after the first period began and found out that Helga and Linda had decided to conduct the reasoning test in this period. The students started to turn their solutions in after 35 minutes and all of them finished within an hour except Buena. While working on the test a few students raised their hands every now and then to ask for explanations or to complain about something. For example, Logi complained to me about how stupid it was to talk about "animals with stripes" (cf. item #1). Both Linda and Helga mentioned (cf. Notes, 10/9/86 p. 3) that students had had difficulties with the wordings "follows from" which I translated as "af því leiðir" or literally as "from it follows." This wording only occurred in two items (#1 and 34) and the students did well on those items. In my opinion, the phrase "af því leiðir" is an essential part of a vocabulary that carries reasoning in Icelandic; I got the impression that the kids' experience in working with such a vocabulary is poor.*

In the hallway, after the test, I talked to three girls from Helga's class who told me that the test had been "funny" (i.e. strange). One

*I didn't follow up on this hunch but it might be a worthwhile research project to study the use of vocabulary and expressions that imply or refer to reasoning. Although not mastering this phrase the kids do of course reason, but this phrase is a standard one when it comes to formations of arguments. It is ordinary and explicit: it points at premises and conclusions of reasoning and actions.

said: "Some of the items were awfully easy others were awfully difficult." Another said: "It was all about 'follows from' and things like that" (Notes, p. 3).

Basic patterns

Before teaching of Harry started on September 23rd, I had learned most of the students' names, although I still had difficulties in associating names, faces and voices. By that time I had detected a general pattern in both Helga's and Linda's teaching style: Both spend most of their teaching time circulating around their classrooms assisting individuals and groups of students at their tables.

Among the tasks that both classes worked on during this period was writing. Helga's students wrote a story about a picture in the textbook (cf. Notes, 9/12/86, p. 9). The students worked busily at this while Helga went around the classroom to assist groups and individuals. Comments and chat could be heard, especially from Angela and Adelle who sat at a table by the window in the back of the room. Tab, Thomas, Titus and Trausti sat at the table next to the entrance and they started discussing their stories when done. As the students were finishing, Helga asked them to close their books as she wanted to introduce another topic to them (on characteristics of nominatives, adjectives and verbs). According to my Notes, I observed:

Angela and Adelle stand up from their table, Helga asks them to sit down: "Girls! Sit down!" and they do. Helga stands in front of the blackboard and starts talking about nominatives, adjectives and verbs. While she talks Titus, Thomas, Tab and Trausti keep on working and talking without paying attention to her. Logi starts talking at Zophon, but they sit at the next table with Harry and Torfi. Helga reprimands Logi: "Logi, would you please stop talking with Zophon!" (Notes, 9/12/86 p. 11.)

It may be emphasized that Logi was not really talking "with" Zophon but

"at" him. It should also be noted that Adelle and Angela sat a little apart from the rest of the students in the far corner by the window, they chatted a lot, but the other students as well as Helga ignored them for the most part. Physically Adelle and Angela are more mature than other girls present and their chatting, comments and laughs are typical of what is generally known as following puberty. Cora and Leona were not present but they have also matured into the puberty phase. Chatting within the groups appeared, in general, as a natural part of the work and was not reprimanded except when the teacher stopped by at the table or if it got too noisy. Chatting between tables, on the other hand, was infrequent.

Linda's teaching style is very similar to Helga's but more tension between boys and girls as groups (see for example: Notes, 9/15/86), as well as between teacher and the group of boys is apparent in Linda's classroom. This may relate to the fact that more individuals have entered the puberty-phase in Linda's classroom: Frigg, Freyja and Saga among them, all in good control of themselves, but the Valkyries, Odinn and Loki often behaved as if they were not in full control of themselves. The following vignette exemplifies the tension between Linda and the boys. The students were writing a letter on behalf of a girl from a rural area to someone in Reykjavik. Linda had stopped behind Thor and was talking in a low voice to him:

Thor: I'm the one who is writing, not you!

Linda: Take it easy, dear Thor!

Loki: You always wants us to write so stupidly!

Thor: It was me that accepted working on this job!

Linda: Take it easy! [talks to them in a low voice...]

Loki: That's the way it is, just like last year! You always decide how we are supposed to write!

Thor: What if the girl wants to have it this way?

Linda: This is just to show you how you might write a letter! (Notes, 9/12/86, p. 14.)

This vignette does not simply indicate a "tension" between teacher and

students, but underneath is the fact that as a teacher Linda is in a difficult position in relation to Thor as he has a history of being difficult to manage.*

Odinn and Hodur did not enter the interactions above but they sat at the same table as Loki and Thor, but every now and then Odinn could be heard to call out "Referee!"** referring to Linda. For example: "Referee, can we leave now?" At the very end of the lesson he called out, without using "teacher," "Linda," or "referee:" "Is there some homework to do?!" Responding to this Linda tells the class to read in the book they were working on and to do one page of math per day. The fact that Odinn did ask about homework is noteworthy as he turned out not to care that much about it.

The teaching style described, i.e., walking between tables to assist individuals and groups, certainly fits the physical arrangements in the classrooms and it calls for relaxed atmosphere as students are free to chat a little, on or off tasks, at their stations. It also fits well with Linda's description (a few weeks later) of "the classical structure of a lesson:" "One gives a short introduction, then comes a short discussion, and then an exercise. This is the classical structure of a

* It must be added that through the years Linda has through much effort managed to build a positive relationship with Thor. For example, when we later sat in a circle Thor usually saw to it that he sat by Linda's side, if he chose not to sit with the boys. I am sure that by focusing on "smooth things on nice days" it would have been possible to draw a more positive picture of Linda's classroom than the one I am about to present to you. My picture has maybe more to do with the undercurrent in the classroom. But, as the reader will soon see, instances like the one pictured in the vignette above were too many to be ignored.

** Odinn was the first one to use "referee" as referring to Linda. Loki was quick to pick it up and also the Valkyries but in two weeks time it was out of use. I once asked Hrund why they called the teacher a "referee". She said she didn't know, she just liked the sound of it. "Dómari" is Icelandic for referee or judge and the kids added to it: "Dómariiii" or "refereeee".

lesson" (Notes, 10/16/86, p. 129).

The three elements she mentioned could easily be detected in their teaching,* especially a short introduction to the whole class and a long period of sheetwork exercises. At this stage I never saw anything like a whole-group discussion, but only interchanges between teachers and single students as information was passed to them or they prompted to remember or report something. But discussions, i.e. talking, in small groups was often the first phase of the sheetwork; students would talk their tasks over and the teacher would stop by to assist and overlook how things were going. Sometimes a lesson would also end with the groups reporting on their work. For example, in a biology lesson (Monday, 9/15), Linda's groups discussed the importance of good nourishment and then reported to the whole class. In this lesson Odinn, and Loki to a lesser degree, came to the surface in a quite negative and defying way:

I enter the classroom at 8:30. (All timings were according to my watch as there are no wall-clocks inside classrooms, but only in the hallways.) Linda is distributing textbooks on biology to the students. The kids look at the books while they talk together. Linda tells them to do an exercise on nourishment from the book. "You talk it over in the groups and you have to agree on a conclusion and remember that you have to give reasons [pause]. What is that? [I.e. "giving reasons".] A girl answers: "It's why things are this way but not some other way." Other students share comments on reasoning and I hear one of the Valkyries say: "This is stupid! The answers are right there!" For the next ten minutes the groups work on the exercise and Linda circles around the classroom. At 8:43 Linda stops the work to have the groups report their conclusions: "Hildur, Hrist and Hrund, what conclusion did you come to?" Hrist is their spokesperson and answers: "If one eats healthy food, one's mood becomes good and if one eats junkfood one's mood becomes bad." Some members of the class [the boys among them] raise unclear objections about the connection between food and mood, so

*It should be emphasized that I am talking about basic patterns in their teaching style; what would be called a "default option" in computer language. Helga informs me that as they get into the schoolyear and after students have adjusted to school they start to apply various methods in their teaching.

Hrist adds to her answer: "One can have a tantrum if one wants to, but one's nerves become stronger!" [if the food is healthy].

Linda: Loki, do you agree?

Loki: No, I can't hear her!

Linda asks Hrist to repeat her answer and then repeats her question to Loki.

Loki: I don't know, I have never tried it out!

Linda starts writing on the blackboard but Loki and Odinn comment: "One can see it on Hrist that she doesn't eat healthy food!" "You can see it on the teacher too!"...[The first comment could correspond to facts but the latter must be considered as a bad joke! Both comments are ignored by the class.]

Thor: Humans have to eat healthy food so they don't become like monkeys!

Linda asks a follow-up question on this: "What do you mean?" But Thor stays silent and the other boys chat together. The question is not directed to others in the class.

Linda: What is worst to the heart?

Thor [raises his hand at once and calls out]: "I know it! Fat!"

Linda: Why?

Thor: It narrows the heart-veins!

Linda expands a little on this and then cuts pieces from an apple and calls on Hodur and Saga up to the blackboard and asks them to eat the pieces without moving the tongue. Hodur and Saga testify that they cannot do it without moving their tongues. Now Linda proceeds to cut small pieces from the apple to allow each and every student to try it out.

Odinn: They boys need bigger chunks!

Some of the students comment on the experiment: "It's impossible!" "You always swindle although you don't realize it!" "It [the tongue] just moves by itself."

Linda: Can we conclude that we have discovered something in this lesson?

A girl answers and Linda repeats after her: "We need saliva to swallow and we need saliva to move the tongue. Do you agree?"

Odinn: No, you can have Hodur spit in your mouths!

Linda and most students ignore this comment but from the front I hear a girl's comment: "How disgusting!"

It's close to nine o'clock and the lesson is almost over. Linda keeps on talking about digestion with the students. All of a sudden she looks at Syr and asks: "Syr, what were we talking about?"

Syr [without hesitation]: We were talking about digestion!

Linda directs a similar question to Hrist and reminds them of paying attention to the subject. By now the lesson is over (edited from Notes, 9/15/86 pp. 15-18).

There are three things I would like to note about the lesson just described. First, it is likely that the comment from the Valkyries, "This is stupid! The answers are right there!" in the beginning of the hour surfaced because of an ambiguity in the directions. "Give reasons" can both mean "recite reasons" (when the answers are right there to be talked about) and "work it out" (when students have to discuss issues and

integrate, generalize, or otherwise apply their knowledge). Let me add the opinion that "discussion" is commonly used, both in English and Icelandic, where "talking" would be more appropriate. To "discuss" implies examination and arguing about a subject, talking does not have that implication. When we pretend to be discussing we are usually just talking or chatting, I believe.

Second, Linda is really checking whether Syr and Hrist have "dropped out" at the end of the hour when she asked what the topic had been. Third, although cursing and vulgar vocabulary is infrequent in both classrooms, some students (at least) are not reprimanded for it. (I never focused on this last point. Perhaps vulgar comments are just the students' attempts to get the teacher's attention and perhaps they are best left ignored.)

A general pattern that relates both to the daily routine at the site and the teachers' instructional style was that Helga and Linda read short stories or chapters from novels primarily for purposes of relaxation and entertainment while students fed themselves in the beginning of the third period. When students were done nourishing themselves, and a story or a chapter was over, a sudden shift was made to the next subject matter at hand.

The following vignette shows how this typically occurred:

Helga starts to read from the story The Gray Man. When it says in the story: "I live in Malmö," she stops and asks: "Where is that?" Someone says: "In Norway!" but more students say "Sweden." Helga responds: "Norway is not correct." [A little later comes an expression to indicate that a cat in the story is dead. Something like:] "The eyes of the cat were distinct," Helga stops again and asks: "You know what had happened?" Some students respond at once: "The cat is dead!" A little later, at 10:31 the story is over and Helga says: "The story is over let's turn to Icelandic. Now we have a lesson in Icelandic, go and get your textbooks!" (Notes, 9/12/86, p. 9).

The vignette does not only show the shift to the next "subject" at

hand but also Helga's reading style to some degree: She stops to check on understanding of single expressions or to check on knowledge about the story's scene. If stories were in simple language and the scene a familiar one, Helga would read the story through without stopping.

Linda's shift to the next subject and her reading style was in essence very similar. Neither one of them preceded nor followed the stories with discussions about issues raised; notwithstanding that the issues often could serve as food for thinking. For example, both teachers read a novel by Swen Wernström, a Swedish author. In Helga's case:

She starts reading at 10:07 from Murder in the Theatre by Wernström. First she asks the students to keep in mind that the story happens in Sweden. The students listen with attentiveness.... The following points in the story awaken my interest as she reads: 'If one has a role to act, it means that one is pretending to be something one is not.' 'The play had a funny name: "The Exception and the Rule"...it is impossible to guess what it could be about.' 'It was meant to make us think because there were discussions afterwards where the play by Brecht was to be discussed'....At 10:21 the story is over and without any remarks Helga walks from the window [but earlier she had moved to Adelle, Angela and Cora to quiet them down] over to the teacher's table (Notes, 9/19/86, p. 41).

The piece she read was in simple language so she never stopped to check on understanding of words or phrases but still the text touched on concepts like: Role, pretending, personal identity, exception, rule, play, possibility, prediction, guessing, and thinking. My hunch is that without destroying entertainment or relaxation, discussing the issues raised in the story would have deepened the student's understanding of them. The vignette also shows that Helga used her location in the classroom as an instrument to control the noise level; she did move herself from the teacher's table towards Adelle and Angela to quiet them down, but before she changed location she had stopped once to reprimand them: "Girls, you must be capable of being quiet for ten minutes!"

The lessons we have peeked in on have been on writing, reading, and

biology. Now we take an edited look (from Notes, 9/16/86 pp. 20-31) at three consecutive morning periods devoted to mathematics.

When I enter the classroom at 8:23 Loki comments to me: "Arrives the KGB!" I grin back to him: "CIA!" and he repeats my English spelling of c-i-a. Linda checks on who are absent this morning, the head-teacher stops by to inquire whether there are any pupils in this class that speak Norwegian as a new teacher in that subject will visit them in the lunch hour. Two students raise their hands. [At this time I was still learning the students' names and had difficulties in associating names and faces; I miss the accuracy myself.] The intercom-phone rings at 8:27 and Linda asks Frigg to go down to the office to get some transparencies.

Linda asks the class to work on an exercise in their math book; the task is to find out the math operations that fit series of numbers. Linda asks Hildur to be patient, to pay attention and not disturb the others although she had already done this exercise. I hear Loki comment: "Junk! This is not fair!" [Comment ignored by others.]

Thor leaves the room, probably for the lavatory. When he comes back in a few minutes Linda walks over to him to get him started on the task. Otherwise she circles around the room to assist individuals and groups.

The boys [Vidarr had not yet started school] and the Valkyries call for more attention than other groups. The boys share comments on the task but every now and then Odinn and Loki make comments such as: "No swindling!" that are loud enough for everyone to hear. Hrist comments in a loud voice: "I'm too lazy to do this! I'm not in a mood for math! When I'm not in a mood for math I'm no fun!" [She stays silent for a moment, but then she goes:] "Linda, help me! I don't know how to do this!" Linda goes over to their table.

From the middle of the classroom I hear an unknown student's comment: "This is so boring!" Linda comes over to the boys and asks Odinn: "Are you done with the bottom line?" He answers: "This is absurd nonsense!" Linda leaves him for the blackboard and asks for the class' attention. Thor throws a hard piece of something [it makes a sharp sound when it hits the floor] at the Valkyries. "Was the line second to top easier?" asks Linda. "Yes, do that one!" calls Thor. Linda explains the operations needed for the series as Thor requested and then she asks the class to turn the page over. But Thor asks her to repeat what she had already done, she asks him to look at how the other boys had solved the task. The boys resist in allowing Thor to look it over. Linda asks him whether he is done with his calculations. When he answers "No," she tells him to calculate first and then look at how the other boys did it.

At 8:53 Linda turns the overhead on to do some calculations and she warns the pupils not to add things of different nature such as kronas and pencils. She finishes and Odinn comments: "What a nonsense this is!" And Linda reprimands: "Loki! Pay attention! All of you [the boys] have been chatting and not paying attention!"

AT 8:58 Linda leaves the classroom and tells the kids to keep on with their work until the teacher of Danish arrives. "If you want some challenge you shouldn't peek at the answers!" are her last words as she leaves the room.

There are several things to note in the lesson described above.

First, Loki made similar "spy-comments" about my presence later but he was by no means hostile to me, on the contrary he was quite friendly and positive towards philosophy. I took his comment as a mixture of truth and joke; indeed there are many strong similarities between spying and case studies. Odinn, on the other hand, was always neutral towards me, but rather hostile towards philosophy. Second, Linda picked Frigg to go down to the office to get the transparencies. Frigg was even of assistance without being asked to. Two weeks before (Notes, 9/9/86, p. 9), for example, she came twice to Helga's classroom to inform her that a teacher substituting for Linda had not arrived yet. This comes in line with Frigg's special position within the group. Third, it is known that Hrist and Thor have personal problems that they need to work on, but they have a kind of "love-hate" relation to their work in the classroom: They hate the "stuff" ["stuff" can refer to almost any activity and subject], they chat, their attention is fluctuating, but all the same they are interested to work; both of them ask for help and explanations, both of them participate openly in discussions.

Now we follow Linda over to Helga's classroom where she covers the same subject matter as she did in her own class; notice the different atmosphere.

In a minute I follow Linda across the hall to Helga's classroom where a lesson in Danish is just over. Basically she uses the same approach, but the atmosphere is different: it is more peaceful and no groups in particular call for attention. However, Logi requires more attention than others. Early in the lesson he commented: "Why are we learning this? There is a computer cashier at the store which works this out!" Linda responds by telling a short personal story where she added the cost of things together in her mind and was thus able to correct a clerk that had pushed the wrong buttons.

A few minutes later Logi comments: "I will buy a pocket calculator for sure, so I don't have to learn this junk-math!" Linda ignores him. A couple of minutes later she works on the

blackboard and asks the class: "What do we need to be careful about?" "We need to be careful about not forgetting the pocket calculator!" answers Logi. Linda explains that one can do mistakes on a calculator and that one has to know what operation to use (Notes, 20-25).

The different atmosphere corresponds to a different social structure within the groups as already described. Physical maturity is also different within the groups; Logi is the only boy (out of seven) in Helga's class that has matured into the puberty phase whereas two of four, Odinn and Loki, have done so in Linda's group.

I stay in Helga's classroom for the third period and now she is the teacher. Before peeking in on her lesson, let me tell you what I learned in the morning break:

I used the break to get 40 copies of Harry to my car and bring them up to a storage on the third floor. On my way down to the cafeteria I stopped to chat with the teacher on guard in the school and playground during the 20 minute morning break [it's up to pupils whether they are inside or outside during breaks]. I inquired whether physical fights among pupils are common and got to know that violent fights are far from being as frequent as they were a few years ago when the kids formed a circle around two fighters and shouted "Fight! Fight!" The circle hindered the guarding teacher to separate the fighters. This has changed for the better and now the kids separate fighters themselves, if conflicts are serious.

Early in the third period Helga starts reading The Ghost by Knut Hamsun which she introduces as a famous author. Helga stops three times to quiet Adelle, Angela and Cora down. She also moves towards them in the same purpose. The reading is over at 8:26 and Helga announces that they will have a math lesson as they have not yet started on "social studies" (i.e. philosophy). The following interchanges take place between Helga and Logi.

Logi: "How one can hate this bloody fucking junk!"

Helga [looks at him silently before asking]: "What did you say!?"

Logi: This is so boring! One has already been in 5th grade and the book there is more difficult!

Helga [with a doubtful intonation]: Is that really so?!

Logi [a moment later and this was just meant for his partners at the table]: One can see Mars from the Earth. Like one sees the Sun. If one would be 20, and one would travel in space for 70 years, one would be 20 years old when one would return. [He is silent for a moment, but then he goes:] The mother doesn't allow it! She's in the waterbed!

The noise level increases in the room. Adelle, Angela and Cora whistle, Titus, Thomas and Tab hum a song, but Logi gets a pocket radio from his bag and puts the headphones on at 10:38 and seems to concentrate on the math. Five minutes later Helga asks him to take

the headphones off.

Logi [protesting]: It's much better this way! I can't hear the noise!

Logi puts the headphones down to his neck and in a little while he calls out: "What am I supposed to do! This is so messed up!" Tab, Thomas and Titus imitate car sounds. Helga reminds Cora that she is not supposed to bring sweets to school. Logi calls again: "What am I supposed to do?!" The time is now 8 minutes past the usual shift to the next period [starting at 10:40] and Helga walks over to her desk. She asks the class to close their math books and start on Icelandic. Logi puts the headphones on again. Helga walks at once over to him:

Helga: Please be good about it! [I.e. to take them off.]

Logi: It's much easier to work with them on!

Helga: Perhaps at home, yes.

Logi: No, right here.

Logi takes the headphones off and puts them on the table by his side. The class is busy writing adjectives, nominatives and verbs on pieces of carton paper that they cut out. Helga circles around the room. At 10:58 Logi puts the headphones up again. Helga walks to him:

Helga: So you want me to store this [radio and headphones] for you?

Logi [tense and noisy]: If one can work well with something it is just taken away!

Helga: The mood is not very good today!

Logi puts the headphones in his bag and then he picks a small piece [perhaps an eraser] and throws it at the table where Adelle, Angela and Cora sit. They respond: "The mood is not very good today!" (Description of the three math periods is edited from Notes, 9/16/86 pp. 20-31.)

As far as I could see the students worked busily throughout the period at their tasks, they chatted for sure, but the chat was a "natural" part of the working process. As the period relates to Logi it seems as if his mood was getting better after Helga showed him some attention because of his vulgar mouth in the beginning of the hour. She was not shocked nor did she overreact to his comment, "how one can hate this bloody fucking junk!" but instead she tried to make the best out of it. This approach seemed to work for a while, at least Logi started to fantasize as he worked on his math, but later when Helga got too busy to pay him all the attention he wanted, his mood worsened. At other times Louise would have her tantrums and Leona would get mad over something but in each case the conflicts would usually just involve them individually.

Central Reflections

This period covers the first three weeks of the school's operating year. The students have grown and matured during the three months of summer break. At one of our meetings Helga and Linda noted that in the beginning of every schoolyear they needed some time to harmonize the students again to schoolwork. Even if this "harmonization" was in process during the period above, it should have been clear to me that neither the kind of social togetherness nor intellectual openness that both characterize and are prerequisites of communities of inquiry were present in the classrooms. This does not mean that there was no social togetherness or intellectual openness present, but simply that it was of a different nature.

As authors of the Philosophy for Children program are not very exact when they describe communities of inquiry the next few points serve as a bridge between their descriptions and what took place in the classrooms studied. The focus is on necessary conditions for a community of inquiry to be in operation. This discussion is included here to prepare the reader and ease him or her to come to grips with the analytic side of the dissertation.

The most basic conditions for communities of inquiry to operate are twofold: (1) Objectively, social togetherness must be present so that students listen to one another and monitor their own interactions. When this is in place students openly take care of their turntaking when talking together. (Instead of following external authority they take rules on themselves and thus submit to internal authority.) In most basic terms, social togetherness means absence of physical fights between students or between groups of students. A more mature social togetherness includes listening to one another. In short, this means

showing respect for persons.

(2) Subjectively, intellectual openness or respect for ideas, both of one's own ideas and other persons' ideas is also needed. Intellectual openness is expressed through willingness to discuss and investigate ideas and by settling disagreements with openness to evidence and reason. Social togetherness and intellectual openness are not only basic conditions for operation of a community of inquiry but they also characterize it and they do need to be cared for.

The basic conditions above can appear or be fulfilled in various ways in classrooms. Teachers need to keep in mind that, for various reasons, respect shown to persons and ideas can vary to a great degree between classrooms, but working with the Philosophy for Children program helps teachers bring these conditions about. It is possible to have one but not the other of the two discussed factors working in a classroom, but when both are present the classroom converts to a community of inquiry. This shows in the students' commitment to the procedures of inquiry: in questioning (of one another and the teacher), in the students' search for problems, in their attempts to clarify the terms they use, in their distinctions, as well as in making connections to what seemed to be unrelated before. In other words, in a community of inquiry the objective and subjective conditions become of shared values; it is not sufficient for its operation to have single individuals behaving on their own in accordance with the basic conditions above.

Furthermore, it is assumed in the Philosophy for Children program that certain general conditions are being met: (1) A story is the most appropriate medium for giving context to ideas. Reading the story aloud gives a common experience that serves as a springboard into discussions. (2) Students need to be given opportunities to identify what they want to

talk about and thus they are also given opportunities to accept responsibility for their own education. (3) Teachers need to be willing and able to explore conceptual issues through (a) dialogue and by operationalizing content through (b) exercises where appropriate

Certain procedural (or technical) conditions are also emphasized in teacher education workshops at the Institute for the Advancement for Philosophy for Children: (1) Students and teacher sit in a circle or in a "U" to make sure that facial contact is possible. (2) Students are given opportunities to take their reading turns automatically but not have them assigned by teacher. (3) What the students want to talk about is clarified if needed, and written up on the blackboard with reference to text and with person's name that made the suggestion. (4) If present, every effort is made to be reduce or eliminate interruptions from outside.

Before the project started the conditions to philosophical inquiry, enumerated above, had not been met nor intentionally nurtured in the classrooms studied. Furthermore it is fair to say, I think, that the students' beliefs as well as the teachers' beliefs concerning the daily routine of teaching were at rest. Philosophical dialogue as a method of instruction took the teachers by surprise; it was more difficult to conduct and more different from their teaching style than they had imagined. The students did not know what was happening nor why they were learning "this"!

SEPTEMBER 23 - OCTOBER 14: UPS AND DOWNSIntroduction

This section will focus on Helga's and Linda's teaching of Harry before lessons were demonstrated by the researcher.

"Ups" and "downs" are terms that came to me as I looked back on this period. The terms are relative and basically they will be used from three perspectives: from the teachers' perspective, i.e., how they experienced and evaluated their teaching, from a philosophical perspective on content, and from a philosophical (/pedagogical) perspective on dialogue as a method of instruction.

For the remainder of the chapter I will sketch an outline of the project week by week and lesson by lesson. The tables on pages 87 and 88 summarize various factors relating to the teaching of Harry. The three factors that have "+" or "-" are difficult to assign, but my premises were basically as follows: If concepts presented in the novel or manual are operationalized through discussions or exercises in a lesson, a "+" is assigned to "content" of the lesson. If none, or only limited, operationalizing is apparent, a "-" is assigned. If classroom "dialogue" reflects listening and intellectual work or inquiry, a "+" is assigned to it, if not a "-" is assigned. A "+" or a "-" is assigned to the teachers' perceptions depending on whether they were pleased with their lessons or not. These categories are by no means clear cut so that a "-" does not mean that a lesson was thoroughly bad in the concerning domain. Neither does a "+" mean that a lesson was thoroughly good in some other respect.

TABLE IV: SUMMARY OF TEACHING FACTORS IN HELGA'S CLASSROOM

UPS AND DOWNS										
Lesson	Teacher	Circle	Turns	Agenda	Exercise	Content	Dialogue	Feeling	Harry	Topics
I.1	H(P)	Yes	Given	No	Also	+	-	+/-	1:1-4	Conversion
I.2	H(P)		None	No	Mainly	+		+		Discovery/Invention
I.3	H(P)	Yes	Given	No	No	-	-	-	2:5-8	
II.4	H(P)	Yes	None	No	Mainly	+	-	-		Standardization
II.5	H(P)	Yes	None	No	Mainly		-	-		Stereotyping
RESEARCHER ABSENT FROM CLASSROOMS										
II.6	H									
III.7	H	Yes/No	Given	No	Also		-		3:9-12	Thoughts
III.8	H	No	None	No	Mainly	+	-			Inference
III.9	H	Yes	Given	No	No	-	-	-	3:11-14	Venn circles
MODELING										
IV.10	P	Yes	Taken	No	Also	+		+	3:12-14	Venn circles
IV.11	P(H)	Yes	Taken	Yes	Also	+	+	+	4:15-17	Vagueness
IV.12	P(H)	Yes	Taken	Yes	Also	+	+	-/+	4:16-17	Understanding
MORE UPS THAN DOWNS										
V.13	H(P)	Yes	Taken	No	No	-		-	4:17-18	Harry is boring
V.14	H(P)	No	None	No	Mainly	+		+		Standardization
VI.15	H(P)	Yes	Taken	No	Also			-	4:18-20	Who threw stone?
VI.16	H(P)	No	None	No	Mainly	+	+	+		Inference
VII.17	H(P)	Yes	Taken	Yes	No	+	+	+	5:21-24	Induction
VII.18	H(P)	No	None	Yes	Also	+		+		Generalizations
VIII.19	H(P)	Yes	Taken	Yes	No				5:24-26	
VIII.20	H(P)	Yes	None	Yes	No	+	+	+		Schools&Education
IX.21	H(P)	Yes	Taken	No	No			-	6:27-30	Mind
IX.22	H(P)	Yes	None	Yes	No	+	+	+		Mind&Brain&Memory
X.23	H(P)	Yes	Taken	Yes	No	+	+	+	7:31-34	Culture &
X.24	H(P)	Yes	None	Yes	No	+	+	+		Degrees & Kinds
POST SCRIPT										
XI										
XII.25	H(P)	Yes	Taken	Yes	No				8:35-37	Mental acts
XII.26	H(P)	Yes	Taken	Yes	No				8:37-42	Transitive rel.

EXPLANATIONS:

Lesson: Roman numbers refer to weeks, Arabic to sequence of lesson.

Teacher: H=Helga; P=Palsson; H(P) Helga observed by Palsson.

Circle: Students sat in circle (Yes) or in small groups (No).

Turns: Given or assigned by teacher or Taken automatically by students.

Agenda: On board (Yes). Not on board (No).

Exercise: Used to support discussions (Also) or as the backbone to a lesson (Mainly).

Content, Dialogue, and personal Feeling(perception): A down (-), an up (+).

Harry: Number before colon refers to chapter in novel. Numbers after colon refer to pages.

Topics: Topics which most time was spent on in lesson.

TABLE V: SUMMARY OF TEACHING FACTORS IN LINDA'S CLASSROOM

UPS AND DOWNS											
Lesson	Teacher	Circle	Turns	Agenda	Exercise	Content	Dialogue	Feeling	Harry	Topics	
I.1	L(P)	Yes	Given	No	Also	+	-	-	1:1-4	Conversion	
I.2	L(P)		None	No	Mainly	+		+	1:5-8	Discovery/Invention	
I.3	L(P)	Yes	Given	No	No	-	-	-	12:5-8		
II.4	L(P)	Yes	None	No	Mainly	+	-	+		Standardization	
II.5	L(P)	Yes	None	No	Mainly	+	-	+		Stereotyping	
RESEARCHER ABSENT FROM CLASSROOMS											
II.6	L	No	None	No	No		-	+		Discussions	
III.7	L	Yes/No	Given	No	Also		-		13:9-12	Thoughts	
III.8	L	No	None	No	Mainly	+				Inference	
UPS AND DOWNS CONTINUED											
III.9	L(P)	No	Given	No	Also	+		-	13:11-12	Teasing	
IV.10	L(P)	Yes/No	Given	No	Also	+		+	13:12-14	Venn circles	
IV.11	L(P)	No	None	No	Mainly	+				8 Sentences	
MODELING											
IV.12	P(L)	Yes	Taken	Yes	Also	+	+	+	14:15-16	Learning&thinking	
V.13	P(L)	Yes	Taken	Given	No	+	+	-/+	14:16-17	Understanding	
MORE UPS THAN DOWNS											
V.14	L(P)	Yes	Given	No	Also	+			14:17-18	Standardization	
VI.15	L(P)	Yes	Given	No	No		+	+	14:18-20	Friendship	
VI.16	L(+P)	No	None	No	Mainly	+	+	+		Contradiction	
VII.17	L(P)	Yes	Given	No	No				15:21-22	Boredom	
VII.18	L(P)	No	None	No	Mainly	+		+		Induction	
VIII.19	P	Yes	Taken	Yes	No	+	+	-/+	15:22-26		
VIII.20	P	No	None	Given	Also			-		Scoldings	
IX.21	P	Yes	Taken	Yes	No			-	16:27-30	Mind, brain,	
IX.22	L(P)	No	None	No	Mainly	+		+		Assumption finding	
X.23	L(P)	Yes	None	No	No			+		Culture	
X.24	L(P)	Yes	Taken	No	No	+	+	+	17:31-34	Degrees & kinds	
POST SCRIPT											
XI											
XII.25	L(P)	Yes	Taken	Yes	No					Agenda	
XII.26	L(P)	Yes	None	Yes	No					Beauty	

EXPLANATIONS:

Lesson: Roman numbers refer to weeks, Arabic to sequence of lesson.

Teacher: L=Linda; P=Palsson; L(P) Linda observed by Palsson.

Circle: Students sat in circle (Yes) or in small groups (No).

Turns: Given or assigned by teacher or Taken automatically by students.

Agenda: On board (Yes). Not on board (no).

Exercise: Used to support discussions (Also) or as the backbone to a lesson (Mainly).

Content, Dialogue, and personal Feeling (perception): A down (-), an up (+).

Harry: Number before colon refers to chapter in novel. Numbers after colon refer to pages.

Topics: Topics which most time was spent on.

My aim is to provide enough information so that the reader will have grounds to agree or disagree with my evaluations of the lessons. The reader will note the many blanks in the tables above and perhaps feel confident enough to fill some of them in him- or herself. My own evaluation either lacked bases or was too blurred for that purpose.

Before we return to the classrooms studied I want to put forward basic assertions that surfaced gradually as more philosophy lessons were given: (1) Students grew in their social togetherness. (2) Students grew in their intellectual openness. (3) Helga's students came to be committed to the procedures of inquiry.

The growth that the assertions refer to developed gradually and these assertions will carry us throughout the dissertation. I am sure you noted that the last assertion only refers to Helga's class, that does not mean that Linda's class was not on the right track.

Week one: Mixed reactions

When coaching for the first chapter of Harry I pointed out two central themes in the chapter: Conversion and discovery versus invention.

Linda had her 1st philosophy lesson in first period on Tuesday September 23. According to my Notes it went briefly like this:

Linda asks the kids to take their chairs and form a horseshoe in the middle of the room. The kids do. At 8:26 Linda introduces the lesson by saying that they will start by reading from the novel and that they will take turns (i.e. she will give them turns) like they do when they read their textbook on Icelandic history. The kids respond by a loud chorus: "No-o!" Linda adds that their rule will be to talk one at a time.

They read as Linda calls on them. At 8:36 ten readers have finished reading the first chapter of 44 paragraphs altogether. Linda opens the discussion by asking: "What was most fun?" The students do not react impressively to the chapter. Someone answers: "Nothing!" Loki comments: "It's all about the same!" Linda asks him to tell us more about that, but no immediate answer.

Her next question was: "What did Harry discover?" Thor responds at once to this question: "He discovered that a sentence starting with the word 'all' becomes false if you turn it around." Linda asks him whether he can come up with an example of such a sentence, but Thor doesn't respond at all. A little later Loki or Odinn comment that Hodur has an "all" sentence, but when Linda asks him to say it aloud so that everyone can hear Hodur remains silent. This creates tension in the group, some of the girls start giggling and Hrund comments: "Sure it's about something that girls have!"

Linda tries to shift the attention to the novel: "What was Harry's sentence?" There is no immediate answer so she answers herself: "'All model airplanes are toys.' He took this sentence to be true and now look what happens if we turn it around: 'All toys are model airplanes!'" Most of the kids pay attention, but the boys chat and the Valkyries chat and giggle. Linda shifts the emphasis again by asking: "What is a toy to you? How do you think Harry defined a toy?" Linda asks whether a model of an airplane is still a toy after it has been put together. There are different opinions on this.

 * If true sentences of the form "All x's are y's" are turned around, "All y's are x's" they become false.

All of a sudden the Valkyries announce that they have an "all" sentence: "All boys are crazy!" The noise level in the classroom increases with this announcement. Loki goes off track, I think, and starts: "If a black man and a white women have a child..." He cannot be heard well. Now Linda distributes an exercise on "all" sentences (or on the structure of logical statements from Philosophical Inquiry, pp. 11-12), which the whole group works on in cooperation but at first sight they react negatively to the sheet.

Throughout the lesson students talked simultaneously and I didn't notice them listen with attentiveness to one another. This was especially evident when working on the exercise where the goal seemed to be to answer the questions, but not to discuss them.

At the very end of the hour Linda points their direction to Harry's application of the rule: "All people who can't stop drinking are people who go to the liquor store, that doesn't mean that all people who go to the liquor store are people who can't stop drinking" (Harry p. 4). The period is almost over, but Loki comments that this sentence is false because people would die if they wouldn't drink (Notes, pp. 46-48).

In the morning break Linda tells me that the lesson had been a "horror" to her and at our regular Thursday meeting she still had the same opinion. In short, she felt that she was not in good enough control of the kids and that the discussion was not disciplined enough. In both instances I informed her that I thought the lesson went just fine for a first lesson. Also, I speculated that before the dialogue could be disciplined the kids would "almost need" to have this experience where "everybody" talk simultaneously and "nobody" listens.

In retrospect I see no reason why children should "need" to have this experience before being able to talk and listen in a orderly manner, but at the time I was working from the hypothesis that the basic conditions of a community of inquiry were already present in the classroom.

So to Linda the lesson was a personal "down," but in terms of content the lesson was an "up;" the content was operationalized and for a first lesson Linda's application of the discussion method reflected intellectual work on her part although the students were evidently not ready for it.

Areas can of course be spotted where improvement is needed in Linda's teaching, especially when looking from the outside and in retrospect. Calling on each student to read and have only ten students read 44 paragraphs seems unfair when all can have a chance to read aloud. Using the blackboard or perhaps the overhead could also help focusing the students attention and either one is ideal for keeping a record of the discussion agenda. (This point on the agenda is more appropriate to later lessons.)

Helga gave her 1st lesson in the third period that same day. This is a part of what I observed:

Around 10:10 somebody asks: "Aren't you going to begin?" This is a question for Helga and the student is waiting for a story as usual. Helga answers: "No, I'm waiting for you to finish."

At 10:16 she asks them to take their chairs and form a circle in front of the blackboard and they have their books ready at 10:18. Helga starts by explaining what will happen in the "social studies" periods in the future. The class is noisy and only a few students listen. Helga stands up and writes on the blackboard:

1. Reading.
2. Discussions, talking.
3. Write, do exercises.

More and more students pay attention as she writes on the board. Adelle and Angela want to sit on the cushions but Helga is quite firm in insisting that all must sit on their chairs.

Helga starts reading at 10:21. Along with the next fourteen students in the circle they read the 44 paragraphs of chapter one. When finished, she opens the discussion by asking: "What was most fun?" The students respond at once that the sentences were fun and they mention: "No submarines are kangaroos." "All model airplanes are toys." They play a little with the sentences and Helga asks: "Who helped Harry?" The students were quick to mention Lisa and Helga asks a follow up question: "Do you think that Lisa is rather smart?" A boy (Thomas ?) claims that Lisa is "ugly and boring!" Another boy (Tab ?) asks him: "How do you know?" Ari cuts in before the first boy answers and comments that he doesn't know a thing about how Lisa looks although it is evident that she is not stupid!

Noise increases in the classroom. From either Adelle or Angela I hear an identity statement: "All beljur are kyr !" but Helga has no chance of noticing as she is listening to Salome which has a very weak voice and then she asks the class whether they heard what Salome had just been saying.

Evidently nobody heard and now the class is getting very unruly.

* Both words refer to "cows."

Adelle is eating frozen juice with a spoon; it makes noise and calls for attention of others. Helga asks her a few times to stop it, but Adelle starts over and over again. Somewhere among the girls a "let it pass" game starts; you are supposed to knock on the person's shoulder sitting next to you and she is supposed to pass it on. Helga hands out an exercise on "all" sentences (Philosophical Inquiry, pp. 11-12). The students make a "poo" when they see the sheet, but then they work fiercely on the sentences, all except Logi. He climbs up on the back of his chair and does not take a copy when his turn comes. When he complains a little later about not having a copy, Helga tells him to share with the person by his side. Lousie has a fight with a boy [Zophon, according to my notes, but I must have messed up! Zophon is too dignified for fights!] The fight is solved by Agatha changing her seat with Lousie (Edited from Notes pp. 48-50, 57-58).

Helga was not that happy with this class, especially the latter part of it which was a personal down to her as she was not successful in maintaining order in the classroom, but in terms of content the lesson was an up although Helga never really got to apply the discussion method. The students did not listen much to her nor to their classmates and her questioning did not reach far enough, "yes" and "no" were too often appropriate as answers.

Something happened when Lisa was said to be ugly and boring. A possible dialectical move would have been to ask Ari why he thought Lisa was not stupid as he just said it was evident. Also, the boy who claimed Lisa to be boring and ugly might have been given an opportunity to explain his position. Perhaps he took his clue from the story where it said: "Her gray eyes, set wide apart, were clear and serious" (Harry, p. 3). Are people that have their eyes wide apart ugly? Boring?! Still, it was an appropriate move Helga made in asking whether they had heard what Salome had been saying, but unfortunately most students did not listen to Helga by that time, and that single question was not enough to bring the class on track. However, at least some of the students were on task in their talking as the identity statement indicates and their first reactions were also positive. Although Helga used the blackboard in the

beginning of the lesson, she did not use it to work on sentences nor to keep a record of the agenda and only fourteen of her students had opportunities to read aloud.

Both Helga and Linda had their 2nd philosophy class on Wednesday, the day after, but because of misunderstanding on my behalf I was absent that day. On our Thursday meeting both of them agreed that the second class had been much better and not comparable to the first one; a personal up. There was no reading but only recollection of the chapter and discussions and exercises on discovery and invention (Philosophical Inquiry, pp. 5-7). Linda started by asking them what Harry had discovered and then she moved to their discoveries. The boys claimed they had discovered many things but didn't want to share them. Linda moved on to the exercise on discovery and invention and that worked out very well. She mentioned that Loki had been positive and active in his participation. It also impressed her that most students had something to say, even Var "who has not talked much through the years" (Notes, p. 54).

In summary, I made the following points at the meeting. First, I noted that both Linda and Helga had opened the discussion with the very same question but the reactions had been very different in the groups. In response they informed me that they had decided beforehand on using the same question and also that the groups were just different, that there were more individuals in Helga's group dispositioned in a philosophical direction. Helga noted that her students liked the chapter, but Linda thought her students did not like it that much.

Second, I noted the difference in their introduction and how Helga used the blackboard to get her students attention. I didn't say a word on using the blackboard to keep a record of the agenda. Using the blackboard for this purpose was explained in the readings, but in

retrospect, I should have emphasized that the next step would be to create and keep a record of the agenda.

Third, I pointed out that there are 44 paragraphs in chapter one, but not all of their students were given an opportunity to read aloud. I recommended that each student would read one paragraph, long or short. Helga responded by claiming that her intention had been to give everyone a piece to read, but it simply didn't work out. Linda's position is more difficult as Thor doesn't want to and is afraid of reading aloud. The two of them, Linda and Thor, have a silent agreement that he is never selected as a reader and they pretend it is just by pure chance that he is never selected, she said. I had no further comments on this except I recommended shorter portions for each reader.

Fourth, I noted that both groups had reacted negatively when the exercise sheet was handed out, like they already had had too many exercises. I was informed that these were their usual reactions and only a surface phenomena as they liked to work on exercises once they had started.

Helga and Linda made two major points. First they noted the difficulty with having the students raise their hands as that could outdate their comments and slow the "spark" in the discussion. In response I speculated that the kids would learn as time passed, to listen, respect others as well as to talk one at a time.

Second, they noted the difficulty with having students write individually on exercise sheets, if the exercises were to be integrated with discussions, as some are slow and others fast in writing and as students do not sit by desks in the circle. Both of them thought this was uncomfortable for students. I responded by recommending having the students taking turns at solving the exercise items aloud.

In preparation for the second chapter Linda mentioned that she had cut out all statements* that concerned "boys and girls" as the kids seemed to be unable to handle such issues reasonably. I responded that hopefully they would get better at it with time. Linda added that she wanted to work on improving the students' interactions from a different perspective as the philosophy classes seemed to invite the students to be nonsensical in this respect. I made no comment and our time was up.

Helga taught her 3rd philosophy lesson in the period following the meeting described above. As usual she read the class a story and at 10:16 they formed a circle and sat in the following order from left to right: Helga, Salome, Sophie, Doreen, Erla, Buena, Angela, Adelle, Cora, Ari, Tab, Logi, Trausti, Torfi, Zophon, Titus, Thomas, Agatha, Louise and Helga again. This time Helga divided the 30 paragraphs of chapter two into 23 reading portions. Two or three times she called on a new reader within a paragraph as she was obviously trying to give all students similar length to read. So rather than having a simple rule like one paragraph, long or short, per student, she evenhanded the portions.

When the reading was over there was not much time left for discussions, the little it was was scattered and difficult to handle. Given the time limit the smartest move would have been to concentrate on putting an agenda on the blackboard.

Linda taught her 3rd lesson in philosophy on Friday. This time she had eleven students (Var, Gefn, Odinn, Hrund, Gna, Fulla, Hodur, Hlin, Hrist, Frigg and one more girl) read the 30 paragraphs. Loki was not present and under Odinn's lead the boys protested the formation of a horseshoe. Linda talked them into it, but Odinn was very disruptive

* Items #1, 2, 4, 5, and 10 from Leading Idea 7: Stereotyping. From Philosophical Inquiry p. 36.

throughout the period. He rolled his book to form a trumpet and every now and then he squealed through it. Linda tried to ignore him as much as possible, only giving him a sharp look when he went "too" far. In a protesting manner Hrist wanted to know why they were learning this, but she sat next to Linda and participated a lot. Hrist also commented that they would never finish the book! In short, this turned out to be a very difficult lesson.

The 3rd lessons in both groups must be labeled as downs; although there were sparks and fumes that could lead to good discussions most students did not listen much and it was awfully difficult to discipline the talking.

In the following break we had a short conversation on the lesson. Linda commented (Notes, p. 67) that Hrist really liked the discussions, she only acted this way because she thought it was smart to protest. I recommended directing questions such as "Why are we learning this?" to the group instead of answering them for the kids. In Linda's opinion the atmosphere was too negative for such an approach to work out, she suspected that a negative attitude would have come out on top, as the class would have taken their clue from Odinn.

Yesterday Linda had a conversation with the Valkyries where she told them that she knew that they had much to say in the philosophy classes and she encouraged them to participate more than they had done in the second lesson.

I mentioned that a different everyday arrangement in the room (having the tables in a circle or a "U") might help as the students were protesting forming the horseshoe. Linda reacted favorably to the idea, noting that it would have the advantage of splitting the groups that she thought were getting too tight. Later she thought the matter over and

decided not to change the arrangement.

Reflections on week one

This was a week of mixed reactions. The students reacted differently to Harry in the very first lesson. The teachers were both disappointed and pleased. I was pretty optimistic myself. Probably I overestimated the teachers' abilities to conduct reflective inquiry, as well as the students' natural inclinations toward philosophy. However, what is needed for reflective inquiry is not really a question of estimation, but of experience. How can it be expected that both teachers and students change their conduct all of a sudden? How can it be expected that teachers will master dialogue as method of instruction through mere verbal and written preparation? Are teachers different from other professionals in not needing training on the job? How can twelve year old students be expected to be inclined toward philosophy when socialized in an environment that is hostile towards philosophy as practice? (Cf. Lipman, 1985a; Matthews, 1980.)

Social togetherness and intellectual openness were evidently not shared as values in the classrooms. If it had been Linda would, for example, not have needed to cut out of an exercise all the items that had to do with boys and girls.

Doing philosophy with children needs preparation, but ultimately it is a question of extemporaneous conduct on the spot. A kind of conduct that is absent, I suspect, from most schools at all levels!

Week two: Difficulties

At our Monday meeting we prepared for chapter three and we discussed a one page letter to be sent home with the kids, basically a note on the aim of doing philosophy with children and an invitation to a meeting where the project would be explained further. We also speculated on how to start the next period, the problem being that chapter two of Harry had already been read but main themes had still to be worked on. I suggested they would start by helping the students to recollect the chapter giving special attention to the activities of Tony, Harry and Mr. Spencer, which related mainly to standardization of statements.

Linda told me of a personal conversation she had with Odinn where he had promised her not to disrupt the class as he had been doing. Also, Linda had discussed the philosophy project with the whole class this morning. She had told them that our goal was to improve their reasoning abilities and better reasoning could help them in any subject. This was some food for thinking and Hrist commented: "Oh, that's good! Then we are not just laboratory animals!"

Linda's 4th philosophy lesson was in first period on Tuesday. At 8:25 Linda asked the kids to form a horseshoe and some protested at once. Hrist (?) commented: "The most boring thing I do is to sit in a circle!" Five minutes later they started to recollect the chapter. I hear the boys cursing and at 8:40 someone comments: "I'm falling asleep!" At 8:41 Linda moves to an exercise on standardization of statements (Philosophical Inquiry, pp. 31-32b). They finished eight statements and sometime during the work Linda heard Hrist comment: "This is great fun!" The boys worked busily on the exercise.

Afterwards Linda was pleased with how the lesson went, but for myself, I was rather confused. I can see now that my confusion had to do with

the sharper focus and more positive atmosphere the exercise gave to the work. Surely the lesson must have been a personal up for Linda, in content it was an up too, but towards discussion as a method of instruction it was indifferent.

Helga's 4th philosophy lesson was in the third period that Tuesday. Around 10:20 they had formed a circle in front of the blackboard and now she asked friends and partners not to sit side by side but across from one another. (This was in line with a suggestion I had made at the Thursday meeting last week to decrease chat and this was the only lesson where the advice was acted on.) Helga started by recollection of chapter two and at 10:27 she introduced an exercise on standardization of statements (Philosophical Inquiry, pp. 31-32b). Difficulties in handling the class soon increased. Once she stood up from her seat to reprimand Thomas and Lousie and she also announced that she didn't want the class to be "chatting in every corner." At 10:40 she praised them and said they were getting better with every sentence they worked on. At 10:46 the class was quite noisy and Helga commented that they were getting tired and they would better stop.

According to my Notes (p. 72) I detected three major groups within the class: First, those who paid attention; Buena, Agatha, Tab, Sophie, and Salome among them. Second, those who who didn't pay attention and chatted for most of the time; Louise, Logi, Ari and Thomas among them. Third, the rest of the kids behaved, but didn't show any interest for the subject. In retrospect I almost disbelieve my notes as I didn't spot Trausti, Torfi and Buena among the chatters.

Overall the lesson was a difficult one to manage and contrary to Linda's case this was a personal down to Helga, as well as to application of the discussion method. But in relation to content the lesson was an

up because of the exercise.

Helga's 5th lesson was likewise a difficult one. The first part was spent on an exercise on stereotyping and although Helga was able to silence the students and have them work on it, chat and noise increased steadily with time. Helga spent the latter part of the period working from the discussion plan "What makes you you?" (Philosophical Inquiry pp. 34-35.) But no luck! In short, it was a down, except perhaps for content.

Linda had her 5th philosophy lesson after the morning break that same Wednesday. I enter the classroom right behind her and as soon as the students see me I hear negative reactions: "Yuk, social studies!" Hrund asks me why we are doing this at all. I ask her whether she had not read the letter she took to her parents yesterday. She admits, but it is stupid to train their thinking, they already think enough she maintains. In a moment we notice that Freyja cries silently at her desk. Linda walks over to her and I hear that Freyja tells her that the four boys had attacked her. Now the boys enter the classroom and Linda asks them to tell her what had happened in the break. They play innocent, they were just playing soccer. Linda asks them what they were doing before they went outside.

The boys keep on playing innocent, it makes no difference to them that a few girls claim having seen them attacking Freyja with a wet towel. Hodur says that the girls must be hallucinating. After a few interchanges the interrogation comes to this point:

Linda: I suspect you would not have lasted very long, each one of you, if there had been four [persons] to attack you like you attacked Freyja. FOUR! Against one girl! [The boys mumble something at this point.]

Hrund: They are such poor rags that they don't have the courage to attack other boys! [Chat in class.]

Loki [mad]: WHAT'S THE BLOODY DIFFERENCE?! [Between attacking boys and

girls.] Is she supposed to be somewhat weaker?
 Brund: Isn't everybody saying all the time that boys are stronger than girls?
 Loki: Let's just check it out!
 Girls: We are not interested in fights!
 Linda: But tell us why you decided to attack Freyja? [Silence.] Has she done something to you?
 Hodur and Thor [in a very low voice]: No.
 Linda: But why did you then attack her?
 Hodur: We didn't do it!
 Linda: Sure you did? Don't try to argue against it!
 Brund: Do you think she wet her own hair?
 Loki: One can expect everything from you! [I.e. from girls.]
 Girls: Is that so!?
 Hodur: Yes, you could go to the lavatory and tear her jacket apart!
 Linda: You boys are not much of heroes! [The girls support this, but Loki quickly inserts: "We aren't trying to be ones!"] For one thing you are four in attacking one girl, for another thing you don't have the courage to admit it! [This stops the boys for a moment, but then:]
 Odinn: Huh! Don't we have the courage to admit it!!
 Loki: We'll beat her up in front of you if you want to!
 Linda: I was not asking you to do that...(Notes pp. 75-76).

The interrogation went on without the boys admitting their attack. When Linda advised them to be reasonable and clear their act and apologize to Freyja, they maintained they didn't know what to apologize for. So after almost 20 minutes of talking Linda threatened the boys that she would take the case to the principal. Odinn labeled that as ridiculous. Linda closed the case by asking the boys to come and talk to her during the next break.

At this conclusion a horseshoe was formed, but first the idea received negative reactions. Linda turned to the exercise on standardization which was finished in a short while and then she moved on to the exercise on stereotyping. While the class worked on this, many students could be heard to talk simultaneously. The boys participated like nothing had happened, except for Odinn who sat a little out of line with the horseshoe, but he remained silent. At the very closing of the lesson Linda asked whether they had learned something in the period. The only answer I could hear was a "no" and a claim that they had known this all

beforehand!

The lesson was both an up in terms of content and I guess it felt that way too. But it was indifferent to discussion as a method of instruction.

The next week I was ill, but Helga and Linda recorded the lessons I missed. This also meant that I missed a parental meeting Thursday this week, but the principal substituted for me. Attendance was good at the meeting and favorable interest was expressed towards the philosophy project. This night was also one of general parent-teachers meetings at the school.

The recorder didn't work properly in Helga's 6th lesson on Thursday so we jump to Linda's 6th lesson given on a Friday.

Linda started from a discussion plan on dialogue (Philosophical Inquiry, p. 47) and announced that their issue would be how they behaved during discussions. The class agreed that in their discussions everybody talked simultaneously and Linda used the opportunity to ask them to follow the rule of one person talking at a time. At that point there is a knock on the door and a nurse comes in and calls on a few students for physical examination. Hrist comments: "There is always someone that interrupts when we have a class in social studies!" (Notes, p. 78a.)

After the interruption Linda picks the thread up again: "So kids are supposed to stay quiet and listen while grownups talk, but..." At this point Hrist takes over: "Grownups can talk whenever they want to!" Hrud builds on this and comments: "It is impossible to talk to grandpa because he is always listening to everything!" Syr makes a point on how she is reminded of talking clearer at home. Other girls note that they

talk too much at school and someone claims that she just can't stop. Someone notes she can't talk and listen at the same time [probably building on Hrund's comment]. One more point of interest is someone's claim that grownups are already tired of having kids around them.

From listening to the recording I sensed a pleasant atmosphere. However, there was not much "build-up" or forward movement in the discussion; for the most part it was a collection of anecdotes. In my judgment Linda needed to make more use of the discussion plan, but she did a good job of eliciting views and opinions from the kids as she helped them to express themselves. A thing to note is that not a single word was heard from the boys.

Reflections on week two

In terms of applying dialogue as a method of instruction, this was a week of difficulties. Neither students nor teachers showed significant improvements in practicing philosophical discussion. Linda's last lesson was somewhat an exception as the students' listening seemed to be improving and in general her class seemed more promising. Helga's class was more of a mess.

In retrospect I think that Linda tried to cope with the situation by adjusting the teaching of philosophy to her ordinary teaching style. She was successful in getting her students to work in groups as individuals on exercises. Thus, she was able to take advantage of the social togetherness that was present in her classroom, a togetherness that is best described as "togetherness-while-working-in-small-groups."

Although Helga was undecided in conducting her philosophy lessons she did not adjust them to her ordinary teaching style. I must admit that at the time Linda's class looked much more promising to me. My evaluation was of course based on conventional ideas about teaching: if there is chaos in the classroom nothing much of value is happening. Discipline and order is a prerequisite to teaching! This conception ignores the fact that usually it is both difficult and time consuming to change phases; no matter whether it is in one's teaching, drinking or other social habits.

For myself I was still waiting for the students to "take" the program; I expected that they would any day discover how meaningful a philosophical discussion can be. But there were two factors, at least, against us: Neither the participating teachers nor students had experienced a philosophical discussion in a school setting, except perhaps by accident.

Week three: Retreat

Linda's 7th lesson was in a first period on Tuesday. Like with the lesson before the following description is worked from a recording of it.

Linda started the lesson by praising the kids for how well they had done in the last lesson: "You didn't all talk at the same time." Then they moved on and read the first part of chapter three; twelve students (Fulla, Freyja, Var, Frigg, Hrund, Hrist, Hodur, Loki, Horn, Saga, Sjofn and an unrecognized girl) read 30 paragraphs. She opened the discussion by asking: "What do you think was special about this chapter?" The only answer was "Nothing!" Linda tried again: "What were they [the characters] talking about?" A girl mentions "Thinking," another says "Feelings." This is followed by a short silence before Linda asks: "Kids, what about thoughts? Can you describe them?"

This beginning has three possible agenda items: Nothing [as always], Thinking and Feeling. Linda bypassed this opportunity, perhaps because she had decided in advance to work on Thoughts. Even if she did decide working on thoughts she could have sprung into that domain by asking for expansions on the "Thinking" suggestion.

The class did not respond to her questions about thoughts; neither "yes" nor "no" was heard. Linda tried some more: "What do you suppose Jane Portos meant when she said it would be all right to talk about thinking at school?" "Can I have your opinions on this?" "Do you think thinking is not talked about at schools in general?" She asked these questions one after another without pausing.*

After these unsuccessful trials Linda announced: "Go back into your

* If possible one "always" needs to be careful during discussions not to bombard students with questions. See Pálsson (1986c) for some thoughts on the nature of philosophical discussions.

groups. We are going to reflect on our thoughts." The groups are to work on an exercise on thoughts ["My thoughts are like ____"] and she asks them to come up with as many suggestions as they can think of and write them down. Before the recording just becomes "all talking in groups," I hear a protest from Hrist: "We cannot work on this in groups, [because] nobody thinks alike!" At the very end of the hour Linda announces: "Stick to your sheets because we'll discuss them the next time."

The first part of the lesson has most likely been a personal down for Linda. I guess the latter part was more comfortable because in form it appeared as any other of her regular lessons, but I do not know whether she was pleased with it. To philosophical discussion as a teaching method the class was indifferent.

Helga's 7th lesson was in a third period on Tuesday and what follows is a summary of what I heard from the recording.

In the beginning she reminded the students to raise their hands before talking and she asked them to remind her of that rule if necessary. They move ahead and read the first part of chapter three. The reading portions are short and shift as Helga stops each reader: "Thank you and [name], please!"

She opens the discussion by asking: "Was there something you thought was fun in this chapter?" Someone answers: "The part about the animals" [the image where all animals were cats]. Helga asks others: "Do you agree? Is there something you think is more important than the rest?" There is some chat in the room but I hear three points coming from the students: "Fran's leap;" "The dog;" "Girls don't discuss thoughts with boys." These items are not discussed any further and are not put on the board as agenda items. It comes as a very sudden shift when Helga tells

the class to go back to their groups.

She has just announced the group work when the intercom-phone rings. What is left of the period is rather chaotic, students come and go to a physical examination, a lot of talk is done, both on and off task.

Helga's 8th lesson is in the first period on Wednesday, my description is from a recording.

Helga started the lesson by noting that their philosophy class from the day before had been chaotic and that she wants to recollect some of what they had read yesterday. A girl responds at once: "There is no need to do that!" Logi picks this up and adds: "I mean, what for? We know everything about this book! It is always the same, from beginning to end!" (Notes, pp. 78-9).

Helga does a brief recollection and leads a few interchanges on "a photo of a dog," "a dog" and "a mental image of a dog." Most students claim that the picture and the dog are real and Sophie announces that the mental image is real too. The discussion stops here and Helga asks the secretaries to report the results the groups came to on the exercise [My thoughts are like ____] from yesterday.

When the secretaries finish their reports Helga announces that they will work on one more exercise. Logi comments: "Retarded hell!" [There is not much feeling to it.] He continues a little later: "Look, we are not hurrying us at all! We are just taking it easy!" (Notes, p. 79.) Helga asks Zophon to read the introduction to an exercise on inference (Philosophical Inquiry, part iii, p. 49). It works out well and they finish as the period is over.

It is difficult to evaluate Helga's two last lessons, but they are clearly indifferent to the discussion method. The 7th lesson suffers from external disturbance, but content is worked on in both lessons. I

guess Helga's personal experience is mixed, perhaps it is more of an up than a down; at least she applies her ordinary teaching style to the task as the students work in small groups.

Linda's 8th lesson was in the third period that Wednesday. She starts by refreshing the readings from yesterday: "What were we reading about?" "About thinking" comes from the class. Thor qualifies it: "About thinking and our mind."

This does not go to an agenda but the class starts to talk about thoughts. In awhile Linda asks: "So your thoughts are copies of reality?" Pupils are quick to agree on that and Linda moves on to daydreams and asks what happens when they daydream. That does not build up, but then comes:

Linda: What is it to figure things out?

Girl: It's to find out and discover!

Linda: Can you give us an example?

Girl: For example if someone is killed then the police has to figure the puzzle out.

Hrund(?): Like Harry, he is figuring out this discovery of his!

Thor [very surprised]: Figuring out his discovery?!

Hrund(?): Yes, that's what he's doing!

Syr: Sometimes when one is thinking one forgets oneself completely [and she tells a story of two brothers that went to an reef on ebb and on the tide they could not make it back to shore.]

Linda: Yes, they must have done a lot of thinking trying to figure this out [how to get on shore]! (Notes, p. 81.)

There is not much of a response to the last statement and Linda keeps on and relates the issue to an exercise on inference (Philosophical Inquiry, part iii, p. 49). Freyja is asked to read the introduction to the exercise. For the rest of the period the class is engaged in working on the exercise. Many students talk, often simultaneously but, as far as I can hear, always on task. In Helga's class the student's were quicker to settle on the right answers, in this class there is more arguing. Loki is the one individual who is most apparent. He changes his opinion in two cases, once from a wrong answer to a correct one (that the girls

had hit on first), and once the other way around. There are many student-to-student interactions as the items are debated. At the very end of the lesson Loki is heard, loud and serious: "I'm not trying to be a smart-ass, I'm trying to come up with reasons!" (Notes, p. 82.) The period was over before they could settle on an answer to the last question.

The next day I was out of bed for our Thursday meeting. Linda starts by noting that the kids had managed to thoroughly confuse her on the last item in the exercise discussed above. She laughs at her solution which was that everyone should reflect on the matter until the next philosophy lesson. She also notes that a funny thing has been happening with the boys. In the beginning of the week they had obviously decided not to say a word in the philosophy lessons, (Thor being the only exception as he was heard to say "fuck you!"^{*} to a girl), but in consequence they couldn't help listen and yesterday Loki could not stay silent any longer. However, Odinn was consistent in his negative attitude and did not say a word, but he has not been much of a disturbance after Linda talked things over with him.

Linda noted that she has been trying to be much firmer in leading the discussions; she reminds them to talk one at a time and praises them in the beginning. In continuation of this she speculates whether it is in agreement with the Socratic method to decide who talks, when, and about what. In my answer I note that the responsibility of leading and keeping the discussion rolling is on the teacher's shoulders to begin with, and as time passes one can only hope that the students will share the

* We do not have a literally corresponding curse expression in Icelandic, but Thor adjusted his Icelandic to English: "Fokkaðu þér!" Through what cultural channels is such an expression picked up from a foreign language?

responsibility and that should in turn give more freedom to the dialogue. Linda brings me back to reality by doubting that this will ever work in a big group, at least it does not seem to work with adults, she noted. I admit it is neither easy nor simple, but I insist it can be done. Helga is not present yet and the two of us have the following conversation:

Linda: I think it was a mistake in the beginning of not being firmer, we were nervous and afraid of being too much in control... The general rule should be to be firm in the beginning and let go gradually. It works out better that way, but I think we acted on the premise that we knew the kids so thoroughly that we didn't need to be [firm]...I think that the two of us [her and Helga] and our insecurity towards the subject [philosophy] created the situation we have.

Me: Yes, well, I just couldn't see in advance how things would turn out!

Linda: Neither did we.

Me: But ... do you remember your first lesson when you had a mini-dialogue on "What is a toy?" I have missed episodes like that. Something which you take off from to fly without exactly knowing where to! There was nothing in the Manual on this.

Linda: I have spent all my energy to stay on top of things. Somehow, you know, I just hold on to the exercises, I'm afraid that I will just lose my grips on things. I feel, I was extremely disappointed in how things were turning out. It [the class] was just a mess.

Me: But in the future you should try to relax and take off some more, take some sidesteps...

Linda: Yes, I think that perhaps the time has come to do something like that because I have the feeling that my control over the circumstances is improving. The parents were also interested [at the parental meeting] and that gave me support. I also think that the kids' negative reactions weren't very deep....(Notes pp. 85-86).

Later at the meeting, after Helga arrived, my contribution became more analytical.* When she entered the room and I asked how things were going with her, for the better or for the worse. "A little better," she answered. "Perhaps we are moving in the right direction, but we have a long way to go, I think" (Notes p. 67).

My main points at the meeting follow. First, I suggested they would

*It may be added, that soon after the project started I sensed a conflict between my roles as a researcher and as an advisor in teaching philosophy to kids. The advisor was disappointed from the beginning as the teachers could not join the course on Philosophy for Children (see p. 43) and thought of leading model lessons on Harry, but the researcher thought of the focus: How do teachers (but not advisors) create communities of inquiry.

make arrangements to decrease disturbance from outside by having a sign at the door or something. At first they didn't get my point^{*} but when they thought about it they admitted that at times disturbance from outside could be quite annoying. However, I never noticed them doing anything about it.

Second, I warned against jumping right to the exercises and thus separating them from the novel. I suggested this could be worked on by spending more time on creating the agenda and writing it on the blackboard. The agenda could be written down and later lessons would just be discussions [or sheetwork exercises] springing from it and thus a bridge to the text [as well as to the students interests] would be in place. Pieces could even be reread from the novel when working later from the agenda. In direct continuation I suggested they would use the blackboard more and not only for the agenda but also as a pad for working on ideas that would come up (for sorting, comparisons, contrasts). Linda pointed out that the time it takes to write on the blackboard might be enough to lose the kids' attention. But Helga thought the blackboard might enable them to hold the attention to the point, it might wander while they were writing, but it should come right back. I also repeated the suggestion that they should try to take the discussion off the ground and fly without knowing exactly where they were heading. Responding to this Linda expressed her surprise on how her kids reacted to the novel: 'When I ask them what they want to discuss the answer is "nothing!'" I shared this view with her, but in retrospect I think both of us were too involved: It is true that "nothing!" was often the first response that could be heard, but it is not true that it was their only reactions (see

* I think it was because they are so thoroughly adjusted to an environment where it is "natural" to have calls from the office in the middle of a lesson or to have kids and staff visit classrooms.

for example her 7th lesson). Learning this Helga shows surprise and comments:

Is that so! I always get something. I wrote it down, I got four items on the first part of chapter three: Fran's leap; animals; feelings running on street corners; and dogs urinate on everything that looks like trees (Notes p. 90).

Helga's comment shows that she is quite aware of an agenda being "out there" but why she did not make it explicit by putting it on the board, I do not know. But the comment reminds Linda that she expected reactions from the boys on Fran's leap "because they have claimed to be reprimanded unfairly, but this was in the class they decided to stay silent. If the circumstances had been normal I'm sure they would have reacted strongly. I need to work further on that point" (Notes, p. 90).

Towards the end of the meeting the following conversation took place:

Me: Aren't you a little surprised how [badly] the project has worked out, given how well you knew the kids and what you have worked with them?

Linda: Yes, I thought this would work out much better.

Helga: Yes, I was much more optimistic!

Me: Any explanations you can think of?

Linda: I think it is like I said before, our insecurity reflects over to the kids and then we also have strong individuals, at least in my group, that have decided to be against the project and they did much damage in a few lessons...

Me: So on the one hand it is a question how you relate to the subject and on the other hand we have [negative] individuals?

Linda: Yes, I think so. I think it makes a great difference.

Helga: It makes a great difference how you handle the subject, whatever form you are using. If we were quite certain on what we are doing it would for sure catch over to the kids. It [to be quite certain of what you are doing] gives security (Notes pp. 91-92).

A little later Linda adds that in her kids' experience the novel is not exciting enough. Helga notes that her kids liked chapter three, but she adds that chapter two was not very interesting to them. I agree that chapter two could be improved.**

*Note the differences with my description of her 7th lesson p. 106. It is possible that my recorder picked up the point on "girls don't discuss thoughts with boys" without Helga really noting it at the spot. It is also possible that either one of the points is a revision of the other one.

**The central idea in chapter two of Harry concerns translation from

Helga noted that her kids were finally understanding that they were supposed to sit orderly on the chairs but not like they were trying to relax in a sofa. But the general conclusion of the meeting is that we think we are moving forward and upwards.

I cannot find a single word in my Notes on Helga's 9th lesson which she gave after the meeting discussed above. However, I have a recording of it. As I listen to it I note that Helga reminds Ari of bringing the Harry book to school, that it is no excuse just to forget it all the time at home. (Ari was the only kid I knew of that had taken the book home.)

They reread a page and a half (pp. 11-12) from chapter three on Fran's leap (a response to an unfair reprimand) and Lisa's image (where logical rules are violated as she imagines all animals being cats). Sophie notes that Fran cannot be shy as she jumps up on a table. Tab points out she is protesting. Helga asks how Fran is feeling, the class agrees that Fran is feeling badly. But the class is unruly and the discussion does not go forward to a general level; the class just wants to read on. In a while Helga asks them to finish the chapter (pp. 12-14) and, as before, she gives short and shift reading turns to students, but without having each student read a paragraph.

When reading is done Helga asks: "What was Tony's dad telling him?" The kids get right to the point: One says: "He's saying that you don't have to become an engineer although you are good in math!" Another student protests: "No, he is explaining why you can't turn a sentence around!" Helga takes this as her departing point and works on the

everyday language to a simple logical language. Most of the chapter concerns expressions that can be substituted by the modifier "All." Because of complex grammar in Icelandic the grammar of logical language also becomes more complex than in English. For example, the gender cannot be a single gender; where English simply has "All" both in everyday and logical language, Icelandic has "Allt, allar, allir" and each of these words takes different declensions on.

blackboard with sentences and Venn diagrams. She has the students' attention for a short while, but the noise level increases and the students start to create nonsense sentences.

This lesson was very short, approximately 20-25 minutes and I am pretty sure Helga was disappointed how it went. It is noteworthy that the students wanted to read more and when they started to fool around, they started with the sentences and unfortunately that led to fooling around in general, but not to a general discussion.

Linda taught her 9th lesson on Friday. After reminding the students of talking one at a time, she brushed up on the sentence they had not finished the last time they met, and soon much quarreling began. Frigg was in the front for the girls, following her were Freyja, Gna, Hrist and Hlin and their position was that the sentence should be classified as "Doesn't follow." The boys, Loki in front, supported by Odinn, Thor (and Hodur) wanted rightly to classify the sentence as "Can't tell." In outline the lesson went like described in the next few paragraphs.

Although Linda took position with the boys, and did her best in explaining the sentence, the girls just could not stop debating. It came to the point that Linda commented that it was good for them to have different opinions on the issue, but one also needed to accept better opinions when offered. The boys manipulated this comment to mean that the girls had better agreed with them. Loki talked about "empty heads." After another turn of quarrels Linda comments that it is a sad thing to see that they couldn't respect one another's opinions. Then she closed the debate and asked Var to read about Fran's leap. At that time the girls were still mumbling something as they had done since they learned that "Can't tell" was the answer.

At the site I made a note that Linda could have done a better job in

explicating the source of the disagreement between the girls and the boys. The girls departed from their pre-knowledge, from things as they knew them to be, but the boys just worked from the premises given in the exercise. Perhaps this debate was the spark that got to the powder keg in the next break when the kids got into physical fights?

When Var was done reading a member of the staff came in to inquire whether arrangements had been done concerning "peace candles." After the interruption Linda picks the thread up again and asks: "Why do you think the boys were teasing Fran?" "Because she is a girl," notes Saga. "She has a different color," adds Hrist. Linda wrote these reasons on the board, then she turned to the boys: "Boys, what do you think? Why did they tease Fran?" The boys mumble, Loki says: "Because she is different."

Linda's next move is to ask: "How come they tease her for just being a girl?" The girls are quick to claim that it was because the boys were "so stupid!" Linda reminds the girls to talk one at a time. Odinn notes; "Are we so stupid or what?" [Finally he had something to say! Note the negative context!] Linda inserts: "Now I'm excited to know whether you can discuss this without quarreling! [Pause.] "Boys, why do you think they were teasing Fran?" After a short silence Odinn responds: "To pass the time!" Loki adds: "It's a great hobby! This is our hobby!" (Notes, 93b.)

Now Linda inquires on feelings that accompany "to tease" and "to be teased." The boys maintain it's a great feeling. The girls remind them of particular examples, first concerning themselves and then: "How do you think the younger boys feel when you are teasing them?" Here Linda

*Because of the Reagan-Gorbachev meeting in Reykjavik this weekend, October 11-12, 1986, peace candles were lit at schools.

repeatedly reminds the kids of talking one at a time. I hear a couple of girls repeat a "SSS-"sound after her. When Linda succeeds in retaining silence, she urges them to discuss reasonably why boys and girls teased one another. Two reasons appeal to the kids: Either you tease because you don't like someone or you tease for the fun of it. "Having a crush on someone" is also mentioned as a reason for teasing, but there is much disagreement on that point; the boys totally reject it.

Towards the end of the lesson Thor elaborates on the boys' philosophy: "If they [the girls] do something to us we let the fist decide, but if we do something to them they just go and complain about it" (Notes 93a-93b). As the period is almost over Linda adds: "OK, because we are going to light our peace-candles at school today [here she has to pause because of chat in class]. It's perhaps about time not to let the fists decide!" "We never let them," says Loki.

Now Freyja^{*} comments: "Imagine, if Reagan and Gorbachev would let the fists decide, they would just [imitates boxing:] bang, bang." Again everyone starts talking. "This [letting the fist decide] is just an expression of words that is used," I hear Thor say. The class is over but the kids continue debating as they leave the room.

Given the circumstances, having constantly to remind the students to talk one at a time, Linda did a fair job in exploring reasons for teasing. Working in this area seems important as teasing is not always playful and harmless, but at times violent and harmful. It is also interesting to note that some of the girls wanted more discipline to the discussion as they repeated Linda's "sss" to quiet the class down. Freyja's transfer from the kids' interactions to interactions between

^{*}Somehow I thought Syr had made this comment, but as I listen to the tape again it is clearly Freyja that is speaking.

leaders of the two superpowers, Reagan and Gorbachev, is quite inspiring and to the point. For myself, I would have liked to see less importance on feelings accompanying teasing but more use of the corresponding discussion plan (Philosophical Inquiry, p. 60).

Linda's comment early in the lesson about lack of respect as well as her opening of the next lesson indicates that the lesson was rather disappointing to her, even a down. At least, the lesson was for sure very tiresome as there was much tension in the air. But from my point of view it was an up as the content was worked on and it was through a whole-group discussion that the reasons for teasing surfaced. The inquiry could of course have been deeper and more order to the dialogue.

Reflections on week three

This was a week of retreat. Helga and Linda retreated into sheetwork exercises as conducting philosophical discussions proved to be more difficult for them than the three of us had expected. They spent much of their energy to control the kids, a task which was by now probably more difficult than if they had started out firmer. They missed the peace, listening and respect, needed to conduct discussions with the kids. In short, they missed the presence of the objective and subjective conditions that are necessary for the operation of communities of inquiry. In this respect, Linda's group had farther to go as their 9th lesson quite explicitly indicates.

But "peace" or even respect to persons and ideas does not suffice by itself; to do philosophy with children discussion leaders need to know what they are doing. They do not need to know it step by step, but they do need to recognize philosophical ideas and they need to master the basics of philosophical inquiry. I think that hostile environment (or

lack of a tradition) and the teachers' lack of experience and knowledge in conducting philosophical discussions contributed to their "insecurity towards the subject." Neither teachers nor students had, for example, experienced meaningful discussions and basic procedural conditions for their conduct were not being met, such as creating the agenda. A vicious circle was in effect: Before the kids would cooperate they needed to be led by the teachers and before the teachers could lead them they needed the kids cooperation.

I had myself retreated to bed, but before our Thursday meeting I thought of offering model lessons if the teachers were in despair. My evaluation turned out to be that there was no despair and that things were moving in the right direction.

Week four: A turning point

At our Monday meeting I learn that things got quite rough after I left Linda's class on last Friday: Her kids got into physical fights in the hallway. Linda and Helga informed me that they wanted to do whatever possible to work on improving the kids' general interactions as they seemed to be getting worse. I told them that if I wanted to be "tough" I could criticize them for organizing the classrooms around the problem instead of coming to grips with it. They agreed this could be one way of looking at the situation, but I must admit that I was talking from the underlying assumption that the situation would be different and better if there had been a philosophical dimension within the kids' education. This assumption was not made explicit.

We did not dwell on this issue, as we had chapter four to prepare for. It was quite clear that Helga and Linda were disappointed with how the project was progressing and that their 9th classes were disappointing to

them.

Linda's 10th lesson was in first period on Tuesday morning. She started by asking them to form a horseshoe. Hrist got upset: "Do we learn any better in a horseshoe?" Linda responded by explaining that they need to see one another's faces and that this had been discussed before. When the horseshoe is ready Linda goes:

Well kids, shouldn't we make it our goal in the beginning of this discussion to keep it within bounds so we'll not lose control of it like we did the last time. That we try not to get too excited, that we try to listen to one another and most importantly we should try to stay silent while others are talking. Do not talk all at the same time! Shouldn't we have that as our goal and afterwards we can check on our success, whether we reached it? (Notes, p. 96).

The students consented to this goal statement by silence and they moved on to the reading. They start at 8:28 and read the latter part of chapter three. Hodur, Loki, Sjofn, Gefn, Syr, Hrist, and Gna read the 20 paragraphs. The reading is over at 8:35 and Linda opens the discussion by asking: "Is there something that comes to your mind after having read this?" The class responds by complete silence and after a good pause Linda asks: "Why do you think Tony's father was drawing these circles [Venn diagrams]?" Some girl (Frigg?) responds in a very low voice to this question and Linda asks [or repeats after her]: Do you think that he thinks Tony didn't explain it (what he was trying to say) well enough?" Frigg answers "No, he didn't..."

Linda goes on and suggests that they should practice drawing circles like the ones in the novel. "How about the sentence: "All Reykjavikians are Icelanders?" Linda draws one big circle for Icelanders and then a small one inside it with a broken line. Thor protests and wants to have the inner circle unbroken because Iceland cannot get inside of Reykjavik. Linda corrects her drawing and asks the class to give her more examples. "All schools are training institutions" a pupil suggests. Linda draws a

Venn diagram of this sentence according to directions from the class.

Now Linda asks: "What else than schools could be training institutions?" Students start to enumerate: [Institutions] "for handicaps, handball, soccer, druggies." The last suggestion came from the boys. Linda asks what they mean, "a rehabilitation center" is the answer. "What do rehabilitation centers and schools have in common?" asks Linda. "People are trained at both places," comes from the boys (Thor?).

The last comparison is not taken any further and Linda works on one more sentence that the students suggest. Speculations on why sentences cannot be turned around and why smaller classes of things cannot include larger classes follow.

At 8:48 Linda announces: "Now I want to ask you, is everyone listening? I want you to take your chairs silently back to your desks. I will bring you an exercise^{*} similar to the things we have been working on." A general sigh comes from the class as they stand up. Hrist comments: "This is dead-boring!" Then she turns to me and asks: "Did you discover^{**} to bring this book to us?" I admit and ask her: "Was it a bad discovery?" "Disguuusting," she informs me.

Their task was to look at circle diagrams and fill in appropriate statements. The students are quick to fill in "All apples are fruits." "All squares are closed figures" proves to be more difficult for them and

^{*}Leading Idea 10: Class membership diagrams. From Philosophical Inquiry, pp. 70-72.

^{**}Her use of "discover" sounds funny, but the difference between discoveries and inventions had been the topic in their 2nd lesson. Given Hrist's philosophical intuition, which we will see more of later, I suspect that this comment should be taken literally: Compared to what and how things are done at school, it certainly can be seen as a discovery to bring something as "stupid" (i.e. non-traditional) as philosophy to the class.

after having tried on their own Linda takes suggestions from the whole class and draws them on the blackboard. Loki and Hrist are most lively in this activity.

At the very end of the lesson Linda asks: "So how do you think this lesson went?" "It was awful!" is the first answer. Linda responds by stating that she was not asking whether it was fun or not, but how it went! "It was OK!" comes from a few students. Others stick to their point: "It was awful!" Linda repeats the question and most students respond: "It was OK!"

The lesson is over and as I leave the classroom Linda comments: "A step in the right direction!" I cannot but agree although we still have a long way to go, especially in application of discussion as a method of instruction.

OCTOBER 14-22: MODELINGWeek four continued

As I sat later that Tuesday morning in the teachers' lounge, changing batteries in my recorder, the headteacher informed me that Helga would not be at school today. I offered at once to teach the upcoming philosophy class. That was the 10th lesson Helga's students had. I guess I got too excited, at least the batteries were not arranged properly and the recorder didn't work in the following lesson. When I found out I hurried to write down what I remembered and a brief outline of the lesson follows in the next few paragraphs.

In the very beginning Ari came to me soaking wet from the rain outside and asked for permission to go home to get his snack-bag. I asked him whether he lived next door and refused permission when I learned he had a long way to go. "He is always forgetting something!" Sophie and Salome informed me.

This was a "snack-hour" but I read no story and asked the class to hurry up. In 15 minutes or so, they were ready and I noticed that Zophon was the first one to stand up and bring his chair to the horseshoe. When I informed the class that we would reread the last part of chapter three they protested loudly and wanted to start on chapter four. I stuck to my position and in a while someone said, I believe it was Sophie: "He's not going to give up! Let's just start!"

Under Helga's direction the reading turns were already short but changing them had not become automatic. At this point I explained that each student should read one paragraph in every turn and the next reader should take over automatically. The kids got confused as they didn't know what "paragraph" meant. I gave a quick explanation and told them

not to worry about it; they would find out in the reading. When readers did start a second paragraph I jumped in and asked the next person to take over.

I opened the discussion by asking: "Now, can you tell me why we cannot turn sentences around that start with the word 'all'?" A few students answered simultaneously that it was because they would become false. My next question was: "Why do they become false?" Here, the students explained to me that it was because a larger group cannot be put inside of a smaller one. I asked for an example, which they did and I drew Venn circles of it on the board. From this I jumped right into an exercise and asked for volunteers to come up to draw circles of sentences that I would read to them. The five volunteers were all girls, I think, among them Angela, Agatha, and Sophie.

Logi protested that the sentence "All windows are things made of glass" didn't fit because some windows were made of plastic and in the old days people had used something totally different for windows. This comment could easily be related to the issue of truth, but I simply pointed out that we had to differentiate sentences that we play with and assume to be true, from sentences that we know to be true in reality.

Next I reread the two very last paragraphs of chapter three, which I had taken the liberties to add to the original in my translation:

But Tony thought to himself: "Now I realize what Harry is doing. He is trying to classify ordinary sentences so it can be seen where they belong. It's like he is trying to tie them down."

This made Tony think of all kinds of knots he knew, but when he remembered how clumsy he was at tying some of them he got another idea. "Harry needs to take some lessons on the guitar! To be able to play on a guitar one needs to know some chords" and it is like Harry is trying to find grips that can be used on ordinary sentences. Those sentences of his that start with 'all' are like one grip. But," and now Tony laughed inside, "Harry has to find more grips if he wants to play properly in his simple language."

I probed for responses to these paragraphs. Some kids suggested this was messed up. Logi suggested that the author must have been drunk when he wrote the passage! But Tab and Ari said that this was "very interesting." Sophie wanted to change that to "very uninteresting!" I wrote the suggestions on the blackboard and started working on the negative ones. When I asked what they had meant by "messed up" the kids changed their position and claimed they had just been kidding. But Sophie stuck to her position and when asked for reasons she said it was "because the metaphors were so stupid."

It was in relation to this issue that Logi commented that the philosophy was really just for two kids in the classroom: Sophie and Ari. Sophie protested sharply at once. I ignored the comment and worked on similarities and differences between a "guitar-grip" and a "logic-grip." Logi maintained it was possible to play on a guitar without knowing any "grips" the girls debated against him. But the period was soon over and another teacher was ready to take over for the next subject.

According to my notes and memories I was quite pleased with this lesson, although the students neither gave complete silence nor attention. Compared to Helga and Linda I moved a lot within the circle, usually either to read on the board or to stop chat in the circle with my presence. At one time the noise level was quite high and I had asked for silence twice without success, but then Leona supported me by shouting: "Shut up there!" Her response was similar, but more direct than a response in Linda's class when some girls repeated "SSSH" after her to

 * "Grip" is the Icelandic word used in this context instead of chords. "Grip" has the same basic meaning in English as it has in Icelandic, the main difference being that the word is used in different combination in Icelandic: A guitar player knows the "guitargrips" he or she can take on the strings, and in terms of logic we don't use "standardization," but "rökgríp" which literally translates: logicgrips.

help bring silence to the class. I interpreted both instances as positive signs: That we were on the right track and something more in a similar spirit could be expected.

This lesson is the first one where I note Sophie protesting and being negative in attitude toward philosophy, but as we know from Chapter III Sophie was quite a surprise in this respect. A possible explanation might be that she had a crush on Logi, at least she often seems to build on and respond to his negative comments. This pattern will come to the surface as we proceed. But another part to an explanation is possible. Until this fall Sophie has always been a student with positive attitude toward schooling and the "I" has been the dominating phase of her self. She used to be spontaneous in presenting her opinions on whatever issues there were at stake. But as her mother later said: "There is something happening with her this fall!" I suspect that her "me" is getting in front of her "I". This picture becomes all the more interesting when Logi is taken into account. As we know he had, when younger, a hard time in being accepted to the group. Now Logi is the most handsome and mature of the boys as he is already into the puberty phase. Logi is, in a sense, a guardian of the upcoming community of teenagers; he is an authority in that respect. However, we can see both "I's" and "me's" at work with Logi and Sophie.

At earlier meetings I had complained that Helga and Linda could do a better job in using the blackboard for keeping track of a discussion agenda. In the lesson above I made no attempt myself in that direction. Indeed, I had decided beforehand that the kids needed to work more with sentences and diagrams. I clearly just drove them right into that area. At times this may be justifiable but great care must be taken in not overusing this approach.

In the evening that day I called Helga and we agreed that I would model chapter four the day after. That was the 11th lesson and in a first period on a Wednesday morning. The kids were quick to form the circle, but we had to wait for Ari as he entered the room when we were just about to begin. This time I only had to stop Buena, otherwise the turntaking was almost automatic: I said "Thanks!" if a paragraph was only of one line. After the two first pages (15-17) and 23 paragraphs of chapter four I stopped the reading and my transcript goes:

Me: Thank you! Let's stop here.

S: Can't we finish the whole chapter?

Me: Naah, let's stop here to check whether we find any ideas or something you want to talk about...[cough, cough]. The question is whether there was anything that you want to talk about in the piece we read?

S: [Cough, cough.]

S: There was NOTHING in the chapter [I write it as an agenda item on the board].

Me: What about the rest of you? Do you agree?

S: Well, there was SOMETHING in the chapter! [Someone agrees, then comes a comment about thinking.]

S: It's stupid to think about thinking! [I repeat the comment as I write it on the board. While writing I hear chat and agreements to the point.]

Logi: When you start thinking about it, it is not stupid!

Me: Are there more points you want to put on the board? [Noise increases.] KIDS! Are you done with your ideas? [Chat]

Leona: Shouldn't we just go on?

Sophie: The sentence Mrs. Halsey said was stupid!

Me: A stupid sentence Mrs. Halsey said. Do you remember which sentence that was?

S: "The Most Interesting Thing in the World" - messed up - stupid sentence!

Me: Oh, yes. [I pause and students talk together for a moment]. What do the rest of you think about the sentence Sophie was talking about? [Chat.] Do you agree with her that this is a stupid sentence? [A

* Comments that have to do with physical context or process of teaching I put within [brackets]. Where meanings need to be clarified I add words within (parenthesis). Where a word or two are inaudible I put a single -. Where a few words are inaudible I put double --. Where many words, perhaps a sentence, is inaudible I use triple ---. Where words are skipped from transcript I use the tradition of ... Where someone takes the talking over, or if a speaker redirects his or her speech a / is put where it occurred. Upper case letters are used to indicate stronger expressions. Names of students are used where I am certain who is speaking. The default option is just to use an "S" for student when I do not recognize the voice for sure.

weak "yes" can be heard. Could be from Salome.] BOYS, would you have liked to write about this sentence?

Chorus: No!

S: One must be interested in what one is supposed to write about. --

Me: And you are not interested in "The Most Interesting Thing in the World"?

S: Yes, - stupid - [chat].

Me: What was it again that you said before, Sophie? I've forgotten! You were telling us why this was stupid!?

-- [Sophie is about to speak but the kids run over her.]

Me: KIDS, let's listen to her!

Sophie: It is so stupid to hear such a sentence, -- to say a thing like this. The Most Interesting Thing in the World!! [The intercom phone rings at this point and Helga answers.]

Me: BOYS, can you repeat for me what Sophie was saying?

S: --The Most Interesting Thing in the World --

At this point some misunderstanding comes up. I moved over to the boys that were chatting and asked them to repeat after Sophie, but at least Buena did not hear me clearly as she maintained I had said "kids" but not "boys." When I try to get away from this someone repeats "Halldora" (Icelandic for Mrs. Halsey) after me, imitating my voicing which is a part of my rural dialect. The next page in the transcript is on Mrs. Halsey's "stupidness" in using "greatest," "most interesting." As the discussion became stuck on these words I moved to an exercise* which I gave a new context by pretending to be reading advertisements from the latest radio station. Among the students that have something to say are: Titus, Tab, Sophie, Logi, and Thomas. After two more pages the transcript comes to this point:]

Me: The question is whether there is something similar between the sentences (the advertisements) we were working on and what happened between Mrs. Halsey and Lisa?

Tab: Yes, - [Much noise. Pause.]

Me: Tab says yes. What -

Tab: It's possible to use different words, so that they understand the words.

Me: It's possible to use different words! [Someone coughs over "words."]

S: [Chat.]

*What is ambiguity? Philosophical Inquiry, pp. 87-88. I worked only on two sentences: (1) "Lærið af Helen. The Steakhouse." Depending on context this could be translated as "Learn from Helen" or "The leg of Helen." (2) "Hop to London. Icelandair."

Me: How is it with you here in the school, do you remember incidents where you have understood something in a different way than / TITUS! RELAX! AND YOU TOO GIRLS! / Do you remember incidents where the teachers have been trying to teach you something, or telling you something, and you have understood it differently than you were supposed to? -- Odinn, I'm sorry, Logi do you remember any examples? [Pause.] This gives you no problem here?

Logi: It's perhaps a problem, but maybe we don't want to say it so the whole class can hear it. [Sophie agrees.]

S: A problem!!

S: I have problems, the whole thing is a problem! I have them all the time! [Chat.]

Me: We are not talking about problems like that! ^{**} Now we are talking about whether you have ever had a problem because you have, perhaps the teacher has said something and meant by it that you should learn from someone, but you have understood it as if you were to eat a leg! Something similar to that?

Chorus: Yes!

Torfi: There was something on the radio about foreldra-meat (=parents-meat) and folalda-meat (=horse-meat)! [I.e. he thought meat of parents was offered for sale instead of meat of horses!]

Me: That's now, is that similar?

S: No!

S: (No!) That's his problem! [Chat - giggling - on "His problem."]

At this point we have overcome the negative attitude that appeared in the beginning of the hour when the novel was just stupid and they just wanted to go on. However, the discussion is stuck at the point above so I re-read one paragraph from the novel which describes Mrs. Halsey's (the teacher) problem with her imprecise directions to her class. We continue:

Me....When does a game become a good game of football?

Logi: When all the players are present and have begun playing and all of them are in a good mood. [Chat on "football".]

Me: Did you notice what Logi said to begin with? Is there someone that can repeat it?

* "Chat" is a biased term. I suspect myself of just hearing "chat" when students are indeed talking or even debating on task in or across their small groups.

** Here the danger is turning the class into a therapy lesson which is not in accordance with the objectives of Philosophy for Children. However, it could easily be argued, if needed with help from Wittgenstein among others, that philosophy has a pre-therapeutic value, i.e., that it prevents intellectual (and social) disorder (See Curtis, 1985, on this point). A sensitive teacher should of course pay attention to problem announcements like the one from the student in the paragraph above.

Girl: Yes, yes, yes! He said that all the players need to be there and in a good mood. [She leaves out "have begun playing."]

Me: Do you agree that this is enough to have a (game of) good football? [Although being a yes/no question it is not necessarily a bad one; it is open to Logi to protest: "I also said they need to have begun playing..." As with other yes/no questions they can always and usually do need to be followed upon.]

[At this point both "Yes's" and "No's" are heard.]

Girl: No, the audience [Tab can be heard in the background] also needs to be in a good mood and there have to be many of them.

Me: The audience (is needed) too and calling on the team / [Many kids talk simultaneously. Tab and Titus are loud.]

Me: PARDON ME! Titus! I couldn't hear what you said! [Silence.]

Titus: It is not enough that everyone is in a good mood, they must also know how to play football!

Me: Must they know how to play football? [Much noise in room.]

S: Oooh!

[Debates, especially among the boys.]

Me: Perhaps we should try some to realize what it is that we need to put into a good (game of) football? [Wrote summary of conditions already mentioned on the board.] Now, when we have worked this out we know exactly, isn't that so, how we want to have a good (game of) football? We want to have, what did we say [repeat items from board]...?

Tab: Good teamwork!

Logi: Good morale in the team - [Chat on task.]

Me: Good morale! [On board.]

Tab: Good teamwork! [On board.]

Me: Tab, can you tell us when teamwork becomes good teamwork?

Logi: When all -

Tab: When all [pauses], are, when all - [Tab is in difficulties, noise increases, I stay silent.]

Girl: Yuk, I don't know nothing what this is! [This could refer to chat-topics, but most likely it refers to the discussion. I did not note this comment on the spot.]

Titus: When all have exercised enough together.

Logi: No, one thing is missing ---

S: - Forward player.

Me: We need the football itself [on blackboard].

Logi: It stands there: Good football! [That was my title on the board and like Mrs. Halsey I wasn't precise enough as I meant the game but not the ball! It's also possible that Logi is protesting as his "one thing is missing" comment was not noticed!]

Tab: An referee! [Chat.]

Logi [loudly]: It stands there: Good football!

Titus: There must be a good referee, look because - [He and Sophie start debating on football].

Me: This is getting pretty complicated! [Chat and debates for a while.] I just about did the same thing over again as Mrs. Halsey, notice that! BOYS! What am I just about to do over again?

S: The same thing!

Me: It is as Sophie pointed out, that when I write "good football" it can both mean a good ball that can be kicked and a good game. And we are talking about a game.

S: Oh! [Silence.]

Me: The points we have on the blackboard, can we work on them? Are there some similarities and differences between them? I'll read them to you....

Logi is quite active in the discussion above, most likely because he is a good footballplayer (i.e., soccerplayer). Sophie does not participate openly so far.

Right where we left the discussion above an unknown student picks up on Logi's comment about "morale." The student is addressing the whole group and notice how this comment forwards our discussion and leads it to a more general level:

S: "Morall"! * What does "morall" mean?

S: A good linesman is needed!

S: "morall"! [Debates on the meaning of the word.] Wipe it out! It means the same as being in a good mood!

Me: Logi, do you agree that "morall" means the same as being in a good mood?

[Many students talk simultaneously on "morall."]

Me: Ari suggests that we put "being sure to win" instead of "morall"! [On board.]

Sophie: No, it wouldn't be any fun if both teams were sure to win!

Logi: Of course that would be fun! Then they would fight and fight!

[They get louder as they debate more.]

Me: Let's try a little to listen to what Thomas is saying. You're saying it is not enough to be sure to win?

Thomas: No, one must not be too sure to win!

Me: Why?

Thomas: Then one thinks the game is too easy!

Tab: No, one does not need to think they are easy!

S: No, but one must not be too sure to win!

Angela(?): It's OK to be sure to win, but not too sure!

[Much debating among the kids.]

Me: Torfi has something to say here!

Torfi: Look, I - (understand) this about "morall", because once -if one had candy and if one didn't want to give the others they always said: What a morale you have! Then it was /

Titus: It doesn't mean the same!

Me: What morale means [I take a moment to think and the kids get louder]. What Icelandic word can we then use instead?

[Much debating among pupils: "It means..." "No, it means..." Sophie participates, but some of the girls are off task.]

Me: Girls do you have something to say about what "morale" means?

Girl: Yeez! [With affectation.]

Me: What does morale mean? [Loud chat and debates.] Well, KIDS! Let's take this point about the morale aside. I think we'll have to work

* "Morall" is a slang in Icelandic, and it can refer both to "moral" and "morale."

on it later, because I have the feeling we cannot understand it now!

For a second, or maybe just for a fraction of it, there is silence, but then the kids start again debating on "morall". The dialogue has taken on a surprising direction: a problem of meaning hangs in the air. Although the kids did not talk orderly by taking turns on the topic it was evident to me that they were perplexed. I decided to try some more:

Me: Can morale, let's then try to work on this about the morale. [Noise from class.] KIDS! [I pause while they calm a little.] Let's take a while to try to come to grips with (the word) "morale." Can "morale" mean that one is both in a good mood and in bad mood?

S: Yes. [Loud debates.]

Me: If I'm in a good mood then I'm not with -/ [noise takes over]. Look, I can just hear you /

Logi: The morale is in the clock! [Chat.]

S: The period is over!

Me: KIDS! I can just hear that you're saying that morale can be good and it can be bad! [Silence.]

Logi: This they say all the time! [Chat.]

Sophie: - Let's say, perhaps, - someone would be a terrible enemy of mine, I could believe him to do all kinds of bad things, and he could be just horrible, and then there would be another who were extremely good and I'd be neutral to him. Both would offer me candy and I'd accept the candy from the bad one and I wouldn't mind from whom it was, then I'd have a morale, then I'd be without morale, I mean. / [Note how she builds on Torfi's comment earlier when he claimed knowing what "morall" means! Notice also how she moves from "morale" to "morality" in her self-correction.]

Me: Then you would be without morale?

Sophie: Not minding what I'm doing, making no difference from whom I'm taking the candy.

[At this point I hear giggling and comments that make fun of Sophie; I think they came from Angela and Adelle. Tab has something to say on morale, but it is inaudible.]

Me: Notice that the case is becoming different. What Sophie was pointing out to us is that it is not only possible to have good or bad morale / KIDS, please notice, one can also be completely non-morale! One can just be without it! This is a third possibility [works on board]. And if being without morale one doesn't mind one's actions.

Logi: One is an idiot! (Notes, pp. 106-117).

It seems that my comment about the possibility of "morall" being both good and bad, supported by Logi's comment: "This they say all the time," triggered Sophie's spontaneity. She could not repress her "I" on this issue and that gave us her clear vision on the nature of morality.

Sophie used "candy" in her example. In the world of adults the same

problem would most likely concern "money" or maybe "guns." (Do you remember the U.S.-Iran-Israel-El Salvador dilemma that poured over some of the public in the summer of 1987?)

At the conclusion above I shifted the students' attention to an example of vagueness (Philosophical Inquiry, p. 89), by working on the questions: When does a person become bald? How many pebbles do we need to have a heap of pebbles? We worked in this area for the few minutes that were left to the lesson.

I like to consider this lesson as an up in relation to content, method and personal experience. I both re-read a short portion from the novel and used exercises from the manual to support and give focus on content in the lesson. The result was ideal as operationalization of the concepts came through in the dialogue. But the success had also to do with the fact that kids' craving to understand what "morall" means.

I do admit that the lesson was very tiresome as a comment of mine indicates at our next Thursday meeting: "If I wasn't either asking or quieting them down, they were talking" (Notes p. 127). But interwoven with my questioning was a continuous request to the students to listen and repeat what their classmates are saying. This approach does not only train the students' listening but also pushes in the direction of closer social togetherness as well as to intellectual openness.

Linda gave her 11th lesson in a third period on Wednesday. While "snacking" the kids talked about a discotheque that the 9th grade was to sponsor. They were obviously not happy being in a group with 4th and 5th graders. When they are done eating Linda asks them to take seats by their desks. Although Linda doesn't mention the horseshoe, Hrist protests loudly at once: "I'M NOT GOING INTO THE HORSESHOE! I'M NOT GOING INTO THE HORSESHOE!"

Linda reminds them of the last philosophy class and that they had been able to use the circle diagrams in math earlier this morning. Now she informs them she has five sentences^{*} that she wants them to draw circles of, noting that they can assist one another within the groups. "What is left of the lesson," according to my Notes

was 'typical' sheetwork. Students sit in their groups, every now and then they raise their hands and/or call on Linda. She circles around to assist individuals and groups. Students talk, both off task and on task....Everyone is busy....Some students are quick to finish the exercise. Linda brings them another sheet" (p. 121).

At the end of the hour the groups report on their work. Linda stands by the blackboard and draws circles of the sentences in accordance with students' prescriptions. The latter exercise "No apes are alligators" proved to be very difficult for the students. Loki suggests a big circle and a smaller overstricken circle within it for the apes. Linda draws according to the suggestions and then she asks the class to "read" the drawings. The kids are puzzled. Linda draws two separate circles and asks the class whether that will work out. Some girls admit this will work out if she connects the circles. Linda asks why she has to do that. No answer from the girls but Loki suggest a big circle for "alligators" and a small one for "apes". Linda asks whether that would not result in the same sentence as before: "All alligators are apes?" Thor suggests that both apes and alligators go to the inner circle. At this point Linda stops and announces that drawing two separate circles, as she has already done on the board, is the correct way of working this out.

These interchanges follow:

Linda: Is this in accordance with what Harry found out, what did Harry find out about sentences that start with "No"?

Girl: That they are all either true or false!

Loki: They are always true!

* See exercise p. 71 from Philosophical Inquiry.

Linda: Yes, they are always, if a sentence is true then it is also true after being converted.

Loki: But if it is false then it stays false after being converted (Notes, p. 123).

Linda closes the lesson by asking the class to work on two more sentences which she creates: "No Christmas presents are Christmas trees," and "All crazy beings are teachers."

When the lesson was over I could see by Linda's smile that she was very pleased with how it went; it was a personal up. But my afterthoughts ran: "More discussion is needed. Sheetwork exercises are slow. There must be a way to cover more in a lesson" (Notes, p. 124). But although Linda did not apply the discussion method, the drawings were of great puzzle to the students, enjoyable to watch, and in relation to content the lesson was an up. My afterthoughts were raised on the assumption that in a whole group format more quantity could have been covered with no less quality.

At our regular Thursday meeting Helga was absent as she had to take her young child in for some shots. But Linda confirms that things are getting a little better and she has the impression that the kids are starting to show more interest to philosophy. She especially mentions Loki. After a few interchanges I go:

But, well, I have to say that for myself I think things are getting better, but now, well, when I think about it there are really two kinds of lessons that this curriculum can be taken into. On the one hand we have exercise-lessons, the logic is especially fitting for those, on the other hand we have discussion-lessons.

Linda: Exactly!

Me: And the discussion-lessons have, [I was just about to say "totally missing" but at the last moment I thought that would be an unfair statement,] well, I don't know whether I should say they have been too few, perhaps we'll see more of them later. You see, perhaps the exercise lessons are a prerequisite for being able to, you know, one can get them used to the subject through working on exercises and one has something to hold on to, but we need to work toward more discussions (Notes, p. 126).

My comment about exercise lessons as a prerequisite to discussions is

a misguided one. There are, of course, many ways of conducting exercise lessons and of course they can be used as a way into discussion lessons, but we should keep in mind that there is no causal necessity involved.

Linda found it difficult to have the kids for such a long time sitting in a circle for discussions, especially

as it has been said that people cannot keep their attention for more than perhaps 7-10 minutes at a time, or something like that.

Me: No, no! [I got irritated inside, maybe it showed. Standard psychological experiments on attention and attention spans do not transfer to philosophical discussions in my experience.]

Linda: Perhaps this will work out gradually. But I think it is too much for me to conduct discussions for 40 minutes. Therefore, those exercises as you have seen, then naturally we use them a little bit to [pause] (hold on to, she means).

Me: Yes!

Linda: When people get uneasy it's a good thing to throw in an exercise. One does this a lot in general teaching, to structure the lessons this way. First comes perhaps a short introduction, then comes a short discussion, and then an exercise. This is the classical structure of a lesson. But on the other hand, it would naturally be fun if we could train the kids to sit and talk about a particular issue but not just about all and nothing, that is to say, up to 40 minutes and as such it can be seen as an objective.

Me: The real length of the periods is just 30-35 minutes.

Linda: Yes.

Me: Then comes the reading, which can take up to 10 minutes.

Linda: Yes.

Me: And then we have left like 20-25 minutes and I know it in my heart that if one, that if the threshold has been reached where the kids enjoy this [working on Harry], where they find something to discuss, then it is not a problem to spend 20 minutes with them. But while the situation is, well, that is to say, we have not yet reached this threshold.

Linda: But I think we're getting closer to this because I sense them to have more interest in this... (Notes, p. 128-9).

My comments were pretty much down to earth! Linda starts out from misguided premises when reflecting on the problematic aspect of implementing philosophy, but she corrects herself as she takes my comments to consideration. My remark about not having reached a "stage" where 20 minutes could be spent in discussions with students is questionable, at the least. It is true that it has proven difficult for

~~~~~

Note the richer context here compared to p. 74 where I use part of the quote to support a description of Linda's teaching style.

Helga and Linda to conduct "long" discussions, but my last two lessons in Helga's class both included more than 20 minutes of discussions.

However, it is difficult when students are not used to this kind of work, and it must be all the more difficult for Linda and Helga to keep the discussions rolling because of their lack of experience in leading philosophical discussions.

Linda wants me to model a lesson in her class like I had done in the other class. Later in the conversation this opens a new direction:

Me: Look, there is one thing before my modeling. I've been thinking a lot about your relation with Thor....Well, of course I don't know all the details to this matter, and, but I have certain doubts about it and I think, that before I start to excuse myself, I'd better bring them up.

Linda: Yes, please do. That will be interesting.

Me: In my opinion he doesn't, well, somehow he doesn't pay your confidentiality back. He doesn't show it in practice, but that can perhaps be traced to his difficulties.

Linda: Exactly!

Me: Then I've been thinking in general whether, whether ... (your arrangement of the reading) is really for the best...I'm for example absolutely sure that the kids notice that Thor never reads aloud.

Linda: Yes, but there [pause] /

Me: And then my question is: Why isn't Thor allowed (openly) to be poor at reading? It's a general knowledge, everyone in the class knows, that certain persons are poor at math, poor at drawing, or poor at something.

Linda: Yes, I agree with that.

Me: And why then, well, against this we have his personal characteristics and his personal problems, perhaps they overrule, I mean, the attempt to get everyone to tolerate him and take Thor like he is?

Linda: That they have done to a considerable degree and his image has also changed. In 3rd grade they didn't think much of him ....[His history.] I have thought a lot about this with the reading. I have always been afraid that it would result in extreme behavior on his part, in extreme insecurity that would gradually increase. But I've been thinking about one route I think I'll take. That is to decide in advance on a short piece he can exercise at home (and then read in class) because I'm sure he wants to read. I know he can do it (Notes, pp. 131-132).

In continuation of the conversation above, I suggested announcing in the beginning of the model lesson that those who did not want to read could just say "pass". But Linda preferred the idea of assigning Thor a piece to practice in advance; she suggested the first 6 lines of chapter

four, I recommended only the first 3 lines as they constitute one paragraph.

We also discussed the problems in interactions between the boys and the girls. Linda agrees with me when I speculate that the problems must have very deep emotional and historical roots in the class. She also comes up with a possible explanation: The boys have always been much fewer in number and always with a female as their regular teacher.

Having a student like Thor can be nerve racking. I suspect that different experts within psychology and education would suggest different approaches to him. For myself, I must repeat that I am doubtful of the approach of organizing reading turns around the delusion that it is just by pure chance that Thor is never selected as a reader. I cannot see how it can be consistent with the aim to form a community of inquiry.

#### Reflections on practice

My conversation with Linda shows that she had become doubtful that a whole group discussion would work out with her students, I know she was thinking whether the same aim of improving her students reasoning could not be reached by the means she and her students were used to. As far as reasoning goes, there is much to Linda's viewpoint. At least it seems to be a question of common sense that sheetwork should improve students' reasoning as measured by the New Jersey Test of Reasoning Skills. Implementing philosophy, as such, would be a question of new exercise sheets employing already established methods.

That approach could strengthen the students' intellect but it would remove spontaneity from the practice of philosophy; the element that has more to do with puzzlement and motivation of the students themselves than reasoning per se. This approach would overemphasize the last step in the

process of inquiry, application, and thus the interconnections between doubt, inquiry and belief would be bypassed. Furthermore, there would be no bridge between the "I" and the "me."

Assuming that there is something that students need to internalize from teachers, for example, critical spirit and inquiry skills, it follows that they need to observe teachers at intellectual work. Given the nature of the process of inquiry, teachers need to work for a continuous period of time in their modeling. Two paths for such modeling are clearly open: (1) Teacher works with whole class. (2) Teacher works with perhaps half class in some lessons. Either way students could internalize attitudes and skills which they might possibly apply later on their own, whether being by themselves, in small groups or in big groups. Circulating between small groups during lessons serves best to reinforce skills and attitudes that are already internalized and it does not serve the objective of training students to discuss particular issues to depth.

Modeling continued

The 12th lesson in Helga's class is in the third period that morning and I am to model it. Helga is a little late and I volunteer to read for the kids a chapter from Murder in the Theatre by Wernström. I stop when they are done eating and we move to the horseshoe in front of the blackboard. Leona complains in the beginning that my method of shifting reading turns gives some a lot to read and others just a tiny bit. I point out that it is sheer coincidence whether they get long or short paragraphs to read. I ask them to turn to page 16 and start reading in line 17. Titus, Logi and Sophie protest at once and point out they were to the top of the next page. I tell them that this is where we will begin anyhow. (I do not mention the reason which is that this half a page contains Harry's paper on "thinking" and that we didn't "cover" in the 11th lesson.)

Angela has just started reading when Ari asks her to read louder so my recorder will pick it up. Some giggle, but Angela reads right on. After 17 lines I jump in:

Me: Here we stop!

S: Again at the same spot!

Logi: Again at the same spot!

Me: Again at the same spot, yes! We'll just get used to it, this is the way it will go!

Girl: Why don't we finish the chapter so that we can start on the next chapter?

Me: This was explained to you in the beginning. Helga even wrote it on the blackboard....

[The kids keep on protesting.]

Me: This is like being in a nursing home! You nag all the time!\*

Logi(?) [Imitates an old person's voice]: Can't we start to finish the book?

Me: Think again about what you just read! What do you think of Harry's

-----

\* Pardon me! In my experience old people do not nag more than young ones. But I do believe that through movies, books, and western culture in general old people are often pictured nagging. I seem to buy right into that stereotyping. However, this comment invites the kids to view themselves from the outside.



paper? [More imitating of old persons.]

Girl: Is this thinking ---

Me: Silence, please! Angela, what did you say? [Chat.]

Angela: We need more than 90 words [for a paper]--. [Logi is loud in the background.]

Me: But what do you think of the theme, is it /

S: Stupid, very --

Me: Stupid! [Sigh and write it on the blackboard.]

S: Boring!

Me: Boring! [On blackboard.]

S: Poopy!

Logi: Just crazy!

Me: Why is it crazy, Logi?

S: Poopy!

Logi: This is so messed up!

S: Poopy!

Me: What do you think is messed up about this paper?

Logi: No, just "To me, the most interesting thing in the whole world is thinking" (Harry p. 16). This is just nonsense!

Me: Yesterday I noticed, Logi, when someone said that it is so stupid to think about thinking, then you said it would not be stupid once you started to think about it!

Logi: No, but this is a messed up paper!

Tab: But this is interesting to HIM [Harry]!

Me: So this is just interesting to him! [Chat, especially from the girls which can be heard to say: "poopy," "queery," "slummy."] Tell me then exactly what it is that is so queer or boring about it?

S: Oh, it's just crazy!

Me: You are not saying me WHY it is boring! [Chat.] Can you give me / (reasons.)

Logi: I mean, one hardly starts to think about thinking, but, look, if someone starts to think about thinking then it must be fun after he has started to. Still, it's crazy!

Me: GIRLS, do you agree with what Logi is saying?

Girl (Leona?): BUENA! [A reprimand for chat.]

Me: Buena, [cough, cough, from class] what was Logi saying?

Sophie: [Cough, cough, from class] -- thinking about thinking.

Tab: How does one think about thinking?

Me: Logi, I guess I will repeat it this time. He said, is there someone else in here that can repeat what he said?

S: He himself!

Me: Ari, what was Logi saying before?

Ari: I don't know!

S: Logi must repeat it himself!

Me: You know it yourselves that this will never work out if we don't listen to one another. (Notes, pp. 139-141).

Perhaps I surprised Logi by reminding him of what he had said yesterday, at least he admits that, although it is crazy, it must be fun once started to think about thinking. Tab did point out that "thinking" is interesting to Harry and a girl reprimanded Buena for her chat.

Despite these positive signs the overall reaction to Harry's paper was negative. At our next Monday meeting I emphasized that this lesson is a good example of how a philosophy class should not be structured (cf. Notes, p. 173). What I had in mind was that I did not follow the students "interests"\* in the beginning and that I had primarily exercised my authority as a teacher. But there is something missing! I think it has to do with how ambiguous "interests" are. When we talk about interests we are basically either referring to social or intellectual habits. As educators it is up to us to define what those habits are, it is also up to us to be open to revisions when good reasons are presented against them. As a teacher of philosophy I want my students to know that there can be plenty of important issues to investigate in a text of seventeen lines; single words are often worthy of investigations. How can this be done? It cannot be done by following social habits that lead in the wrong direction (but habits can lead in whatever direction). So how about justifying my opening of the lesson as an attack on a social habit (Read but do not think!) that leads away from inquiry?

Shortly after the opening above to the 12th lesson I retreated into an exercise, on how thinking leads to understanding (Philosophical Inquiry, p. 90), which I used more as a discussion plan. I took much time working on its first question: Can a person admit something without understanding it? This involved a discussion on understanding and being right.

-----  
 \*Cusick (1985) shows that the teachers he studied, in a few American High Schools, were primarily concerned with not disturbing social habits of their students. Those teachers wanted, for all means, to get along with their kids, serve their "needs" and do "what's good for them." The problem only being that nobody bothered to define what the "needs" are nor what is "good" and this leads to nowhere in building intellectual or social habits among students.

In any case, we often go astray as we take various "interests" as measures of most things, not admitting that: "Concepts lead us to make investigations; are the expression of our interest, and direct our interest" (Note #570 in Wittgenstein's Philosophical Investigations).

Finally I pushed this question aside with the remark: "It's funny that we cannot come to an agreement because of such a simple question!" (Notes, p. 145). The next two questions we worked on were: Can a person know something without understanding it? Can a person believe something without understanding it? Questions that enforce listening were a constant theme in my questioning: "Which one do you agree with?" "Can you repeat what I said?" Logi complained that the questions were boring and Sophie became concerned that I was not asking enough new questions from the exercise; she does mind having questions to think about! We were well into the latter part of the period when this question occurred to me:

Ok, there we have an example of something which we can believe without understanding it. Our next question is whether we can learn something without understanding it?

S: Nope!

Logi [Rolls his book to form a trumpet and calls out]: No, it's not possible! [Some agree with him and he repeats the call.]

Sophie: --I don't know either--

S: There is no need to answer this question!

S: Do you mean when we're learning something at school?

Me: When you learn at school, at home, or wherever. KIDS, we don't let anything pass here except our attention! You do that by concentrating on what is being said! [The kids had started a "knock-pass" game: You knock on the next shoulder and let it pass.]

Sophie: Aren't you going to ask each one of us?! --

S: Stop it Adelle! You are behaving like an idiot!

Me: Adelle, do you agree with the statement that you have learned to read but still you don't (have to) understand what you read?

Adelle: Yes!

S: Good for you Adelle!

S: NO!

We see that the kids' reactions to my efforts are mixed: someone is interested enough to ask the teacher what he means and Adelle is reprimanded by a fellow student. On the other hand, someone claims that there is no need to answer my question and some want to exercise the "let-it-pass" game. Addressing a question to Adelle was an attempt to get her attention, but her "yes" was effortless as an answer. In the

next question I tried to follow up on my "yes/no" question to Adelle, by asking for examples. This time the question was addressed to the whole class. Notice that I am still working on a single question: can we learn without understanding.

Me: Can you give me other examples of something you have learned but not understood?

Sophie: No, one hasn't learned a thing if one hasn't understood it!

Me: One has not learned it if one hasn't understood it?!

S: Yes, just about!

S: Like when one is reading a story -- [and there comes] a stupid word (and one) doesn't understand a thing -- [Chat and screams take over.]

Me: Sophie is saying that, BOYS, RELAX! [Chat.] BOYS!

Logi: Is it not allowed to play the "pass-game"?

Me: How about giving us a chance to talk together?

Logi: Well, how about giving us a chance to practice the "pass-game"?

Me: You have plenty of opportunities to do that. GIRLS! RELAX OVER THERE! ---Sophie is saying that one cannot learn anything except having understood it first!

Sophie: I DIDN'T SAY THAT! [Irritated.]

Me: Instead you said?

Sophie: I said that if one has learned something; one hasn't learned a thing if one doesn't understand it! [Noise.]

Me: What do you say about that: Is it so, that one hasn't learned a thing if one doesn't understand it?

Tab: One must /

Sophie: One must understand things!

Tab: As one learns /

Me: Can you give Sophie an example?

Tab: As one learns things one must understand them!

Me: So you do agree with Sophie: As one learns things one must understand them?

Tab: Yes, so that they can be remembered!

Me: To remember them?! [Doubtful]

Tab: Yes! [Chat and debates.]

Sophie: This is a totally different thing!

Titus: Will you stop it! [A girl giggles.] --

S: Cora stop it, you idiot!

Me: It seems that we have a disagreement here. ---

Yes, we we had a disagreement that did not have an immediate solution as Sophie seemed to have a different understanding of "understanding" than the other students. As Sophie was somewhat rebellious my tactic was to approach her through the other students by asking them to ask her. In an atmosphere of more social togetherness and intellectual openness this dialogue would have been different. For example, Sophie would typically

have been asked after her last entry above: How are those two things different? But we went right on:

Me: Sophie, what do think of the stories you read, she [Buena (?)] says that she learns them but that she doesn't understand them?

Sophie: Then she doesn't learn a thing! She must understand them so that she can learn them! Understand what they are about! --

Leona: Sophie, do you understand all the words in the story?

Sophie: Yes, often, but if I don't understand them then I try to learn them!

Leona: But there is no problem for you to read them!

[Leona and Sophie go into a debate. Simultaneously Adelle, Angela and Cora can be heard chatting.]

Me: Tab, can you perhaps tell us what they were talking about?

Tab: Yes, they were saying that /

Me: SILENCE, PLEASE!

Tab: - learn -- the content of the words.

Me: If one doesn't understand a word, then?

Sophie: You understand them at the same time! Because if I learn something then I cannot but try to understand it also!

Me: Do you agree with Sophie? [Drowns in noise.]

Sophie: You cannot cook something without understanding the recipes!

S: Yes you sure can!

S: Yes you can!

Sophie: No, you cannot! -- [Someone goes: Let it pass!]

Me: -- RELAX! Let's ponder this together! Use your heads for a little while!

S: Use your own head, you sure need to!

Me: Can you come up with a question for Sophie [much noise in the classroom]. Can you come up with a question for Sophie such that she cannot but admit being able to learn something without understanding it? [The class is silent!] That's the task now, try to find a question where Sophie has to admit that she can learn something without understanding it!

We see that Sophie sticks to her position and I stick to my tactic in asking the students to ask her. Actually I did miss an opportunity above to ask for clarification: Must people have recipes before they can cook? Does it matter what we are cooking? In this context we may note that Sophie seems to have a technical conception of learning and cooking; learning is like cooking when following a recipe step by step. There is no mentioning of the artistic element that allows improvisation from the recipe!

We kept on:

S: She can read regardless of that!

S: And play!

Titus: Then one understands her!

Sophie: But then I do not understand the story!

Me: But what we are talking about is whether she can learn something!

S: Yes, it is possible to learn something (without understanding).

Leona: Sophie, Sophie, if you maybe read the word, but (it is) in English and then you can read it but you don't understand it!

Sophie: I can maybe read it, but then I don't know nothing of what is being said in the book!

Boy: Then you don't understand it!

Sophie: No, I just said that! I don't know how to, but I can read OK although I don't understand it! I'm saying that I'm not learning it! I knew how to read many years ago!

Me: Sophie, has it never happened to you that you have been learning something, perhaps for a test, an answer on something, how / You have been learning about Snorri Sturluson, isn't that so?

Chorus: Yes! [Chat.]

Me: In relation to that, do you understand everything you have learned about Snorri?

Sophie: Yes, everything that I've learned! What I don't understand, that I haven't learned!

Me: But can you remember what you don't understand?

Sophie: I can try putting it to my memory --

Me: That is to say, if there are questions on the test that you don't understand, you cannot answer them?

Tab: One can also forget what one learns!

Me: One can also forget what one learns! --

Titus: One forgets ---

Sophie: I'm saying --- [NOISE!]

Me: KIDS! KIDS! The period is over, but I can only, ARI! [Reprimand for chat.] Let's think a little about what we have just been doing! KIDS! It really rather surprises me how this works out! [Pause.] Don't you find it rather uncomfortable when we are talking together / was it boring what we were thinking about?

S: No not this about --[learning and understanding was ok!]

Me: That was OK you say! But how come, how come that one cannot hear a word? Everybody is talking at the same time or doing something like that?

S: Because we're talking about it together! [I.e.: This is how we talk together!]

Logi: We're talking secrets!

Titus: Can't we talk to the whole group but only to one or two? [As usual Titus talks like a machine gun (that skips every third bullet), when he inserts this. I don't know whether he is suggesting that they should talk to the whole group or whether he is saying that their rule is to talk to one or two persons at a time?] (Notes, pp. 148-151).

I closed the lesson by telling the kids that I had enjoyed talking with them. That was the truth, although it was tiresome to stay on top of things amidst social and intellectual unruliness. We did take some

-----  
 \* (1179-1241) Wrote Snorra-Edda, a cultural gem.

steps in the direction toward a community of inquiry as the students reprimanded each other and directed their questions to one another. To activate the social togetherness and intellectual openness needed for establishing a community of inquiry the dialogue, as a method of instruction, is of primary importance. It is through dialogue that interactions between the "I" and the "me" flourish; sheetwork cannot come in place of it.

I modeled the 12th lesson with Linda's group in second period on Friday. I met Linda for a moment before we entered the classroom and she informed me that she had just lost contact with Thor when she suggested he would practice the first three lines and thus it would not be possible to ask him to go on first. We enter the room and the lesson begins:

Me: Kids! Linda was so nice to allow me to teach this period. [Some clap and go "hurrah."] But I am going to start by being a little bore to you! Can you tell me the difference between a boring teenager and a boring old person?

S: No!

S: Old persons are always nagging! \*

S: Old persons are always talking about it when they were young! [Chat can be heard and some are still bringing their chair to the circle.]

Me: But a boring teenager?

S: They complain all the time!

Me: Always complaining. So, maybe there is something which boring old persons have in common with boring young persons? [Chat, pause.] I'm starting this way because when we start forming the circle in the mornings, then I've sometimes wondered whether you remind me more of boring old persons or boring young ones! ["SSSH" is heard a couple of times from a girl (Saga??) that quiets the class down.] Because when we begin in the mornings you always go: 'Oh, I can't be in a horseshoe, I can't be in a horseshoe!' [Imitate kids in my intonation.]

Hrist: Do you know how horribly awful it is to sit like that?

Me: Well, the whole thing is that if you work with a smile on your lips things work out much better!

Thor: Yes, but we don't want to go into the horseshoe!

Me: It has a certain advantage to sit in a horseshoe AND this arrangement

-----  
\* I told you! This is one of the ways in which we stereotype old people! But in Helga's class the comment "This is like being in a nursing home! You nag all the time!" just came out of my mouth. In this case I had put some thought into how I could get the kids to view themselves from an external perspective, but this opening may just be for the worse as the class is already improving.

will not be changed. The best thing you can do is to accept it with a smile on your lips! Now let's form a proper horseshoe! Come on, in here!

S: Poor rags! Is it so difficult! [This is directed to the ones that don't want to enter the horseshoe.]

Me: Frigg and Vidarr! Come into the circle!

Without any protests the kids move into the circle, all except the Valkyries. It may be noted that Thor gave in at once and moved into the circle, but it took a small fight to have the Valkyries move in:

Me: Come on girls! You have to go to a doctor to get a certificate to excuse that you cannot sit like this [facing inwards in a circle] in regular classes!

[Chat and noise of chairs being moved.]

Me: Are you going to be like this at the nursing home? [Hrist and Hildur face outward from the circle, when they turn around they turn their chairs too, so they still have the chairs' backs in front of them.]

Hrist/Hildur: No, we'll much more of a fun!

Me: Well, then you better start here before you will be stuck with the habit of being boring! One, two, three! Turn around! You can bring the doctor's certificate the next time! Then you will be absolutely excused, then you don't even have to attend class!

Hrist: I want to sit this way with both of my legs -- /

Me: Girls! I'M NOT TAKING THIS ANY MORE! TURN AROUND! [Firm, but neither screaming nor angry.]

Hrist/Hildur: OK! [Sulky.]

S: We cannot take this any more either! [Support to me.]

Me: Listen to that, you are not only boring to the teacher but also to your classmates. SIT PROPERLY ON YOUR CHAIRS!

Hrist/Hildur: Oh, can't one sit like one wants to?!

Me: The same goes for everybody here. STAND UP AND SIT PROPERLY!

Girl: What's wrong with you? (Girls.)

Loki: Just take them and spank them!

Me: That's the way it will end or with something similar!

Hrist: It is so uncomfortable /

Me: "YOU TOO!" [Hrist is probably turning around and I'm talking at Hildur]

Hrist: / to sit like this! One just pours down! Then one slips down (the chair)!

Loki: Oh, you! Cut it out!

Me: Well, I tell you, I just hope this will work out better with you at the nursing home! [Intonation of relief.]

This was a most interesting opening to the lesson as I started by attacking their habit of protesting the horseshoe, a habit which the class was not thoroughly committed to. It felt good to have support from the class in fighting the Valkyries. But the fight was not resolved with total victory on my side as a weak spot is now spotted on the teacher.



Notice how Thor joins in when good reasons are presented against the teacher's outfit:

Girl: It's not allowed to be on your (outdoor) shoes in here! [I'm wearing my outdoor shoes. I don't know for sure who is speaking here, but it fits that Hrund would fight back for the Valkyries.]

Thor: Would you please be so kind to take your shoes off! [He is courteous!]

Girl: Those are not his outdoor shoes, those are his indoor shoes!

Girl: One can just see it!

Me: Ok, kids! Let's have silence! [I take my shoes off, pick them up and and take them toward the door.]

Thor: Take them out to the hallway!

Me: Isn't it enough to put them here [I put them under the sink close to the door. Giggles in class!] That's the kind of privileges the grown ups have! [Nobody had stopped me before or pointed the rule out to me. Class becomes completely silent.] Let's turn to chapter four, page 15. Today we're going to read a little differently from how you have been reading so far. And what, what I'll ask you to do is for each one of you to read one paragraph and this can work just automatic. But if there is someone who is not paying attention, or if he thinks the paragraph is too long, or if he is in a bad mood, or something, then it's no big deal just to say "pass" instead of reading. You don't have to read if you don't want to! [Chat: "Let's say pass!!"]

S: What's a paragraph?

Me: Every new paragraph starts with an indented line. Is there anyone who would like to start? [Three passes and giggling.] Then I'll start reading the first paragraph and then we go the circle this way, and check whether there isn't someone who wants to read! Let's have silence, and even though we have passes I want to ask you to try not to giggle very much so that those who have some interest can hear the other readers. Ready? [Pause, I read the first paragraph when all were silent.]

By announcing that a "pass" would be allowed I took quite a risk. But when I took that decision I was not thinking about the risk at all as I was determined to do the reading myself if they refused cooperation. This announcement surprised Linda who caught her breath in response to it, she said (Notes, p. 172). Gefn, the first student to my side, said "pass," then five students read in a row. Next Thor and Hodur said pass. There was a short pause when it came to Loki's turn, then he started to read. Fourteen (of possible 20 students, but I do not think they were all present) read in the first turn. We read up to the introduction to Harry's paper on the next page:

Me: Thank you, here we'll stop. What interested you in what we read?  
 S: Nothing!  
 Me: [I stand up and put the point on the board]: Nothing! Thor, you said something different, wasn't that so?  
 Thor: [Inaudible.]  
 Me: Can I say: Equally as stupid as everything else?  
 Thor: Yes, yes!  
 Me: [There is complete silence while I write this on the board.] Any more ideas that you have about what we read?  
 S: Pretty good!  
 Me: Pretty good! [On board.] Was there anything in particular that you thought was good?  
 S: Nah!  
 S: It was all the same!  
 Me: All the same! [Write on board. Silence in class. Pause.] That is to say, nobody has any special ideas about what he thought was interesting? [Relatively long pause, I say something, but the intercom phone rings at the same time and pulls my feet, Linda answers.] -- it is not that way. If we start on top; the one who said "nothing" how, there were many words in the chapter, but none of them were interesting?  
 S: [Inaudible.]  
 H: Then we have, this is pretty similar to me, this one, this one, and that one [point at board], don't you agree with that? It's really the same idea behind all this. But what is this /  
 Loki: "Pretty good" that's the only positive point.  
 Me: Yes, "Pretty good" is the only positive point. This is all in minus here [on board] and "pretty good" is the only point in plus we have. If we start first with the negative things, can you tell me what it is that is all the same?  
 S: Oh, only, well, these thoughts! What for are we learning this?  
 Me: Thoughts! [On board.]  
 Hildur: Why are we learning this?  
 Hrund: Yeah, boy, I tell you!  
 Me: Is this question somehow related to what we are talking about: why we are learning this? [A low chat is heard on this.] What do the rest of you think? Do you think, has anyone, is there anyone in here that can answer Hrund? For what are we doing this?  
 S: Hildur!  
 Me: Hildur, I'm sorry. I'm not quite sure on your names! [Long pause.]  
 Saga (?): This is not boring!  
 Frigg: This always revolves about the same!  
 Me: And around what does it revolve?  
 S: Thoughts! [Chat on task.]  
 S: Of course it revolves a little around thoughts!  
 Me: [It] revolves around thoughts. And you think, do you think that we have nothing to learn in relation to thoughts?  
 Hildur (?): Well, if there is thinking in one's head, then that's enough!

This opening was not very promising as the kids did not identify particular points of interest in the story. However, we were on to something as we had a reason to examine: The story is boring because it

always revolves around the "same" and that "same" has to do with "thoughts." When Hrist made her next remark I decided to build on it (which is an ideal way to approach the kids, although the idea is to have them accept responsibility for setting an agenda to the lessons by identifying points of interest from the story).

Hrist: Nobody learns from other people's thoughts!

Me: Nobody learns from other people's thoughts!

Hildur: --thoughts--

Me: Thoughts, let's see, do you agree with this that nobody learns from other people's thoughts? This is an interesting idea!

S: Not me!

S: Not me! [Complete silence while I write on board.]

Me: Sorry about my writing! [Actually it is not hard to read, I think.]

S: We're used to it!

Me: Nobody learns from other people's thoughts! Is, is there anyone in here that has ever learned something from other people's thoughts?

S: Aha! [Chat on task.]

Hrist: One never becomes independent if one thinks like all the rest!

Loki: Hrist, how do you know what I'm thinking? --- [Linda is heard in a conversation with a pupil.]

Hildur: OK, we do at least! [From context it is not clear whether she means that they (the Valkyries) will not become independent by thinking like others or whether she means that they know what Loki thinks!]

Me: One never becomes independent, notice what she is saying, one never becomes independent if one thinks like others do!

Hrist: No, if one behaves according to the thoughts of others and if /

Thor: It is not possible to behave according to other people's thoughts!

Me: [So] one shouldn't listen to what others say?

Chorus: Oh yes, yes.

Hrist: I didn't mean that - not to think like -- [Noisy debates, Loki is loud.]

Loki: -That all are stupid except you! Hell (no)!

Me: But wait a second, it's two different things to behave like others or to listen to them and (on the other hand) to learn from their thoughts. [Three different things would have been more exact, but my focus is on learning from thoughts!] Isn't that so?

Hrist: I only know that people should learn from themselves, but not to learn from other people's thinking! [Silent pause.]

Me: What do the rest of you think? [Pause.] I th /

S: It is fun to learn this, but I'm not sure about what I'm learning!

This last comment is somewhat out of touch with the issue under discussion although it certainly relates to the first part of the lesson. However, it illuminates the fact that students usually learn about things, but they do not get inside of ideas or topics to trace them back

and forth by making new connections or relating them to facts and experiences. Furthermore, learning is conceived as a private effort, as Hrist's comment indicates, and the intrapersonal dimension of learning is blown out of proportion whereas the interpersonal dimension is ignored.

Me: You are not sure about what we are learning, but ... (let's) try to concentrate on the question that was brought up on the other side (of the circle). Isn't it, if we try to take this a little further, isn't she telling us that school is completely unnecessary?

S: I don't think so!

S: No, - math. [This comment slipped my attention on the spot.]

Me: Yes!

N: I mean, yes, but like [stops].

Me: What do you do at school? Don't you learn from other people's thoughts at school?

S: Yes, yes.

S: No.

Frigg: - like, you know, she teaches us this way, Linda does, to think it like this, then we have learned from her thoughts - we only need to learn this, we just need to want to imitate after her and do likewise, and think likewise.

Me: So it is possible, you're telling us that /

Hrist: OK, I'LL [Me: "Relax"] change this! Nobody becomes independent from [stops]...

S: ...other people's thinking?

Hrist: I'm telling the truth! [Chat starts.]

Frigg's idea that learning is identical with imitation can be translated to the vocabulary of Mead as: Learning is a matter of the "me" becoming one with the surrounding social environment. On this view it is overlooked that as we learn we can make ourselves, learning is not a simple question of being made by teachers! To become healthy individual persons, capable of independent thinking, "I's" and "me's" must have opportunities to interact.

From Hrist's comments we can see that the interaction discussed is taking place. For sure she is excited and she jumps in before the teacher has finished his question, but the point is that doubt has been raised in her mind.

Me: If one imitates someone, then one isn't independent! Do you agree with that?

S: Yes! [Someone laughs.]

Me: Then you just become puppets on strings [raise my hands and put fingers apart], isn't that so? Then someone pulls a string and we move?

S: In that case, one just lets others control oneself!

Me: Now, but one can learn to imitate, isn't that so?

Frigg: [Inaudible]

Me: Can you repeat for me what Frigg said?

Thor: Yes, what did she say?

Me: I really didn't hear it!

S: Neither did I!

Me: I think you must repeat it yourself!

Frigg: Yes, well, that one can learn from some things, if one is to learn it this way and that way - but when one thinks all things the same way -- then I imitate her (Linda) in everything - doing like others all the time - I can do nothing [Difficult to hear and Frigg does have a confusing manner of speaking.]

Me: Yes, yes!

Frigg: Doing like others all the time, perhaps for a really long time so that (in the end) we cannot do a thing ourselves.

Me: Are you telling us it is ok to imitate to a certain degree, if you do not imitate all things?

Frigg: Yes! - Like not thinking like all the rest, maybe like if I would maybe do something like somebody else, think exactly the same way, he thinks something and I think it, and if he does something then I do it too, that - to imitate all the time, always thinking alike, then one cannot do a thing!

Hrist: I mean, it's ok to do some things the same way!

Frigg: -- everyone do alike!

Me: But if one imitates completely in this way, completely, what does one become then?

S: Dependent! [Some show agreement.]

Notice how Frigg brings up the issue that I discussed in my last insert to the dialogue. Combined with Hrist's comment, they are saying that the "me" needs to imitate a lot of things, but if learning is just imitation the result is a machine that cannot do a thing by itself, a "conventional individual," Mead would say.

Me: One becomes dependent [write on board]. But, kids, this is getting me somewhat confused! Can you describe to me someone who is extremely independent in his thinking? [Here I should have stopped, before asking the next question.] What's the difference between him and the dependent one?

Frigg: The dependent one couldn't decide on a thing for himself, he couldn't -

Me: Can't decide [write on blackboard]. But the independent one if we put him over here [on board]. Is that one of the differences that the dependent one cannot decide, but the independent one can?

Frigg: He is more decisive!

Me: More decisive?

Frigg: Yes, like he can do more things himself.

Me: He is more decisive and can do more things by himself. Somebody said: He doesn't have to. Was it you Gna?

Gna: Yes.

Me: Can you explain that for us?

Gna: ---[Cannot be heard because of noise.]

Me: I think you must repeat this for us!

Gna: The one who is more decisive, he doesn't have to be more independent he can just be more demanding!

Me: Do you understand what she is saying?

S: No; no!

Me: Anyone in here that can help her out of this?

S: No!

Loki: If she asks nicely!

Me: Please try once more to explain this for us!

Gna: The one who is more demanding can be more independent.

Me: Oh yes.

Frigg: - Then it is the one who is more dependent that gives up. Like, maybe, if someone who is dependent would always just do the same things as the independent one, then would --- rather perhaps ---

S: Bring up his ideas?

Me: He cannot bring up his ideas. But are you by any chance, I'm a little confused on this, are you by any chance telling me, let's see, that the demanding one can both be independent and dependent?

Chorus: Yes!

Me: The independent one can be here [point at board], he can be demanding and this he can have in common with those who are dependent, they can be demanding too.

S: More decisive is missing! [Either on the board or in my speech!]

Me: But is the same thing true for those who are decisive, can they be independent too?

Chorus: No!

Me: Frigg!

Frigg: [Inaudible.]

Me: You disagree that being demanding is common to those who are independent and dependent?

Frigg: When you start to think about it then - [students discuss decisiveness and independence.]

Me: Thor, what do you think?

The dialogue above has gradually grown in depth. But Thor's next distinction triggers moves to the topics of fashion, courage and beauty. With all these topics in the air the class gets all the more excited.

Thor: Whether one is independent or demanding, I think those are two different things.

Me: That this doesn't relate, but how can you know those apart that are, on the one hand, independent, and on the other hand, dependent?

Thor: Those who dress just the same way (are more dependent) and then there is perhaps one who dresses differently and that makes him more independent than the others.

Me: Yes, yes. So how you dress is an example we have [on board]. Do you think, should I put "how you dress" or "having courage" [someone brought that up simultaneously]?

S: Courage! [Here opens a short fight between boys and girls on who was the first girl to have some special kind of clothing.]

Me: KIDS! We have one more thing entering here and that's fashion, if fashion is such that it makes all independent /

Thor: Yes!

Hildur: No!

Syr: Then one starts to think of beauty!

Me: Then one starts to think of beauty! [Students talk and I miss a chance inquiring into this comment.]

Hrist: OK, so should I just NOT have bought a jacket because Hrund was going to buy one like that? Should I just NOT buy it?

Loki: You wanted to buy it to be independent!

Hrund: -- I mean, was she just to say: "Yuk, I'm not going to buy a jacket like that!"

Hrist: I just want to have it different!

Me: Let's relax a little now!

Loki: It's funny that all of you haven't bought the same kind! [Intonation of teasing.]

Me: KIDS! KIDS! Let's think some more about this, but let's do it differently! [Excitement in class.] Wait a second, PLEASE! Let's not get too excited!

Girl: It happens to us in every period!

Me: Let's try to keep our heads up! -- What are you saying?

Girl: It happens in every hour that we get too excited!

Me: Well, we have to change that, we must try to talk together without always becoming like food grinders! Now let's THINK, we were talking about fashion and dependence, now let's see whether we can imagine someone who is totally independent. What kind of a person would that be? The one who'd be totally independent?

S: He'd be - [laughs]

Frigg: -He'd not be doing like the others -- then he doesn't have to do like the others, he can be independent.

Me: He doesn't have to follow all the others, he can be independent.

Thor!

Thor: Sometimes [inaudible].

S: It seems to me that everyone in here is extremely independent!

Me: All extremely independent, BUT wait a second, we are trying to push it, we are trying to take the case to ultimate extremes, notice that. [Chat increases.] KIDS! Notice that we are trying to imagine how it would be if we'd be extremely independent and Thor has pointed at Gísli from Uppsälir. Do you think it would be fun to be in the same class as, or in the same family as individuals who are so extremely independent?

-----

\* Gísli from Uppsälir died in 1986 around the age of 80. Approximately five years ago he was discovered by a TV newsman living by himself in an isolated valley in the Westfjords. There was only one more farm in the valley and the neighbors checked on him once and in awhile but respected his isolation. Gísli was interviewed on TV, he had a hard time speaking because of lack of exercise, but basically his story was that as a young man he wanted to leave the valley but as his family did not allow him to leave when he wanted to, he DECIDED to STAY, i.e. never to leave. As the years passed people left the valley, but Gísli stayed, survived without modern technology, and played his old organ. He was somewhat brought to

Chorus: No!

Girl: --- [She took her father as an example of a person being too independent as he would always have to do his things at different times from everyone else in the family.]

Hrist: We're extremely dependent, we all buy the same kinds of socks, we are all wearing athletes' socks.

Me: Perhaps there are certain advantages accompanying being a little dependent, because then one can be with others, isn't that so?

[Laughs, talking.]

Hrist: Almost everyone is wearing athletes' socks!

S: Yes, it's much more comfortable! [Talking.]

Me: That's it! That would [pause], yes, yes, [pause] yes. Look, those could be boring individuals who are so independent!

S: Yes, yes.

Me: Frigg!

Frigg: My sister --

Me: Excuse me! I didn't get that, I was closing the door, and then we had so much noise, would you please repeat your point?

Frigg: The one who is independent doesn't have to be eccentric, he can perhaps, perhaps if he is with --, is going to buy himself something or things like that, and he wants it very much, but the other -- [It is very difficult to follow her. But I think she was saying that the one who is independent can buy things because he wants them, but the same is not true for the one who is dependent.]

Me: I noticed one word you used, you said "eccentric," can it be that those who are so extremely independent end up being weirdos?

S: Yes, those who are extremely independent ["No's" are heard too.]

S: If all were independent nobody would go to the same movie! --

Me [work on board]: They are eccentric and can we add that they are boring?

Girl Those who are eccentric are boring!

Loki: They can be very funny although they are eccentric!

Me: So this doesn't (have to) go together. I see that there are many hands raised, but I don't remember who was the first one, let's start here. KIDS! KIDS! wait a second. Let's listen to her. We start here!

The kids are evidently interested in the discussion and they control themselves, i.e. they raise their hands but do not all speak simultaneously. In deciding who should have the next turn, I tried to be fair by announcing that I did not really know who was first to have his or her hand raised. I suspect that I used the opportunity to call on Fulla, a student that is rather laid back. However, the students should ultimately be themselves in control of such simple procedural matters by

-----

the present as money was collected and the TV-crew brought him a TV-set and a freezer too! He liked the freezer because storage of food had always been a problem for him. The TV he never got used to watching.



identifying the one who should really hold the floor.

Fulla: Well, if I would for example, if Sjöfn had bought herself jeans with special patterns on, now I'd maybe want to buy black jeans, -- then I'd be awfully dependent if I wouldn't dare to buy them because I'd think the class wouldn't like them, still I 'd think they were nice.

Me: Uum, Gna, yes. Kids, please listen!

Gna: --- [An example of a green circle she had drawn in art.]

Me: And what are you trying to tell us by this?

Gna: Just, -- destroyed my picture.

Me: And you were independent or dependent?

Gna: Rather independent.

Hrist: But I'd like to take Hrund as an example, she was so awfully independent: "You can go eat before me, I go when you're done, I'm too lazy to eat with you," I'm imitating you [she sure imitated and she evidently wants Hrund to know]. And then we were perhaps playing some game: "Don't you want to play cards or something?" (Hrist asked.) "What, no, you" [Hrist pauses here and then goes:] People acting like this are boring!

Me: So those who are extremely independent are boring? [There was silence while Hrist spoke, now the noise increases.]

Loki: This is not the way it is, then they (people) wouldn't be able to speak to others. -- Yes, not a man like that, then it would be best to store him in an institution!

Me: Do you think people that are so extremely independent end up in institutions?

S: Yes!

S: That would be boring people!

S: They would just be crazy!

Frigg: That's when people are like that!

Me: Aren't they independent?

S: Yes!

Frigg: Although it just is /

Hrist: It's just a failure!

Me: It's just a failure! A sickening independence?

S: It is not exactly independence! [Noisy debates.]

Me: LISTEN! LISTEN! KIDS! Let's now go over to the other side and check on those who are dependent. We have already traced that those who are independent, they end up being eccentric and almost a failure if they are sickly independent. How do those end up that are dependent?

Thor: Fashion-freaks, or something like that!

Me: Fashion-freaks! [On board.]

Girl: There are more fashion-freaks than just those who are independent [talk].

Me: KIDS! [Pause.] KIDS! KIDS! [I hum, the kids talk and then someone makes a "SSSH" sound to quiet the class down.]

Thor: We're talking together here!

Me: Listen to that! They are trying to talk together!

The kids seem to be growing in their social togetherness, their increased respect of one another shows in their listening and disciplined

debates. Some of them even reprimand their classmates so that the intellectual work can openly be carried on with. It is tempting to explain the students' increased social togetherness and intellectual openness, simply as an expression of their interest for the issues under discussion. That would, no doubt, be a major part in any reasonable explanation of our success in the discussion above. However, the hard part is not to explain but to help the students identify and come to grips with topics of interests. Topics that are all around them, both in boring and entertaining matters, both in books and in their immediate surroundings.

By now our discussion had lasted for quite some time (ca. 25 minutes), and revolving around the same theme. A theme that relates easily to Mead's theory of the social development of the self.

Frigg: Dependence, if you end that way then you cannot be without others. Those have to stay with someone that helps them, they cannot do a thing by themselves!

Me: They cannot do a thing by themselves!

S: Yes!

Me: Gna, you had your hand raised?

Gna: Yes, well, perhaps someone [a classmate makes an "SSSH" sound] - must always think something that is fashionable right now - and then when it is out of fashion they don't dare wearing it again!

Me: What word can we put on that? How can we describe those? -- Dependence, but we agreed earlier, wasn't that so, that one shouldn't be too independent, one needs to be a little dependent, listen to what others have to say, and things like that, be with others. But now we are thinking about those who are sickly dependent and how they end up, how does it end?

Hrist: Well, [it ends] like when I was going to have a short haircut, I cannot remember how old I was, -- (No, I don't think a short haircut is) Ugly! I think it's cute to have a short haircut. "Oh, how tough this is! This is a fantastic style for you!" people would say. People are just trying to have one being the same way they themselves are! I don't want to be a ["case" ?] like that -

Me: Controlled by others then, or? [Pause and students talk.] Would puppets, like puppets on strings you know, express your thinking?

Loki: Like throwing up! [Almost inaudible.]

Girl: Like Hrist was saying, then it is like forcing you into another danger, if he is in danger!

Me: Uuu, did you hear what she had to say over here? Can you explain it for us? I didn't understand it completely!

Girl: Hrist was saying that -- just as if I were in danger, then I'd be

dragging Hrist along with me.

Me: Oh yeah! Frigg!

Frigg: One can also see the difference between independent and dependent ones by seeing that dependent ones cannot live by themselves, they almost cannot be by themselves, they cannot do it because they have been with someone just ["from birth" ?? Talking increases.]

Me: Wait a second. I'm going to try pull this together.

Thor: The period is over!

Me: YES, I KNOW! THOR, PLEASE SIT! STAY PUT! YOU'RE NOT JUST GOING TO RUN OUT! LOOK, IT JUST TAKES LONGER IF YOU BEHAVE LIKE THIS! YOU'RE NOT LEAVING UNTIL IN A MINUTE OR TWO! KIDS, I'LL BE QUICK IF YOU GIVE ME SILENCE! I think you have been telling me that this, over here, independence, ends in a failure, but you have also been telling me that dependence ends in failure! Don't you agree with that?

Chorus: Yes! [What but "yes" could they say?!!]

Me: The failure is common to both, but then we need another period to work this out further and perhaps most of us are somewhat independent and somewhat dependent. Perhaps that's just for the better. Unfortunately, we have to stop here! (Notes pp. 154-170)

In my judgment this lesson was an up in application of a philosophical discussion as a method of instruction. However, it must be noted that it did not spring from the text we read in Harry, but from Hrist's comment: "Nobody learns from other people's thoughts!" I found this comment very appealing and as it is the idea to work on ideas that the kids find important I decided to stick to this idea. Unfortunately I do not think that Hrist nor anyone else in the class respected the idea to begin with, i.e. that it might be fun and worth exploring. As far as Harry goes the kids evidently have a hard time recognizing, or at least they have a hard time admitting they recognize, ideas in or springing from the text that they find interesting enough to discuss. From my point of view, that is sad!

As a teacher I was pleased with the lesson above although I realized that we had a long way to go. In terms of content, the lesson was satisfactory as there was considerable interplay between the concepts under discussion and concrete examples. It may be noted that the content of this lesson was quite different from what I had expected and in such

circumstances it helps to have a general background in philosophy.

The kids complain of our lessons as being boring. However, I suspect that their complaints were not genuine as they relate to philosophical discussions. Look for example at Hrist. Nobody is louder and more decisive in protesting, nothing seems to do as an answer to her question: "Why are we learning this?" But Hrist has the keenest philosophical intuition and she cannot help participating in discussions. Can it be that her "me" is coming to the front and that she has learned or is in the process of learning that philosophical reflection is "stupid"? I wonder if her philosophical insight will be distinct in a year or two!

#### Reflections on week four

Week four proved to be a turning point as teachers (and students) were provided with the component of modeling which was most lacking from their preparation. Explanations were not lacking, at least not to the teachers. The modeling provided the teachers with experience as observers, but what was still lacking was the teachers' experience in conducting their lessons in such a way that they themselves and their students would experience inquiry in process.

In the the first four weeks we have seen that the students' were not used to set an agenda to their lessons, nor were they used to listen carefully to one another or explore ideas in a community of inquiry. Given this history, I guess I should have been pleased with how quick the kids caught on once they were introduced to dialogue as a method of instruction. The kids did make nice dialectical moves, but what was missing was practice and their acceptance of taking responsibility for their own education.

Week five: Modeling and experience

We spent most of our Monday meeting to browse through transcripts of the model lessons from last week. There were some positive signs in the air. For example, Linda pointed out that when the two of us had entered her classroom in the last period some of the students were already with their chairs in the horseshoe. Also I got to know that Ari's father had praised the project, but he has a daughter in an upper grade which borrowed Ari's book and they had discussed it at home. This came in line with the fact that Ari had not brought his book to class many periods in a row!

Helga and Linda are about to rearrange the groups by having the kids drawing themselves into new ones. Helga mentioned that "cliques and chat-clubs" needed to be broken up and she especially mentioned the pairs of Buena and Erla, and of Titus and Trausti as being chatting all the time.

I modeled the 13th lesson with Linda's kids in first period on Tuesday. The kids were quick to form the circle when asked to. I thanked and praised the class for our last lesson. Next I pointed out the leading ideas on the page and a half that we had read noting that they they had been unable to spot them. I also explained that in teaching this material teachers would prepare themselves to talk about these ideas. Loki asked whether it was not allowed to bring up other ideas than the leading one's. Of course, I agreed to that point and commented that it happened all the time and that it was fun to work on unexpected ideas.

After this opening I asked for three volunteers whom I gave them 17 lines to read in total from chapter four on Harry's paper on thinking.

Me: Here we stop today and this is all the tiny bit we're reading today.  
And I want to ask you, like you perhaps know, whether there is anything from these lines that you want to discuss?

S: Nothing!

Me: Perhaps we can talk about that nothing came up [on board]. Was there someone that mentioned thinking about thinking?

Thor: No, that was in the book!

Me: Do you want us to talk about that?

Thor: No!

Me: Are there any questions you have about what we were reading?

S: No, no! [Pause]

Me: It's a little difficult, I think, to talk about nothing! [But in itself it really is an interesting topic!] -- I think I must then just talk about what I want to talk about! -- I want to talk about understanding! [On board.] Do you know, is there anyone in here that can tell me what understanding is?

S: To understand people!

Me: "To understand" what does that tell us?

Frigg: It's only understanding, now I understand what you're saying!

Me: Understanding people [on board] or someone and somebody else said: To understand what I say, to understand language, wasn't that so? To understand language [on board]. Loki what did you say?

Loki: To know what someone else is saying.

Me: Isn't that really the same idea as the one over here [point at board: to understand people? [Loki and Frigg talk together. Pause.] I was asking you whether you could tell me the meaning of this word or what it is. We already have two ideas: On the one hand we can understand people, on the other hand we can understand words or language.

Frigg: It is possible to understand what you were saying --

Me: Yes, yes.

Thor: That's not the same thing!

Me: Do you mean, that is to say, that if you don't understand the words or the language I'm speaking then you ask: What do you mean?

Frigg: No! You're perhaps explaining something to me.

Me: Yes. -- Are you talking about understanding of what is being talked about, or (understanding of) a thing, or this could be /

Frigg: You are trying to explain something --

Me: Perhaps this will clear later!

S: To feel pity for someone!

Me: To feel pity for someone! Would that relate to understanding?

S: Yes, something happens, he's in a bad situation or something.

Me: Yes, yes. [On board.] This is a kind of something else than the understanding. [This comment was a bad move!] -- Someone else said something here!

S: --- [Inaudible.]

Me: To understand a problem, yes.

Hrist: ---

Me: To understand this dam nonsense you're talking about! [A repetition of Hrist's comment.]

For a while I thought we were on to something. Perhaps my mistake was to postpone clarification of Frigg's point above. She evidently had a

hard time getting her meaning across. A better tactic on my behalf might have been to ask for help from the class as someone might have understood her although I did not! Also I could have asked her: How is your idea different from the two we have? I also ignored Thor's comment "That's not the same thing!" that might have helped the exploration.

In any case I was completely stuck after Hrist's comment, but given the confusing opening it is understandable that she thought I was talking about "dam nonsense!" I decided to follow the discussion plan (What is understanding? Philosophical Inquiry, p. 91), I was working from, more closely.

Me: [Continued from above.] Well, is there someone in here that has a pet?

Chorus: Yes, yes, yes!

Me: Let's start over here: What kind of a pet do you have?

S: A dog!

Me: Do you have a dog! Do you understand the dog?

S: Yes, sometimes!

Me: Sometimes but not always? [Should have stopped here.] How do you manage to understand the dog?

S: Well, if he --- [inaudible explanation.]

Me: What about the others that have pets, do you understand them?

Chorus. Yes! ---

Me: Do you have a parrot! How do you manage to understand it?

Freyja: --- [She describes its behavior when hungry.]

Me: So the animals /

S: ---

Me: Now we're thinking about animals and we can understand them from, well, from what they do [on board]. Don't you agree with that? [I do not wait for an answer!] They perhaps, well, the dog barks, bark, and the parrots they peep ["skríkja"].

Thor: They chirp! ["tísta"].

Me: Chirp, yes. That's a much better word!

S: --- [On animals.]

Me: So we have (their) actions [I work on board and pupils start to chat/talk but up till now there has been pretty good silence in the classroom.] -- But is there someone in here that is interested in gardening?

Chorus: No!

Me: Someone that has trees in the garden at home?

Chorus: Yes!

Me: Someone that has trees and does he understand them?

Chorus: NO! [Laughs.]

Me: Isn't it possible to understand trees? [Work on board.] -- What, are you telling the truth? That it is impossible to understand trees? [Students debate, talk, chat cheerfully.]

Me: Yes, - did you notice what Frigg was saying over here? She was talking about /

Hrist: But one doesn't understand them!

Frigg: ---

S: And then you have to cut them!

Me: Are you telling me that you understand how they grow?

[No clear answer. Talk.]

Thor: Do you understand trees?

Me: I, I think I understand a little about how they grow. I know they need light, soil and water. Do you also understand that, kids?

[Noise increases.] Let's relax now! We were talking about understanding trees. Let's clear this up! You cannot by no means understand trees?

S: No!

S: Sure you can!

S: Yes!

Me: There is another thing. And ["long" pause while students debate].

What about biologists, do you think they understand trees?

S: No, no! They think they understand them!

This last remark remark and the next following interchanges are "Kantian" in nature as it hangs in the air we cannot understand "things-in-themselves" but only as they appear through our experience and observation, i.e. as "things-for-us".

By moving around with the examples above, doubt was raised in some students' minds. Simultaneously unruliness increased in the classroom. I had the impression that the inquiry was too "stupid" for the kids; that it irritated them. But this was a positive mental irritation that indicated that the students' opinions had been moved.

We continue from the departure above.

Me: But what about specialists in forestry? Are foresters foresters without understanding trees?!

Hrist: How are we to know?!

S: ---

Me: We can reflect on it, I mean [here a student is louder than me, but I do not get what he said] they are about to start (industrial) forestry here and things like that. Do you think that those men are going to start out without understanding trees?

Loki: They will just ask around what trees can live here!

Me: It's perhaps fair to leave this by saying that we cannot understand the trees themselves, like we cannot understand the dogs themselves?

Chorus: Yes, yes!

Me: But on the other hand we know a lot about trees!

S: Yes, (we know) whether they need food (nutrition) or -

Me: Yes /



S: -- whether they (dogs) like us, lick us, and things like that.  
 Me: We know a lot about them. There was another, there was another idea brought up, kids, relax a little over here [I move to the the source of the unruliness.] Hrist brought up a funny (= very good) question /  
 Hrist: Me?! [Laughs.]  
 Me: Yes, she said something like, and this is a very serious question, you said that this was just like asking us whether one could understand blocks (of apartments)!  
 S: Yes -  
 Thor: This is just like asking stones!  
 Me: To ask a stone! How is it with blocks, do you think there are some people that do understand blocks?  
 Chorus: No, no!  
 Me: Gna tells me that one can only understand things that are alive!  
 S: Yes, yes!  
 Loki: No! --- [Inaudible.]

Hrist was surprised when I noted that her question had been a serious one. In fact I was encouraging the class to play along with my questioning, but at this point unruliness increased. Someone made fun of how I wrote on the blackboard. My handwriting is far from being as beautiful as Linda's. We have different styles. She writes, for example, "n" with one curve, I write it with two curves; she writes "m" with two curves, I use three curves.

Thor and Loki have something important to say, but as the kids' attention fluctuated I recapitulate what we had been talking about:

Me: Not possible to understand dead things? KIDS! This says "things" it is supposed to be "things." [Some are troubled as I write "n" with two curves!] We have talked about animals, and all agree that we can understand animals, we understand the bark, and we understand the chirp, and we understand their actions, and concerning trees there is a considerable agreement that we cannot understand the trees themselves, but still we do understand them or we do know what they need to grow and prosper.  
 S: Yes.  
 Me: Then we talked about things, and first came: "No, we cannot understand things! We can only understand what is alive!"  
 S: Yes.  
 Me: Then Loki and Thor brought something up and claimed they sure could understand (dead) things. Could you perhaps repeat it for the rest of us? -- Thor was talking about the chair, one could understand the chair, the structure of it. Was that what you said or?  
 Thor: No, ---  
 S: -- and the material.  
 Me: But [pause] do I cheat on you Thor if I say that you were telling us

where from, (and) from what things are made?  
 Thor: No /  
 Hrist: Look, understanding it! One only knows it!  
 Loki: Sure you understand it!  
 S: No you don't.  
 S: Yes you do!  
 Loki: Should I ask you (Hrist) what material the chair in the storage room is made of? --  
 Hrist: I do think that you can only understand people properly!  
 Me: Only possible to understand people properly!  
 S: -- and animals  
 Me: And animals!  
 S: Tamed animals!  
 [I work on board, pupils discuss "what can be understood." Noise increases.]  
 Me: KIDS! Listen for a second to Hrist! RELAX! LET'S ALL RELAX! Hrist says she knows animals she understands /  
 Hrist: Horses, I can talk to horses!  
 Me: But you said something else earlier that I've more interest to talk about. First let's / [This is a clumsy way of putting it: "I've more interest!" But I was on my way to her former comment of "you can only understand people properly!"]  
 Hrist: Let me tell you, horses are really sensitive. --  
 Me: You [responding to another student, most likely Thor, that broke into the discourse] can understand dogs and gerbils very well, you understand parrots. We have examples of this on the board. We have already talked about how we understand animals, and we have talked about how we understand things, and we have understood, --- I'm sorry but the question that Thor, or the comment he brought up before / GIRLS! GIRL-L-S! You said it's only possible to understand people or animals!  
 Thor: It's just bullshit and nonsense!  
 Me: Why?  
 Thor: ---  
 Me: Not possible to understand thoughts about chairs?  
 ---  
 Me: Is this then a different kind of understanding that one has of what is alive and of what is dead?  
 Chorus: Yes! [Talk.]  
 S: If one understands ---  
 Me: Try to talk one and one at a time!

In the interchanges above we see the students' limited respect for one another and their ideas. The students evidently lack experience in working in a community of inquiry although some were interested in our discussion. Is it unfair to ask those who are not interested to show respect to those who are by giving them peace to work? Or is it maybe outrageous to expect twelve year old students to show respect to their classmates and ideas because schooling is compulsory?

I suspect that lack of respect stems from lack of the students' training in cooperative inquiry. Communities of inquiry cannot operate unless its members accept responsibility for their own education. There is no reason why twelve year olds cannot accept some of that responsibility!

As the dialogue was halting I thought it might help to move closer to the students and that was in accordance with the discussion plan:

Me: Kids, how do you think you understand one another?  
 S: That's a little difficult!  
 Me: Is it a little difficult? What is difficult about understanding one another?  
 S: Saga --  
 Me: Loki do you have a comment on this?  
 Loki: No!  
 Me: What about the rest of you, do you find it difficult to understand one another?  
 S: Yes, it's very difficult!  
 S: No, it's very easy! [Talk.]  
 Me: But how about, do you understand how the teachers understand you?  
 Chorus: No!  
 S: We understand what the teachers are -- (using or saying).  
 ---  
 Me: I can tell you, just very quickly, why we are learning this! [A response to inaudible comment.]  
 S: Yes (tell us)!  
 Hrist: Do you find this funny?  
 Me: We are learning this because we need to learn how to talk together. [Noise increases.] I've noticed that, / KIDS!  
 ---  
 Me: Exciting? There are some who find it exciting! [A response to inaudible comment.]  
 S: Whom? Whom? Whom?  
 Hrist: Let me tell you what I cannot understand!  
 Me: OK!  
 Hrist: I cannot understand why a pot is named a pot and (why) dogs are (named) dogs!  
 Me: Y-e-es, yes! [I was very surprised here and so was my intonation.]  
 S: Yes, neither do I!  
 S: Why is this named that way --?  
 S: Is this exciting!!  
 Loki: What's wrong with it?  
 [Talk.]  
 Loki: If a pot would be named "man" and a man would be named "pot," then you wouldn't understand why it would be that way!  
 S: Exciting --?

The interchanges above are stunning to me because of their philosophical

nature. They are all the more stunning because the context is really negative. Hrist proves here once more that she has a sensitive intuition for philosophical issues that surfaces at unpredictable moments.

I didn't grasp the content of Loki's comment on the spot, but it sure is an interesting one. Is he saying that we can just understand language but not how it relates to real things? Or is the point that our understanding will just always be limited?

Me: Is there anyone on the other side (of the horseshoe) that can repeat what he was talking about? Anyone on this side?

S: No!

S: You were being asked a question! [Directed to classmates.]

Me: The idea came up, there were two kids that said they didn't understand why things have the names they have. [Talk, pause.] What do you think it would be like if we would start to name things by totally different names?

S: ---

Me: I'm sorry, I can't hear you!

S: Do you think this is exciting?

I gave up on why things have the names they do as discipline and attention in the classroom was minimal. Instead I moved to another discussion plan: What does it mean to know oneself? (Philosophical Inquiry, p. 92.)

Me: I know it can be exciting! [Chat on "exciting."] Uuu, [pause]. Kids, I don't think you're right! How is this really?! It's like you're telling me that you understand yourselves much better than I do?!

Chorus: Yes, yes we do!

Me: Is it the case that you that you understand yourselves much better than I understand you?

S: Yes!

S: No! [A very weak voice.] --

Me: You have already come to know yourselves! Ok, how about your dentist does he understand your teeth better than you do?

Chorus: Yes! [On the recording I hear someone say a weak "No." A possible route here would be to probe for reasons pro and con, but I decided to "drive on."]

Me: How about your eye doctor, does he understand your eyes better (than you do)?

S: No, he doesn't know whether we see!

Loki: Sure he does!

S: He understands how the nerves connect to them. --

Me: But how about teachers, how about teachers? Do you think they understand you better than you do?

Chorus: No, no, no!

Me: Do you think teachers perhaps have a better understanding (than you) of what you need to learn?

Chorus: Yes, yes!

Thor: I think the teachers just hallucinate on that!

Me: Hallucinate on that! Do you mean that they give you too much to learn?

S: No!

S: No!

Syr: They give us too little to learn!

Me: Too little?

S: Yes! ---

S: (There is) Much too little homework!

S: No!

S: Sure there is!

Me: What would you like to learn more of?

Syr: -- Just -- I think we should have something that is fun --  
--- [Talk, chat.]

Me: Sometime earlier we talked about thoughts, how is it about thoughts? Now that you think so much at school, is there someone who understands your thoughts better than you do?

Chorus: No, no!

Me: Absolutely sure?!

Chorus: Yes!

Me: But is it not possible that someone else expresses these thoughts better than you do? [Talk, chat.] Kids, you all agree that there is nobody who can express your thoughts better than you can?

S: One thinks better for oneself!

Hrist: Not if my mother thinks for me or the teachers or the dentist or the eye doctor! [She pays attention, doesn't she?!]

S: This is a little messed up!

Me: But how about when you are extremely fond of some tune or some story or something like that?

S: ---

Me: But is it possible that the song expresses some thoughts for you better than you yourself can?

---

Me: It says in the book that: "If we think about electricity, we can understand it better, but when we think about thinking, we seem to understand ourselves better." --

S: That's just bullshit!

Me: That's just bullshit! OK! Why is this bullshit?

S: (Just) crazy!

Me: 'That's just bullshit!' I mean, that doesn't tell me much!

S: Although electricity is ---

Me: Although electricity is --- What do the rest of you think? Kids, I will read it again! Wait a second! [The period is almost over and the kids are unruly.]

S: Hildur! When are you going to grow up?

We kept on stumbling for the couple of minutes or so that were left of the lesson. The lesson above shows that the classmates had a long way to go in terms of listening to one another as well as in respecting ideas.

Perhaps I was too optimistic in the beginning of assigning only 17 lines to read, but the length should not matter if willingness to explore the text is present. Overall I missed not being able to take the discussion to a more general level in a more peaceful atmosphere.

However, I hope it is fair to label this lesson as an up, as a step in the right direction. I hung on to the discussion plans in my attempt to model how to use dialogue as a teaching method. Despite negative reactions there were some good moves in the discussion. I did use the blackboard for "operationalization" of the content, but it could have been more thorough by having the kids do sheetwork. But sheetwork, in my judgment, was not what they needed more of.

OCTOBER 22 - NOVEMBER 27: MORE UPS THAN DOWNSWeek five continued

From now on Helga's and Linda's teaching of Harry will again be at the focal point.

Helga taught the 13th lesson to her group after the morning break that Tuesday. It was a difficult lesson. The teacher from the lesson before had forgotten a radio/tape recorder and instead of the usual story the kids listened to pop music. There was also a tension in the air because the kids knew they would have to enter new groups that day. Logi commented for example that he would commit suicide if new groups would be arranged and that it would be just horrible to be "one" with three girls at a table.

It takes a while to form the circle and quiet the class down before reading. Lousie brings a novel with her to the circle and doesn't want to put it aside. Leona asks whether they just shouldn't get started. Logi asks whether they shouldn't just read but not talk. Lousie complains that they read portions of different length. Buena doesn't notice what page we are on.

Usually I take a seat outside the circle but today I join them and sit between Sophie and Ari. The last ones to get ready are Louise and Doreen and then 10 of us read 10 paragraphs from the middle of chapter four (pp.17-18), 18 lines in total. When Helga stops them the kids complain about who got to read and how much. Helga tries to open a discussion but the kids want to talk about the reading. She explains that what they read was not enough for everyone to read a part. Logi protests that everyone "should" read. Helga asks them about the rule that explains that some get more to read than others. Sophie explains it is just

sheer coincidence how much a person reads. Salome agrees, it's just luck and bad luck, she claims. But Louise and Buena claim that it "always" turns out the same way; they have "always" had short sentences to read.

While this is going on I notice that Ari is peeking into chapter five.

When this scene is settled Helga tries to start again:

Helga: Is there anyone who listened well enough to remember something from what we read?

S: Yes!

Sophie: I can't remember a thing!

Helga: Was there someone that listened /?

Tab: About chairs!

S: Seven chairs in the room!

Helga: So they were talking about chairs, yes!

Leona: There are many chairs here, yes, yes.

Helga: And what was it about those chairs?

Logi: Look, the next time, no matter whether we will be on this or that side (of the circle), the boys, then you should let them start reading [points at girls]!

Helga: Logi dear, you know we decided to talk about something more fun? /

Logi: This is no fun! [Chat.] ---

Sophie: That's my point too! [Notice how she follows Logi!]

Logi: Do you think it is any fun to talk about chairs?!

Helga: Yes, why can't that be fun kids? Tab you mentioned the word (chairs), what did you mean?

Girl: Why does this one over there get to read? [Upset.]

Helga: I asked you a question! -- Do you know any more about this?

[Students talk about chairs and names of characters.]

Sophie: -- (There just was) a sentence that didn't fit with Harry's rule! [Chat.]

Helga: Yes, Adelle, what did you say? [Adelle can't be heard, Helga asks the kids whether they were too busy about themselves to listen to Adelle and then she repeats:] Adelle pointed out to us that we were talking about these chairs because Harry and his mother had been talking about Harry's rule, don't we all remember that rule? [Someone speaks but Logi takes over.]

Logi: I just think this is crazy! It doesn't make any sense to talk about chairs!

Sophie: And also just about this rule of Harry's!

Helga: Uu, is it just nonsense? -- (But) this is nothing you're to learn, look! [Giggles in class.]

Logi: This is a messed up book!

S: Crazy!

Helga: Does Harry's rule work on seven chairs in the room?

S: No!

Agatha: Hreinn, he translated it: Hreinn Pálsson translated. Published on translator's expenses. [She reads from title page.]

Helga: KIDS! DEAR KIDS!

Logi: Hreinn Pálsson sits here!

Helga: Do you remember when we were playing, it worked out just fine, we, GIRLS! we were working on sentences and trying to standardize them



to "All" and "No" sentences. Do you remember?  
 S: Yes, but we have just become bored on this!  
 Logi: Everyone has become bored over this book! We always read the same [stuff], and the same ones always read. We are always talking about this all, no, seven, [sic!] seven, seven, [sic!] chairs. This is childish and boring!  
 Sophie: Philosophy is boring! Always the same ones who read, always the same pages, and some do not read loud enough and then you cannot follow it at all!

This was a difficult beginning! The kids' complaints are mainly procedural, on how they read and how much they read. But the complaints also relate to the "sameness" of the content, which can partly be explained by our slow pacing through the book. Notice that the kids become unreasonable in some of the comments that follow, but Helga copes very well with the situation by asking for reasons and inviting the kids to discuss why the lessons are boring.

Helga: Is this just impossible?  
 S: Yes, this is just impossible!  
 Ari: This is not childish! [He is sitting next to me and very few heard this comment; none responded to it.]  
 Sophie: It's a dead boring book!  
 Helga: What is this "always the same" you're talking about Sophie? [Noise!] DEAR KIDS! Girls! GIRLS! You all agreed when someone said that this is dead boring, so maybe you can participate in a discussion on why this is boring? [This is especially directed to the girls.] What? Can you give me some reasons why this is dead boring?  
 S: Always the same! [Chat.] --  
 Helga: Were we talking about that in the last lesson: All and No?! [The fact being that it was not so. There are no clear answers to this question. Agatha tells a story on discovery. The kids chat and talk along these lines: "Why just Harry? Why do we just talk about Harry? Harry bla bla!"] ---  
 Sophie: Yes, it's just about Harry!  
 Ari: It's because Harry is the main character in the book! [Nobody seems to pay attention to this comment.]  
 Sophie: Look, he's also boring! [Chat, noise.]  
 Helga: So you don't want to give Harry all the credit because of the rule, but Lisa also?  
 ---  
 Leona: Why can't they have different names? It's always either Harry, Rosy, [sic!] Lisa or something like that?!  
 S: It's not Rosy!  
 Helga: Now you have lost the thread! -- Boys, I haven't heard anything from you! [I.e. "boys" except Logi.]

At this point Trausti responds and says that all he wants to talk about is the upcoming rearrangement of the groups! Someone claims the period is over. Helga kept on:

Helga: Look, I don't think you have given me any good reasons to support that this is dead boring?!

S: Yes we did!

Titus: Harry always does some small thing by himself, then he has others to work it out for him!

Sophie: Yes, and he needs to tell, it's not enough for him to discover it himself, he even has to ask the teacher for help! He is nothing but a teacher's pet!

Logi: Hurrah! [Claps.] Well spoken! Well spoken!

Helga: Ee, and you find it boring to read about it?

Sophie: YES WE DO!

Titus's point was a good one because Harry would be nowhere without the community of inquiry in his classroom; his teacher and and classmates are continually helping him out. How this relates to boredom I do not know. But at this point the roof is just about to take off because of noise in the classroom. The kids want to know why they are learning this. Helga explains that the novel was written in the United States and has been taught to all kinds of kids and that experience has shown that they became more independent in their thinking and that they do better in subjects like math and reading. She closes her explanation this way:

Helga: ... On one thing they learned a lot, and that was to listen to one another! --

Me: I want, KIDS! I just want to add a thing on what Helga said about listening. We all know, everybody in here knows that we all know how to talk. All of us do know how to talk, and sometimes one's impression becomes that you know it too well, because everybody are talking at the same time! But what kids have learned by working through this book with the methods we're using is really how to talk together! And this is a little like in sports, kids, one learns, for example if you're learning head-jump then you need to practice and practice and practice, and then you perhaps do it right for one time, but fail the next time. It's likewise with this, sometimes we succeed at learning together, pardon me, sometimes we succeed at talking together, and gradually we become better at it! Just like you gradually become better at head-jumping!

Girl: I'm no good at head-jumping!

[Somebody suggests that they spend all of one period reading then the next period they should talk.]

Me: But then you have forgotten what you read in the last period!

S: We have memory!

Sophie: Don't you think we can remember a thing?! Do you think we are, there we have the explanation why we always have to read it over and over again, you think we have no memory!! (Notes, pp. 188-194).

The noise and unruliness increased again with this comment. Sophie was the loudest of all and she was the first one to throw her book to the floor. Some girls followed her example, I did not note in particular what Logi did, but the other boys held on to their books and showed facial expressions of surprise. Sophie complains it is no use for her to raise her hand as "nobody answers me, I mean, that's true! But When I just start to speak someone answers me!" (Notes p. 194.) She complains that "they" are always nagging about how funny the book is. When Helga asks Sophie who "they" are, she points at Helga and me and says: "You and him!" (Notes p. 195). At that point Ari protests, but he seems to have bought into the argument about the boredom: "It is not the book that is boring, it is just that this is always the same! This is so weary, one is always doing the same but just using different words! This is just like it would be in math:  $2+2$  and again  $2+2$ " (Notes p. 195).

The kids do have a point. We have have been proceeding slowly through the novel and the logical exercises have perhaps been emphasized too much, (or driven too quickly into without relating them to the novel). But because of training arrangements (or rather lack thereof) it would have been difficult to move faster. The logic and the slowness are also only a part of a possible explanation. The kids are not ready themselves for philosophy, or maybe they are not ready anymore (cf. theses by Matthews p. 24). Our philosophy lessons are "childish and boring" according to Logi. They seem to have entered some phase where quantity is all that matters; they want to read all of the book now. Notice for example Sophie in this respect. Philosophy is dead boring according to

her (the philosopher), but still she wants to read more and have her classmates read louder! However, some kid did present a good idea about reading in one lesson and then discussing in another. This is certainly a worthwhile approach if an agenda is created right after the reading.

Later that day I called Helga and we discussed the situation. She did not want to make too much out of the kids reactions as she thought the upcoming rearrangements of the groups had created tension among them. Helga mentioned that she thought throwing the books to the floor was "unexampled" with earlier behavior of the kids, but neither one of us focused on that as a problem in itself.

In the beginning of the 14th lesson Helga asks me how working on an exercise sounds to me. In response I take a middle of the road position, but then I add: "You know I don't want to pull any strings!" "That's good!" she answered with a smile (Notes p. 197). The following lesson was exercise work, among the best I have seen.

The new groups are as follows: (1) Agatha, Angela and Leona sit in the front to the right. In this lesson I often noted Leona trying to be funny by making comments falling outside the topic. (2) Salome, Adelle and Cora sit next to the teacher's desk in the front to the left. At least twice, Helga had to quiet Adelle down. Sophie is in that group but she is ill today. (3) Lousie, Torfi, Thomas and Logi are in back of the room to the left. So contrary to Logi's expectations he is among three boys against one girl. As usually Louise has a sour face and doesn't show much interest in the work. (4) Doreen, Trausti, Tab and Titus are in the middle of the room. (5) Buena, Zophon, Ari and Erla are located in the middle of the room close to the door and they already seem to form a new chat-society, except for Zophon who is easy going and quiet as always.

In her preparation Helga had obviously concentrated on three types of quantifiers for standardization of sentences. She had written five sentences\* on cards of different colors, one for each group of students. She had also written the different forms of standardization on four different cards: (1) All \_\_\_ are \_\_\_; (2) No \_\_\_ are \_\_\_; (3) Some \_\_\_ are \_\_\_; (4) Some \_\_\_ are not \_\_\_. She started by showing the cards with "All \_\_\_ are \_\_\_" and "No \_\_\_ are \_\_\_" and she asked whether the groups' sentences could be standardized using these forms. While the groups talked about their sentences Helga wrote the key words on the board: several, very few, a number of, all but one, almost all. Now she asks the groups to read their sentences and report why they cannot be standardized as "All" or "No" sentences. As the sentences are reported on she underlines the appropriate keyword and then her next move was to write

"All ----- No"

on the board as she asked about the word that covers everything in between. The kids were quick to suggest "Some" and she asks them to use it to standardize the sentences showing them the appropriate cards with "Some \_\_\_ are \_\_\_" and "Some \_\_\_ are not \_\_\_." The students work on the sentences. Titus and Tab were thoroughly engaged; Titus was confused as he thought he could standardize "Very few pirates are pilots" as an "All" sentence. He tried.

Next she asked the groups to send a spokesperson to the board to write up their standardized sentences. When they were done she asked those who turned their back to the board to turn around and she standardizes the sentences with the class. She asked whether the "meaning" of unstandardized and standardized sentences remained the same one and that

-----  
\*

Philosophical Inquiry, p. 95. Sentences # 2, 3, 6, 8, and 14.

gave her a springboard for showing that three of the sentences needed to be standardized in two forms; "Some \_\_\_\_ are \_\_\_\_" and "Some \_\_\_\_ are not \_\_\_\_," but not only in one form as the students had suggested.

In short, except for the subject, this was a typical good lesson: Students sat in their groups and worked on exercise sheets while Helga moved swiftly around to assist them or to work on the board.

The 14th lesson in Linda's class is in the third period that Wednesday. On my way to the classroom I meet Loki in the hallway and he asks me whether they were going to have "social studies" in the next lesson. I admit and then I asked him: "Don't you find it fun?" He answered as we entered the classroom: "Yes, oh yes! It's fun, but it is about nothing!" (Notes, p. 200.)

As usual Linda read the class a story while they snacked. During her reading I notice that Hildur reads a novel. Forming the horseshoe works out just fine except that Linda has to go over to Hildur who wants to keep on reading the novel. I sit at the teacher's desk that has become my usual place by now and when they are just about to start the reading Syr asks: "Where's the man?" Linda tells her, but Loki asks me: "Isn't your name Hreinn?" "Yes it is," I admit, and again when he asks "Pálsson?" Then someone can't help a comment: "Hreinn" soapbar!"

Linda asks Hrist to start reading page 17, line 6. Horn, Vidarr, and Hildur take the next turns. As usual Linda stops each reader and appoints the next one to take the turn. While Hildur is reading Hrist and Hrud start to giggle and laugh, Linda does not reprimand them. Fulla is the next reader and while she is reading several students, among them, Saga, Horn and Freyja, try to quiet Hrist and Hrud down: "SSSH, shut up there!" Up to this point the next reader has been by the side of

-----  
\*Hreinn means "reindeer" but also "clean" or "pure."

the "present" reader, now Linda changes this pattern and asks Hrund to take the next turn. Hrund doesn't know the location, someone tells her but she starts at the wrong place. Loki is the next one to help her out: "We are at page 17, line 27!" And Linda repeats the same information.

As soon as Hrund is done with her part she and Hrist start giggling and the students try again to quiet them down. They read up to page 18, line 21:

Linda: Yes, let's stop there today. Tell me, wasn't there something you especially noted in what we just read?

S: No! /

S: Yes, [inaudible comment on "all" and "no."]

Linda [repeats]: It's not possible to say "all" or "no," (in those cases), yes. And, well, can you perhaps give us an example of such a sentence where we can neither use all nor no?

Thor: Seven chairs are in the room!

Linda: Seven chairs are in the room, yes!

At this point Hrist and Hrund were still giggling, but most of the other kids talked simultaneously about sentences and chairs. Saga, Syr and one more girl were obviously in a hot debate. Addressing them Linda continued:

Linda: Girls, can we follow up on what you are talking about? I heard that you were talking about this. Please repeat for us what you were saying!

Syr: We were quarreling!

Linda: About what were you quarreling?

Saga: Syr was saying that --- [The fact was that Syr had not noticed a change of scene in the novel, from Harry's room to the classroom.]

Linda: But kids don't you remember that Harry thought he could change all sentences such that they would start with "all" or "no"? But there he found out that, / how is it with seven chairs? [Notice how Linda stops herself before she tells them what he found out. Hrist and Hrund are quite disturbing now, and from my point of view Linda "finally" reprimands them:] Girls, please let us, if it is anything that relates to - (this), then please share it with us! [Loki and more students are talking on task, but it is too hard to hear.] What were you about to say?

S: ---

Linda: Are seven chairs few or many? [There are loud conversations on this, but Hrist and Hrund are still giggling. Freyja tries to quiet them down, she gives them a killing look and a "SSSH!"]

---

Linda: Remember, yesterday we were discussing how many Icelandic Sagas were at your homes and then we ran into problems concerning these

concepts: many, most, and few. Where do we draw the line, what is "many" and what is "few"?

S: ---

Linda [repeats]: That is to say, the chairs are many if they are inside Harry's room? Then they are many?

S: Yes!

Thor: Because the space is so limited!

Linda: But if they (7 chairs) would be in the hall downstairs, they wouldn't be many?

S: ---

Linda: Thus, you're trying to tell me that it depends on the room's size /

Chorus: Yes, yes!

Linda: How many --[inaudible.]

---

Linda: Fulla says, Fulla says, Fulla is saying that the chairs are equally as many! / Isn't her hair all right? [At this point Hrud was twisting around with her hands in the hair of the girl sitting next to her. Later she and Hrist did more of this. There is some noise in the room.] Fulla is saying that the chairs are equally as many, there are seven chairs in [Harry's] room and there are seven chairs in the classroom. Why do you say that they are few when in the classroom but many in [Harry's] room?

S: Because (his) room is so small! (Notes, pp. 201-203).

A little later a quarrel opens between Loki, followed by Thor, against the girls on whether it matters what kinds of chairs they are talking about. Linda asks them not to begin quarreling, in a while she comments they are just hairsplitting and that they should just decide talking about ordinary chairs. For the next two pages in the transcript the topic remains the same: "What is 'many'? What is 'few'?" And the criteria is the same: "It depends on location in space." But then comes a forward push on quantifiers and standardization:

Linda: ...But if I say this sentence to you: "Many 12-year-olds are students" how can we --. If we have a sentence like that, "Many 12-year-olds are students," can we then say that all 12-year-olds are students or no (12-year-olds are students)? [The sentences are from Philosophical Inquiry, p. 94.]

Hrist: Can I just (make a point)?

Linda: Please do!

Hrist: All 12-year-old kids in Iceland are students.

Linda: -- No --- some ---

Loki: --- (Notes, p. 205-6).

The class becomes very loud as the kids debate on how to standardize the sentence. Hrist changes her incorrect suggestion to "almost all" but



that is not a standardized form. After a short while, but many words, Linda comments that she "almost can't hear a word because everyone is talking at the same time." Then she asks: "Then, what does a "few" mean?" Frigg comments inaudible on this, Linda inserts something and then Loki comments:

Everything is big and everything is small! It depends on one's location or the surrounding environment! [This comment brings silence to the class!]  
 Linda: Do you mean that we are the measure of all things?  
 [The class answers with both "yes's" and "no's". Someone compares the Soviet Union and Iceland in terms of size.] ---  
 Linda: What do you think Americans think about Iceland?  
 Hrist: (That it is) TINY! [Many agree.] (Notes, p. 206).

In continuation of this a student mentioned that "China is small because there are so many people there!" Linda repeated this comment and then inquired on what they think the Japanese think about Iceland. The class agreed on the conclusion that it depends on the terms of comparisons whether things are big or small. By now the period is almost over and Linda asked: "But do you think we can come to a conclusion about this sentence: "Many 12-year-olds are students?" The kids did not have clear answers to this question. Linda pointed out the suggestion in the novel of using "some," and Frigg responds: "No, (because) some means like every second person --" Here Linda suggests they should all think about the concepts "some" and "many" until the next philosophy lesson.

My evaluation of this lesson was mixed. I was disappointed because of lack of discipline among Hrist and Hrund in the beginning and I missed more of a forward push in the discussion. On the positive side came the fact that some members of the class tried repeatedly to quiet Hrist and Hrund down and Linda's questioning had improved, especially in regard to helping the students to clarify themselves: "That is to say, the chairs are many if..." "You're trying to tell us that..." The discussion

itself also had points of interest as it related to ground for making comparisons.

At the time, I saw two main options for improving the lesson, if it could be repeated: (1) To lead the discussion into working on the quantifiers "All, some and no," in a more decisive manner than Linda did. This route is prepared for in the manual. (2) To take the discussion full force to criteria for comparisons, and in turn to relativism and absolutism. This route would have been more of a free play as it does not fall under any one Leading Idea presented in the manual.

Thursday and Friday were organized as "staff days." At the principal's suggestion I spoke about the philosophy project Thursday morning. I spoke most about myself but I did review what I thought were the (1) major weaknesses to the project; (2) false expectations towards success from me, Helga and Linda; and (3) that at present we needed to improve questioning and quality of the discussions.

#### Reflections on week five

Bringing philosophy to classrooms such as those studied requires negotiation to change the everyday context at the site. Negotiation which requires teachers to doubt their established habits of teaching and willingness to create new ones. Negotiation which requires students' cooperation and willingness to try new things.

Negotiation comes to the front in the very opening of the philosophy lessons: The researcher (/advisor) had suggested that students should take turns, teachers negotiate by giving shorter turns. Some students complain because of changed reading arrangements, others do not mind, but almost all of them like to read! Explanations on how a discussion agenda works, was given both in readings and by advisor, but probably because of

lack of modeling the teachers did not put the agenda they had on the board. At times students seemed reluctant to take new responsibility on; they wanted to work but not talk!

Help from outside can ease teachers to change the everyday context of work in their classrooms. For the outsider, or the advisor entering classrooms, modeling is a most powerful tool. Modeling is not a description but allows for showing the kind of context the advisor wants to create, it allows for practice of what is preached.

Even if the teachers and the students now had a clearer idea of the educational context I wanted to create, it would be unrealistic to expect them to shift gears all of a sudden as they needed more experience in conducting their own inquiry. Up to the modeling period neither students nor teachers had opportunities to perceive what they could possibly benefit from doing philosophy. If the modeling had come earlier, I suspect that negotiations on procedural matters, such as creating the agenda and the reading turns, would have been easier.

Week six: Moving forward

We spent all of our Monday meeting discussing my presentation from Thursday. I proved to have surprised Helga and Linda by some of my comments. I apologized for not having informed them in advance on the exact content. I withdrew a couple of points, I added context to other points and stuck to them. I reminded Helga and Linda that they had every right to quit the project. But our conflicts were not that serious and we managed to work them out and clear the air. Toward the end of the meeting we were all in good spirits and Helga even talked about my model teaching as having affected her like a drug pushed straight into a vein. She thought she had learned a great deal by it and to that Linda agreed (Notes. p. 227).

Linda gave the 15th philosophy lesson to her students in first period Tuesday. I entered the classroom like half a minute before she did and was welcomed by smiles from Syr, Gefn and Gna who announced: "The horseshoe is ready!" When Linda entered she asked me to get the overhead ready. At the end of the hour I saw that she had been ready with transparencies on standardization and contradictions of some sentences.

Linda began by refreshing their memories of the last lesson as five days had passed from it. I thought she was firmer than before in her approach to the kids, for example, she reprimanded the Valkyries sharply right in the beginning when they started to chat.

The refreshing just took a minute or two before Linda asked the kids to finish reading chapter four. As usual she stopped each reader by thanking him or her before saying the name of the next reader. Odinn started and read four paragraphs and eight lines, Syr was next with three paragraphs and five lines, then came Saga with three paragraphs and eight lines. The other readers, Gefn, Gna, Horn, Snotra, Hrund, Hildur, and

Hrist, each read one paragraph and 3-6 lines.

Right after the reading Odinn complained over a fault in his copy of the novel. Linda checked for further faults and three more copies had mixed up pages. Someone commented that all the copies were "faulted!" After this unpromising beginning Linda turned the attention to the text:

Linda: But what about the piece we just read, kids? What do you think of it?  
 Thor: Just dead boring!  
 Linda: What do you think of what we just read?  
 S: It was the same as always! [More students agree to this point.]  
 Linda: Do you all agree on that?  
 Syr, Fulla, Sjöfn: --- [Low and unclear objections.]  
 Linda: Syr, what do you think?  
 Syr: --- [No clear answer.]  
 Linda: Can you point at something you found all right or interesting?  
 Syr: [--]  
 Linda: From what we just read! Was there nothing in particular you noted?  
 [Pauses.] No one that noticed anything interesting in this chapter?  
 Syr: They were quarreling!  
 Linda: Who was quarreling?  
 Syr: Tony and [stops].  
 Linda: Tony and?  
 S's: Harry!  
 Linda: Harry!  
 S: Are they not good friends?  
 Chorus: No, they aren't!  
 Linda: Why do you think they aren't good friends?  
 Odinn: Don't you think they can be good friends although they quarrel a little?!

Many girls, but especially the Valkyries, had something to say on this and they overspoke Odinn. "Friendship" turned out to be the theme of this lesson. Note how the topic was brought up by a student because of the stone throwing incident. Linda brought this theme to focus at once, but she had no formal preparation from our meetings to discuss this issue as "friendship" is not dealt with until in chapter fourteen in the teaching manual.

They kept right on:

Linda: -- Is that what you were saying?  
 Odinn: Do you think they cannot be good friends although they quarrel?  
 Linda: What do the rest of you think of this, do you think they cannot be good friends although they quarrel?

S's: [They debate and I pick up comments such as: "He'd be an idiot--"  
"It is possible that --"]

Linda: Let's stick to the rule: One and one person talks at a time, raise your hands to speak! You are the next one, please go ahead!

Girl: Harry didn't want Tony to interfere -

Linda: Do you think that Harry wanted to have the honor for himself?  
That he doesn't want Tony to interfere?

Girl: ---

Linda: Is that for quite sure? What do the rest of you think? Go ahead, please !

Girl: It showed before that they aren't friends!

Linda: You claim it showed before that they are not friends! Do you agree on this?

Hrist: Good friends quarrel!

S: Yes, and good friends -- [Hodur and Hrist break into the discourse to quarrel a little. Hodur's point is that Harry didn't see for sure who threw the stone at him.]

Linda: Exactly, he did not see who it was, but still his first thought was that it had been Tony!

S: Yes, but if it had been Tony then --/

S: ARE YOU SURE? [Loud and decisive.]

Syr: He said: "I think it was Tony!" You don't know what Tony looks like! Perhaps he (Harry) knows!

Thor: He didn't see who it was!

Saga: No, then it could just as well be Tony because --

Chorus: Yes, yes!

Syr: I think it been (sic!) Tony ---

Hodur: --- [If they had been friends then they wouldn't throw stones at one another.]

S: They weren't friends!

Odinn: ---

Freyja: -- They wouldn't be friends if he (Harry) thinks he (Tony) threw the stone!

Linda: What do the rest of you think of this?

Thor: They weren't friends and --/

S: What do you know about that?!

Thor: That is the way I want to have it!

S: Friends can be --

Odinn: That is just the way you want to have it --! [His voice was weak and it was like he was making fun at Thor's "reason."]

S: Like when Frigg enters a bad mood --

Hrund: Like when Hrist enters a bad mood then we just have totally horrible fights!

Hrist: We break my - (bed) and -- [Here she spoke modestly and in a low voice.]

Linda: So, some think it is possible that friends throw stones at one another? /

S: No!

Linda: Others think that if one throws a stone at someone then the two are not friends. Is that correct?

At this point many students debate simultaneously, Odinn is loud among them. In this discussion it can be seen that the proportion of student-

to-student interchanges is on the rise compared to the teacher-student-teacher pattern. Instead of continuously trying to get off the ground, through the teacher-student-teacher pattern, Linda's entries are now far apart. She reminds the kids of procedures, asks them for clarifications and puts driving questions or comments to them.

Linda: Please try to talk one and one person at a time!

Syr: I say they weren't friends!

S: I say they were friends! [Some agree and it sparks a short debate on friends and enemies.]

Syr: -- He must of course recognize Tony and that's why I think it been (sic!) Tony.

Hodur: He saw him run away --- [and he has just seen the back of his head.]

Odinn: Do you think you can recognize anyone just from seeing the back of the head?

S: Linda, listen! Linda!

Gna: I can recognize you from the back of your head! It's no big deal!

Linda: Look, kids, it says in the book that he saw someone run away but that he could not see for sure who it was!

Odinn: -- No! --

---[Debates.]

S: But why did you say they could have been enemies?

S: Why did you then say it could have been Tony? ---

S: Then I can just claim they were enemies and you can (claim they were friends!) [Students talk simultaneously.]

Linda: Wait! What were you saying?

Hlin: -- Tony wasn't Harry's friend --

Linda: Do you mean that Harry didn't want to bother about things?

Hlin: -- ["Yes" or "no," I guess.]

Linda: Go ahead, please! Go ahead, please!

Gna: Look, if Harry --/

Odinn: How messed up people can be!! --

Linda: Aha, [responding to Gna] you are trying to say that if he had been his friend then he (Harry) would not believe he (Tony) did it?

Hrist: It is impossible to talk about that! Because either one of them is not going to give up until they are right!

Odinn: ---

Hrist: That's impossible! Then this will just go on and on and on and become dead boring! [Infinite regress!]

Linda: Do you agree with what Hrist is saying now?

S's: Yes! No!

Hrist: --- [On being right and being wrong.]

Linda: What can we do about it?

At this point the class wobbles on it's track for like a couple of minutes. Linda comments that she hopes that as grownups they will discuss things without having to fight them out. Then she brings the

class back to the point above. Note how working on the blackboard helps the class to come to grips with the suggested activities of friendship.

Linda: ....But let's try a little to find out, should we just try to find out: What do friends do and what do enemies do? [Writes on board.]

Should we do it in an organized manner and -- What do friends do?

S: Yes, friends --

Odinn: They struggle, fight, quarrel!

Hodur: Struggle and quarrel!

[Linda keeps a record of the suggestions on the board and the students make more suggestions.]

Linda: Do you agree with this?

Chorus: NO!

S: Yes!

S: No this should be on the other side! [Linda had written two columns on the board, one for friends and one for enemies.]

Hrist: No! Enemies struggle! ---

Linda: So, friends can quarrel?

[Some agree and the noise increases in the classroom.]

Linda: Will the others please listen to the ones that are speaking! ---

S: Then it must be a pretend-fight! (If friends are fighting.)

Hrist: Yes, but enemies just FIGHT, just fight like CRAZY!

Syr: Like if you (Linda) and your husband were coming from the supermarket, then she'd be walking, and you pick up a stone and [here she imitates throwing and there is a general laughter] you throw it at his head, - then you'd be enemies!

Linda: Do you think we would be enemies for sure?

Chorus: Yes! ---

Hildur: My sister and Rosy are the best of friends and they always hang out together. But then they have their fights, and Rosy, they fight every day, and Rosy always comes to her and says: "Shouldn't we just be friends?" And then, now they haven't made it even for a few days!

In the beginning of this piece above the students respond to Linda's question, "What do friends do and what do enemies do?" by enumerating activities. Hildur's last comment is a nice move from activities to criteria of a friendship. Linda helps the class to work further on this interesting idea.

Linda: But is it perhaps, they have not made it even for a few days, but do you think they will even it out?

Hildur: No!

Linda: Are you quite sure?

Hrist: But, look, enemies, the others fight but enemies just fight like CRAZY!

Linda: But can there be a difference in what happens afterwards? That, if we are friends and we start fighting, is there more of a chance that we will even it out afterwards than if we were enemies and we would start to fight?



Chorus: Yes!

Frigg: Yes, -- but enemies just shriek --

Linda: That that could perhaps be the difference between friends and enemies? That we fight with our friends and even it out afterwards, but it is not for sure that we will even it out with our enemies? Am I understanding this correctly?

Chorus: Yes!

S: Enemies don't even it out!

Linda: (You mean) That enemies do not even things out?

S: Yes, but they sure could!

Linda: They can even things out?

S: Yes they can!

S: If they want to!

S: Yes, they can if they want to!

Linda: But then haven't they perhaps become friends?

S's: Yes they have!

S: Yes, it could be!

Linda: Is there anything else that marks friends and enemies apart?

Syr: If some sisters, you know, fight or something like that, then it doesn't mean that one of them should then be made to leave the house for good! Then they would become friends, if you know ---

S: If it would be like that at my house then nobody would be left!

[General laughter.]

Linda: Go ahead, please!

Gna: One does something (a favor) for one's friends!

Linda: One does something for one's friends --

Gna: Yes, but not for one's enemies!

In direct response to Linda's questioning Gna presents an "exchange" criteria of friendship: friends do favors to one another.

Linda: One does something for one's friends, but not for one's enemies! Do you agree with what Gna is saying?

S: Yes!

Linda: Something means something! [She must be responding or repeating something which the recorder didn't pick up.] Go ahead, please!

Frigg: Well, those guys Gudmundur J. and Albert they were such enemies this spring and /

Odinn: This fall!

Linda: What can that (case) tell us about this?

Hodur: They were just friends having a fight!

-----

\* Gudmundur J. is a left wing politician and foreman in a working union. Albert is a right wing politician and a business man. Their friendship has lasted many years and across politics. But recently their names were associated with a financial scandal and bankruptcy of a ship transporting company. Among other things it was discovered in public investigation of the case that Albert had arranged for some money from the company to be paid to Gudmundur so he could take a vacation in Florida because of his poor health at the time. Gudmundur claims he did not know where the money really came from and that he would never have accepted it if he had known the truth. Also, there is an inconsistency in amounts talked about, Gudmundur claims having received a lower sum than books of the company show.

Odinn: Are you sure they were friends?

S': No, they were friends!--

Odinn: You believe everything it says in the paper! Do you think they cannot have been lying?

Girl: Yes, they lie all the time!

Odinn: They lie such a lot of things that it just! [Stops.]

Linda: Yes, I think it is correct what has been in the papers that they gave one another a hug and when asked whether they had left this (conflict) behind them they said "yes!" (Notes, pp. 231-239).

Next Linda asked for more things that friends do for one another. The first suggestion was that friends "strangle" friends. This was a joke and arouse general laughter. "Helping," and "standing by" were the next suggestions. Linda forwarded the discussion by taking an example of smoking: What should one do if a friend starts to smoke? The kids got heated on this issue. Among the points expressed was that smoking was just "one's own business" having nothing to do with friendship. Odinn suggested it had more to do with "being independent." Hodur claimed that the question was really whether the smoker himself wanted to smoke or not. Frigg agreed with Linda that one should tell a friend if one has a different opinion on smoking than he or she does, but then Frigg added that after telling it should be up to the smoker to decide whether she would keep on smoking or not. Linda took the case to extremes by including drugs in the discussion. Odinn protested and claimed that doing drugs is totally different from tobacco smoking. Frigg and Syr pointed out that smokers have a shorter life expectancy than non-smokers. That seemed to trigger Var to comment that she had known a woman that would have lost both legs if not being willing to quit smoking. Odinn found that hard to believe, but others did believe it. By this time the class was over and Linda thanked the class for amusing discussions.

At our Thursday meeting Linda was of course very pleased with this lesson, it was a personal up for her. However, the success was a surprise to her as she had spent less time than usual for preparation.

Her teaching plan centered around working on the overhead, but as the lesson evolved she decided not to use the transparencies she had copied. The students' first reactions after the reading were disappointing, for sure, but all the same "friendship" as a topic was brought up by them and that was the key to a successful lesson in Linda's opinion.

This lesson was also an up in terms of using dialogue as a teaching method and Linda succeeded in operationalizing the content although she had no sheetwork exercises to rely on. Linda's success has also to be partly explained, I think, by a change in her questioning. In this lesson she digged under the surface with questions such as: "So, friends can quarrel? Do you think we would be enemies for sure? Are you quite sure? But can there be a difference in ...?" But in the lesson before, the 14th lesson, she had tended to be repetitious in her questioning.

However, Linda seemed to have been unaware of her own improvement; it was as if only the kids had made this lesson a successful one. The students' interest is an essential part of any explanation for the success, but Linda had commented early in our Thursday meeting that the transcripts of earlier lessons were invaluable to her and that reading them had helped her to make an account of herself. An account that must have helped improve her questioning.

Helga gave the 15th philosophy lesson to her students later that Tuesday morning. The class read the last part of chapter four which ends by Harry's perceptual inference that it was Tony that threw a stone at him. This incident aroused excitement in Helga's class, (contrary to Linda's class earlier the same morning,) but the kids were extremely unruly and the atmosphere was like in amidst of a cloud of birds. The students were on task, or at least they started on task by speculating on who threw the stone, but soon their suggestions became far reached.

Thomas suggested that the teacher, Mr. Spence, had arranged for having someone to throw the stone at Harry. Sophie maintained that Tony had done it because he wanted to do math in math lessons but not Harry's logic. Later she concluded that if it would be any other way, i.e. if it was not Tony who threw the stone, the novel would be most boring!

Helga's line of questioning seemed to be good, she asked frequently for reasons and she tried to clarify the issues by asking for repetitions and by using phrases such as: "That is to say... You are saying that... You mean to say that..." But her efforts showed no immediate success as listening and respect was minimal among the students. After having struggled unsuccessfully for quite some time on trying to get the discussion on the stone-incident off the ground, Helga moved to an exercise on perceptual inferences (Philosophical Inquiry, pp. 99-100). But the atmosphere did not change for the better.

Given the negative atmosphere I must admit that I admired Helga's persistence in sticking to the lesson and the topics. For example, she took the lesson into the next period and when students claimed the period to be over she reminded them that it was really up to her to decide when to shift between subjects.

Helga was disappointed with her progress. She said the kids had irritated her a lot in this lesson. She thought the kids were going too far in their behavior; this referred not only to the philosophy lessons. It was not to ease the teaching that her baby son had been ill with mumps, which means, among other things, less sleeping time during nights. I offered to teach the next lesson in place of her, but that she denied.

There were no classes on Wednesday as the 6th grade had a nation wide preview regarding a coordinated state examination.

I was a little late to Helga's 16th lesson which she gave after the

coffee break on Thursday morning and my recorder was not working. In this period she had the class work an exercise on inference from chapter three (p. 51 in Philosophical Inquiry). On a transparency she had written three categories: Good reasons; Not very good reason; and Not a reason. The students sat in their regular groups and each group had two examples to discuss and then to report on to the whole class. This turned out to be a fine lesson, close to Helga's regular teaching style. The students were involved in their groups and shared comments on the reports to the whole class. Ari claimed, for instance, that item e (Where Mitzi said he would not elect Mike Gordon for a class president because "He doesn't wait for the crowd to tell him how to think. He thinks for himself.") would be a "Good reason" not to choose Mike as a class president, indicating that a class president should not think independently of others.

Tab pointed out that the class president needed to be both independent and dependent in thinking. To this Sophie added that to think for oneself didn't mean that he had to be selfish (as was implied in Ari's point), that those were two completely different things and that a good class president would need to think independently. Leona added that a class president would need to think independently in order to be good.

At our next Monday meeting Helga showed great surprise over her success in this lesson. I noted that the lesson had been an example of how an exercise could lead to a discussion and Helga's response was: "Yes, it REALLY did! I mean, did you notice, the students talked TOGETHER!" (Notes, p. 274). Later at the meeting she made a similar remark: "I just can't remember that they have discussed some issues in such a way, the discussion just took care of itself. I just said; 'The next one please!'" (Notes, p. 276).

I like to believe that our efforts were starting to pay off. For sure, this lesson was different from most the other lessons because there was neither reading nor an attempt to create an agenda. But the exercise did lead to a general discussion which Helga enjoyed and the lesson was an up in all respects.

Linda's 16th lesson on Friday morning started by Hrist's complaint that the boys had hidden her pen-case. Linda asked the boys. Thor answered that he had not participated in "this." Hodur said that he was not the one who took it. In a short while Loki admitted having laid his hands on the case. Linda thanked him, exclaiming she esteemed his admittance greatly. Now Thor admitted having thrown the case to Hodur, but it was not cleared where Hodur had put it. The boys agreed they would find the pen-case in the next break. Linda did ask them why their answers were inconsistent, but received no answers.

When this had been taken care of Linda distributed an exercise she had made from a Standardization Chart in the manual.\* The exercise had eight ordinary language sentences and the five possible ways of standardization in a separate column. The students' task was to connect the ordinary sentences with a line to the correct standardization. Linda walked around the room to assist individuals and groups. The kids worked fiercely and most, if not all of them, were involved. I especially noted Odinn's and Freyja's participation. When the groups were done working on the exercise, the whole class went over it.

When it came to the third sentence: "Many 12-year-olds are students" Hlin wanted to use both "Some 12-year-olds are students" and "Some 12-year-olds are not students." The class was open to this suggestion, but

\* Linda worked from page 94 in Philosophical Inquiry and in her version "A" meant: All \_\_\_\_ are \_\_\_\_; B: No \_\_\_\_ are \_\_\_\_; C: Some \_\_\_\_ are \_\_\_\_, and Some \_\_\_\_ are not \_\_\_\_; D: Some \_\_\_\_ are \_\_\_\_.

confused and as Linda was undecided in how to work it out I decided to step in:

Me: Can I ask one question?

Linda: Please do!

Me: What if I claim for example: "Many houses in Greenland are black?"

S: This is the same --

Me: Is it not comparable? /

Loki: It doesn't have to be! Some of them can be green!

Linda: One and one person at a time!

Loki: Some have a different color!

Me: Can I then say; if I say this: "Many houses in Greenland are black," can you then say: "Some houses in Greenland are not black!?"

Chorus: Yes we do, oh yes! [Among others I hear Loki and Hildur.]

Girl: No! [Weak voice!]

Frigg: It should rather be: "Few houses in Greenland are not (black)."

Me: Now, we are trying to work with these three words, isn't that so:

All, No and Some! And we're trying to translate over to their form and I'm saying: "Many houses in Greenland are black!" And you're saying, you can claim from that, that: "Some houses in Greenland are black!" You also claim you can say from that: "Some houses in Greenland are not black!"

Chorus: Yes, yes we can!

Girl: Yes, it is possible!

Gna: "Many" houses, does that mean "some"?

Me: Ok, then we can say: "Some houses are black!" Is it not so? But what about the others? Can we say something about them?

S: Yes! Yes! -

S: Yes, they aren't black!

Me: So it isn't possible that all houses in Greenland are black?

Chorus: NO!

Me: Not possible? [Pause.] I don't know what we should do!

S: ---

During my pause the kids were quiet and they could almost be heard twisting their brains! Most likely I surprised the kids by implicitly asking for their help through announcing that I did not know what to do. It seems that the boys suspected me of playing phony, as they sensed that I had a "correct" answer in mind. But knowing the correct answer is no answer to how to conduct one's teaching. My problem was that I could not get the kids to "see" the correct answer. It may be added that the discussion in this lesson was convergent in nature as the "correct" answers were being searched for.

Me: [You mean] that both options are true?

S: Yes!

Me: That is to say /

Loki: What do you think?

Odinn: Can I ask you one thing: What is [the] correct [answer]?

Loki: What is correct?

Me: What is correct?

Boy: Yes!

Me: I think when I say something like this: "Many are something [here Linda can be heard to quite the kids down. We have complete silence, but it takes me some time to think out an example. The kids stay silent]. "Many sheets of paper are white," I don't think I'm claiming anything about the color of other sheets!

Hrist: YES, you are!

Me: Am I!?

Chorus: Yes you are!

Loki: You're saying that -/

Sjofn (or perhaps Hrist): Many girls in here have long hair but it doesn't mean that they all have long hair!

Me: Many girls have long hair! Ok, I'm not saying that all the girls have long hair /

Loki: ---

Me: Yes, but now we are playing with sentences but not with what we'll do! [This was a response to Loki's suggestion to give the girls a short haircut!] Freyja!

Freyja: It says exactly that -- [many girls have short hair but not all!]

Me: Does it say that?

Hrist: Yes it says!

Freyja: If they all had long hair then you'd say: All the girls are long-haired!

Me: But couldn't they...perhaps I don't know for sure, let's say that I come to a class one morning and that some are absent. Three girls are missing, but I see that all the girls that are present have long hair. Later I go to the teacher's lounge and someone asks me: "What hairstyle do the girls have in your class?" I say: "Many of them are long-haired!" [Pause.] Is that the same as /

Hrist: Then you're saying that some of them are long-haired! /

Me: Ok, we are in agreement on that point! We ABSOLUTELY agree that I'm saying that some of them are long-haired! But what about the rest? Am I saying something about them?

Chorus: No!

Hrist: No, but you are HINTING at it! You're hinting that they are NOT long-haired!

S: We have also seen them!

Linda: Can he say that the others are not long-haired as he hasn't seen them?

S: No, it can very well be that they are long-haired too!

Linda: Can he say that some of them are not long-haired? Can he say that some of them are not long-haired?

Loki: Yes, but we were talking about - [many kids].

Me: But is it analogous? /

Linda: It's the same example Loki!

Frigg: It's just the same as "most of the girls are long-haired!"

Me: I said: "Many of them are long-haired!"

Frigg: Many, yes. And then - the others can be either, the three missing



ones, one can be short-haired and two can be long-haired!, but still, many of them are long-haired!

Me: Quiet right! We agree on that! We're saying: "Some are long-haired," but the question is whether I'm hinting that some of them are NOT long-haired? That's the question!

Frigg: -- Many are, but not all!

Linda: But can we hint at something about the ones that are not present?

Chorus: No!

Me: -- [Many students talk simultaneously.]

Hrist: Either we say --- [Thor and more students talk.]

Me: But how is this? Look, let's take another example! Sorry for the interruption! If I say: We have the same situation, I go to the class and I look at the girls and then I go to the teacher's lounge. Notice that I'm not saying anything about the hairstyle, but when I'm asked about it in the lounge, I answer: "Almost all of them are long-haired!"

Hrist: Then ---

Me: But what am I hinting at then? This [the example] is a little different now. Earlier I said MANY now I'm saying ALMOST ALL!?

[Loud debates, Loki and Odinn are heard.]

Me: Remember that we are trying to play with these three words: All, no and some!

Thor: Then there are some that are not long-haired! ....

It took a few minutes to settle the dispute and the class kept on struggling to find the correct answer without me interrupting them.

Linda moved on and created an example of "many kids are wearing blue sweaters," and the question was whether that meant that "some kids are not wearing blue sweaters." The class debated and they had a hard time in distinguishing between thought and reality. They knew it would be unlikely that a whole class would be wearing sweaters the same color, so they wanted "many kids are wearing blue sweaters" to imply that "some kids were not wearing blue sweaters."

I decided to step in again:

Me: But kids, notice that we are not talking about what is the case everyday, we're all wearing different sweaters, we're talking about how this COULD BE! It could be that each and every one in here owns a blue sweater and for some stupid coincidence it would be POSSIBLE that we would all put on a blue sweater tomorrow morning!

S: ---

S: But why are there (sometimes) two answers?! --

Me: There are two answers because, when we translate ordinary sentence to this language [someone tries to quiet the class down with an "SSSH"], kids, in one case there are two answers because sometimes when we translate to ordinary language. I'm sorry, now I start all

over again: Sometimes when we translate from ordinary language to the language of logic then, then sometimes the sentences cannot have the same meaning unless we use both "some are" and "some are not." Sometimes the meaning stays the same when we say "All\_\_\_ are\_\_\_" it stays, that is to say, in that case it always stays the same, it also stays the same when we can use "No\_\_\_are\_\_\_" The meaning stays the same (in these cases). But sometimes the sentences are such that, for example when I say: "Almost all the girls are\_\_\_" then I'm hinting that the rest of them are different. So in translation I have to use both "some are" and "some are not." - But when I say "many" I'm not saying anything about the rest!

Linda: Do we agree that it is "D"?

Chorus: YES!

S: No!

--- [Debates.]

Loki: "D" is the correct one!

S: It doesn't make any difference!

Linda: It's the correct one but it doesn't make a difference because we're not in a competition like I have told you before!

Me: Perhaps there is one way out of this!

Odinn: There are many ways out of this!

Thor: There is no way out of this!

Me: Yes there is! There are always ways out!

S: Ok, what is it supposed to be?

Me: Look, it depends on how we understand "many." I think that an official understanding of this, if you would call the Word-book or something like that, then they would give us this official understanding: a definition saying that "many" doesn't give a hint about the others we are not talking about. But then they would say: In different regions there is a tradition of using this word in this or that way and in this case it is used like they are talking about "almost all." But that is not our official understanding! We cannot accept that usage here at the Word-book!

S: Ok ---

Our issue may seem of small importance, "many," "some" and "almost all!" What is the big deal?! The big deal is that if we want to reason in language, we are not free to give words that stand for logical relations meanings as we speak.

Linda: Should we try the next sentence?

Me: Hrist has something to say!

Linda: Hrist!

Hrist: -- (If we are going to a discotheque, and almost all are going, and my mother asks me:) Who are not going? Then it is a hint that not all are going!

Me: But did you notice what (words) you used?! You said "almost all are going to the discotheque!" And you didn't say, you didn't say: "There are many kids going to the discotheque!"

-----

\* The "Word-book" is an institution at the University of Iceland, meant to keep a record of all Icelandic words and their different usage.

Hrist: Ok -- then many are going --

Hlin: - Some are not going.

S: You're saying the same; Some are not going!

In a while Linda brings us back to the exercise by asking how the class had standardized "Very few 12-year-olds are students." All groups except the boys classified it as "Some are and Some are not." But the boys must have realized their mistake as they were quick, under Loki's lead, to change their answer to that form.

The next few sentences did not give the class any problems, but then it came to the sentence: "Almost no 12-year-olds are students."

Freyja: It must be C like before! -- ("Some are and Some are not.")

Linda: Loki, what do you think?

Loki: "Almost no 12-year-olds are students" means that some 12-year-olds are students!

Girl: It also means that some 12-year-olds are not students!

Linda: -- But what about the rest? What about the rest?

Loki: Are you asking me?

Linda: Yes, if some 12-year-olds are students, what then about the rest, Loki?

Loki: They are not students!

Linda: Then you're saying it is C, - isn't that so? Some are and Some are not?

Odinn: Yes, it was C, wasn't it?

Now it comes to the last sentence "A number of 12-year olds are students" and soon there seems to be a general agreement that it should (correctly) be standardized as D, i.e. as "Some are," but at least Loki is confused:

S: Loki, what did you say?

Loki: Well, we tipped on D but that's not correct!

Linda: You tipped on D but do you think that's incorrect?

Thor: It doesn't matter!

Loki: I think it's C!

Linda: You think it is C! -- Freyja, what do you think of what Loki is saying?

Freyja: ---

Linda: She says this is the same as "many" one does not know about the rest! -- What about the rest boys, is it logical? Boys? Give me a quick explanation before we finish!

Loki: Nah, --- [Mumble, no clear answer.]

Thor: We have yet to think it over! [Some girls can be heard to crow over the boys doubtfulness.]

Linda: You have yet to think it over? Is it not true that it is D?

Loki: Yes, oh yes! It is D! Yes it is! But we tipped on that to begin with and then you (Linda) were nagging something!

Linda: Yes, you said you had tipped on it, but you were not sure about it. I just wanted to know whether you had become certain of it.

Thank you all, the lesson is over! (Notes, pp. 260-272.)

This lesson was a surprise to Linda, I am pretty sure she had expected "ordinary" work on exercises as she had prepared a transparency presentation to her pupils. But like with Helga's 16th lessons the exercises now lead into a discussion. This lesson shows that the dialogue is not only a means to increase listening and respect in the classroom, but that reasoning skills can also be trained through it. Linda enjoyed this lesson and it must be considered an up in all accounts.

#### Reflections on week six

This was certainly a week of forward movement in both of Linda's lessons as well as in Helga's 16th lesson despite lack of technical arrangements that I have stressed in former reflections: There was no agenda on the board in either classroom. Linda assigned the reading turns to her students in the 15th lesson and in her 16th lesson they sat in their ordinary groups without reading. In Helga's 16th lesson, the successful one, her students sat in their regular groups, but in the unsuccessful one the students sat in a circle. Obviously the presence or the absence of these components does not guarantee "good" or "bad" lessons. Still it is equally as obvious that the presence of circle, automatic reading turns, and agenda brings both advantages to teaching (the agenda should motivate students as it is supposed to be "their's"), as well as to general interactions because they express democratic procedures.

Week seven: Helga's class takes off

Early at our Monday meeting Linda suggested that we would cut the philosophy lessons down to two lessons per group every week. That suggestion was admitted at once, I did not even ask for reasons as I knew Helga and Linda had both given the project more time than they had expected it would need.

Linda was pleasantly surprised at this meeting with both of her lessons from last week and Helga was really surprised because of her 16th lesson. I pointed out that in both of their last lessons the students had been in their regular groups but I stressed that a circle or a horseshoe is the best arrangement as it allows everyone to see one another and thus it helps create social togetherness. Linda thought the kids had become prejudiced against sitting in a circle and her suggestion was to use both arrangements in the hope they will gradually learn to appreciate the circle. Helga thought the kids were not feeling well enough when sitting in a circle, that they were getting more and more conscious of themselves and didn't like to be physically so close to one another. She also pointed out that the kids are getting more and more sensitive to what other kids think of them, so they ask themselves: Are their jeans nice enough? Are their socks in line with their outfit?

Helga told us of a positive transfer from the 16th lesson to interactions in the next lesson which was on biology. They were struggling on who should work together on a task she had assigned to the class when Agatha compared someone's behavior with an example of stubbornness they had discussed in philosophy. This comment helped settling the struggle, Helga said (Notes, p. 282).

In preparing for chapter five I suggested that they should take the time needed to create an agenda building on the students' responses to

the chapter. Linda thought that this was an unrealistic suggestion as up till now the students had shown "NO" interests after reading from the novel she found it highly improbable that any students would respond to chapter five in such a way that a discussion could be based on it. Still, it is worth trying, she admitted. I expressed my surprise over how we had just flunked on this point. But then Helga entered the conversation and claimed that it did not ring true in her experience that the kids did not respond positively to the novel. She suggested that our problem concerned creating an "atmosphere" such that discussions could be carried out. This comment made Linda take a second look at the case and she qualified her position by pointing out that it is only after negative reactions that something positive would be brought up. She wondered aloud: "It is just like this is an order from above: This is the way that everyone is supposed to react!" (Notes, p. 285). This was my experience too, but I am unable to come up with any simple explanation on why this came to be the dominant response; I just know it has to do with social habits that operated at the site.

Linda gave her 17th lesson in first period Tuesday. The lesson started by reading from the beginning of chapter five. Linda stopped each reader by thanking him or her and appointing the next one, thus twelve students read twenty three paragraphs (pp. 21-22). Among the names not included in the list of readers are: Hrist, Hrund, Syr, Gna, Horn, Odinn and of course Thor.

When the reading was done Hrist and Hildur complain that they want to read more. When that issue was settled Linda started the lesson along lines I had suggested the day before, I had still been thinking of ways that would make the students take an external view on themselves. This is how it went:

Linda: Imagine now that you have been in exile on a far away island and the only book you had to read was this one and you just read this chapter. /

Thor: I would just not read it! [More students agree to this remark, including Hrist and Odinn.]

Linda: Will you please allow me to finish before you start speaking! Let's assume you are coming from that exile and this was the only book you had with you and yesterday you read chapter five and today you are free from the exile. You haven't said a word for many, many days! What would you now like to talk about from chapter five, from this piece of it that we just read?

[Some mumble.]

Linda: We assume that we read it! Let's not get stuck on whether we want to read it or not!....One and one person at a time!

Frigg: If one is coming from an inhabited island - then one doesn't begin by announcing what one was reading -!

Linda: But anyway, let's assume you were going to tell us of what you had been reading! Should we give us that (assumption)?

S: I mean, what for?

Odinn: What is so important about that chapter? ---

Linda: But then let's assume that you are to be in a control of a talk show on TV about this chapter!

[Some laugh!]

Odinn: I'd quit (the job)!

S: I'd not show up!

Linda: What would you talk about? People on TV often need to run shows on something which is of no interest to them!

Hrist: I'd talk about how awfully stupid it is to have kids learning this (philosophy)!

Hildur: I don't understand why we're learning this!

Hrund: Look, one doesn't learn a thing! --

Girl: It's of no use to me!

Girl: Is there anything in it that we are supposed to remember!?

Linda: But what were the kids talking about in this chapter?

As Linda expected the reactions were certainly negative. Our philosophy lessons seem to be meaningless to the pupils as they do not "learn a thing," they have "no use" for it, and there is nothing "to remember!" Given the reactions it would be tempting to jump to the conclusion that it is not worthwhile to do philosophy with [these] kids! But that would be isolation of the kids' reactions from their social environment and the accompanying habits. Also, we must keep in mind that what is "worthwhile" refers to educational aims, but not only to present habits.

But now there was a time for a "positive" remark, Frigg made it in

response to Linda's question above:

Frigg: Just, they made the distinction between boring and fun lessons!

Linda: Yes!

Frigg: This one is boring! Danish is boring! Icelandic history is boring! -- [She continues to enumerate what bores her, but she cannot be heard.]

Odinn: This lesson is extremely boring! ---

Linda: Now we are all talking simultaneously! What did you say Freyja?

Freyja: Can't this boy (Mark in Harry) be left alone thinking that his lessons are boring?

Linda: Yes, of course he can be left alone, but can't it be that we also find them boring?

Hrund: I think Danish, social studies (i.e. philosophy), and Icelandic are just dead boring!

Linda: Should we (make a column of) ... boring lessons here / [Works on board.]

Odinn: Just write up all the subjects!

Linda: And of fun lessons here? [Some laugh.] ...

S: Yes!

S: Social studies!

Linda: Social studies (philosophy) are boring! Does everyone agree with that?

Chorus: Yes!

Linda: Can I see, raise your hands! [Someone laughs and then all the kids raise their hands.] Each and everyone!

Odinn: Man, this was dam cool!

Linda: Can I hear some reasons why? One and one person at a time! One and one person! One and one person speaks at a time! Go ahead please! (Notes, pp. 286-289.)

The kids enumerate their reasons: They are "always" conversing some dead boring sentences, they "just" talk and argue, they "learn nothing," they have no "use" for it. As the discussion is going nowhere, I raise my hand and then comment: "I think you should start to talk about it on a general level what it is that makes lessons boring or fun!" This gets positive reactions, but half under my breath I added: "Before I break down and start to cry over this whole thing!" I'm sure very few students heard this last part which slipped out of my mouth, but Loki did and he sent me a grinning look! When the lesson was over and I walked down the staircase he stood on top and waved to me.

Frigg pointed out that "interest" is a prerequisite to learning and it was also implied in her comment that interest is a prerequisite to fun.



Commenting on lessons in general Hrist put it succinctly: "If one has decided they are boring then they are boring!" (Notes, p. 291).

Good teachers and good curricula were also mentioned as prerequisites to lessons being fun. The seating arrangement was first mentioned when it came to enumeration of what it is boring about lessons. It took quite some time to find more reasons. Odinn finally found a route to more "reasons" when he responds "EVERYTHING!" (Notes, p. 294.) More students repeated this after him, including Hrist. Building on Hrist's earlier comment, it was Syr who brought more reflection to the matter:

Syr: - (It depends on) whether one wants to have them boring or not!

Whether one decides beforehand that they will be boring!

Linda: Aha, that is to say, it is our will that has a role to play?

Should we, can we put this into different words?

Hrist: If one has decided that a lesson will be boring, then it will be boring!

Linda: Aha!

Odinn: So what!?

Thor: Then you just decide --- (Notes, pp. 294-95).

Although the kids never explicitly stated that they had decided beforehand that philosophy would be boring, I suspect it may have been the case for some of them.

Next the discussion moved to what it is that makes a boring teacher and the reasons enumerated included: Bad mood, being stressed, being impatient, being disputed over, showing distrust, not showing consideration, too firm, too easy going. Linda closed the lesson by asking the kids whether they trusted themselves to meet all the requirements they had come up with towards teaching and teachers. Odinn had no doubt he could, but the others had mixed opinions on this.

In general I thought this lesson was too much of an enumeration of good and bad reasons, and too little investigation on why the reasons were good or bad and thus there was little depth to the inquiry. But it should also be noted that Linda was not working in a atmosphere

supportive of reflective inquiry.

Helga gave the 17th lesson to her students in a first period on Wednesday. I showed up early and many students were already in the classroom. Helga arrived in two or three minutes. While we waited for her I could not help listening to Sophie whispering loudly on how boring she finds social studies, alas philosophy. She and Salome sat on a pillow underneath the blackboard.

Trausti was the first one to take his chair in the horseshoe and Thomas, Tab and Titus followed right away. The reading worked out completely automatically except that Helga stopped them early on and asked Agatha to move closer into the circle. Another time she stopped to ask Buena to stop chatting and when it was Ari's turn in the second round she had to call on him as he was absent minded.

By mistake I had boiled three paragraphs into one unusually long paragraph of 22 lines in my translation. As Zophon started to read "all this," Sophie commented: "Poor Zophon!" Altogether they read three and a half page.

Helga: And there we stop today! [Pause and complete silence, no protests!] Well, what do you think of this?

Buena [in a very weak voice]: --- [It was fun!]

Helga: Why?

S: They were talking about different things. Now they talk about completely different things!

Buena [in a very weak voice]: They were talking about /

Angela: They were not talking about "All" and "No." [Here she pauses and Buena continues but too low for my recorder to pick it up. Then Angela continues and takes over again:] Look, yes they do, sometimes they talk about "all schools!"

Helga: Is there anything in particular that you would like more to talk about than something else from the chapter? Think about it and - I will write it up (on the board)! Something which you think we can discuss further!

Adelle: The point about the Martians!

This was the first suggestion and now they came one by one from the students and the blackboard soon looked like this:

1. The point about the Martians. (Adelle)
2. Little kids nursing. (Buena)
3. The school is awfully boring, the school is not awfully boring.  
(Louise)
4. Who can run the schools? (Agatha)
5. Some subjects are boring, others not. (Angela)
6. The small islander! (Leona)

Helga: Are you done, you think? Is there anything else that comes to your mind? [She pauses and students "chat" before she continues.] Now I want to ask you to give us a rather good silence! And try to remember to speak one and one person at a time. The first item on the board is the point about the Martians, what idea did you then have in mind, Adelle?

Adelle: Just how big they were! --

Helga: Why does that come, why does this example come up in the chapter?

Adelle: Because of what they were talking about --

Helga: You are most welcome to take another look at the chapter if you are not quite sure!

S: How did they know they were Martians?

Helga: Is there anyone that can help?

Logi [another student started to help out too]: This about the candies! You cannot say that all the candies in the bag are brown!

Angela: --

Sophie: You can if you can look through the bag!

Helga: But /

Logi: No, don't look -- [Directed to Sophie.]

Helga: But should we take a while to think about why it is needed to talk about Martians and candies?

Tab: --- [He has weak voice!]

Helga: Was that the original reason why they started to talk about it?

The class did a fine job in creating the agenda, but in the few interchanges above we see that their concentration fluctuates when it comes to discussing their ideas. Helga keeps them on track by constantly referring to the novel:

S: Helga! Helga! [Low noise.]

Helga: But do you remember what Mark said in the beginning of the chapter? [Students talk among themselves and Tab comes with an inaudible point.] Do you remember when Mark says, I am just going to recollect what was said in the chapter, the piece we read was rather long. Mark said:

-----  
\*Reference in original text is to: "But people are always jumping to conclusions. If people meet one Polish person, or one Italian person, or one Jewish, or one Black person, right away they jump to the conclusion that this is the way that all Polish people are, or all Black people, or all Italians, or Jews" (Harry, p. 22). In the Icelandic translation this passage refers to people from Asia, people from Greenland, and to inhabitants of Grímsey, a very small island to the north of Iceland with less than 100 inhabitants.

"There is not one [course] that's any good...They are all bad."  
 "Mark," said Maria, with just a note of annoyance in her voice,  
 "just because some courses are uninteresting to you, that doesn't  
 mean that they're all uninteresting."

"It doesn't mean it," answered Mark. "They just are" (Harry, p. 21).  
 And do you remember what his sister, Maria, then said? Does she  
 agree with him? Does Maria agree with Mark?

S: No!

Helga: Should we recollect that part also? She says that "if some  
 courses are uninteresting, then it must be that there are other  
 courses that are interesting." And now we are really up to the  
 examples about the candies and the Martians. What does Harry then  
 say? Do you remember? Does he agree /

Ari: No! Harry doesn't agree!

Helga: Harry does not agree! Why?

Ari: Because he says that you know that there are some courses that are  
 uninteresting but from that you cannot say whether all of them are  
 uninteresting. Also, you cannot prove from that that there are some  
 interesting courses!

Helga: And then he takes the bag of candies as an example, so we can  
 think of it as comparable! Sophie, what do you want to say?

Sophie: I don't think there is anything special about this, but look /

Ari: The point about the islanders is really the same one!

Helga: Yes, in what way?

Louise(?): This is really all the same stuff, [but with different words!]

Sophie: This is always the same!

Tab: If one hasn't seen them - then one thinks they are all the same.  
 [The class chats, Angela is clearly heard.]

Helga: Tab, what was it you wanted to say?

Tab: -- then one thinks -- (that they are all the same size!)

Helga: KIDS! It is a pity if someone is coming with, look, putting  
 comments forward, not to hear them! Will you please take it into  
 consideration ... [the class quiets down], those who are speaking,  
 would you please show them your consideration by being silent (while  
 they speak). That way you will not disturb the others!

S: -- farting! [This belonged to the chat discourse!]

Helga: Adelle brought up the first point concerning the Martians and we  
 are trying to discuss it with reference to that. And Tab, I want  
 (you) to repeat while the rest of you listen.

Tab: If one hasn't seen a Chinese person -- then one thinks they are all  
 the same.

Helga: All right! Is this comparable with Mark's courses?

Tab: Yes!

Helga: He says, how was the conversation?

Notice how Helga stops herself when she is just about to repeat the  
 conversation. So far the discussion has mainly centered on recollection  
 from the chapter, at this point it might have been a good idea to insert  
 an exercise to help the kids work on comparable examples with the ones  
 they have been discussing. But Helga makes a nice connection in her next

comment and pushes the discussion forward:

Tab: He says --- (that there are some(?) that are no good, and from that he says that all the others are no good too!)

Helga: From that he comes to a conclusion about the rest. So this is comparable with the examples of the islanders and the Chinese people. [Pause and now the class is completely silent.] But what do you have to say about, about this item here. It's really these (two, #3 and #4) here: Who can run the schools and who cannot?

Angela: I CAN!

Ari: You cannot run the schools. No dam way!

Helga: What does Mark think about this? He finds the school dead boring, doesn't he?

Chorus: Yes, he does!

S: He thinks that grownups are too much in control! Kids could run the schools --

S: Nah!

Helga: You (Ari), think that would not work out?

---[Debates.]

Helga: One at a time! BOYS! If we think this completely (through), -- [much noise] who should run the schools? I want to hear your opinions on that!

S: (Opinions) On what?

Helga: On who should run the schools!

Sophie: There is some know-how [needed] to do what they are doing!

Helga: But what do they need to have?

Sophie: They need to go to the College of Education and ---

Helga: But doesn't it matter, just if he (a teacher) has gone to the College of Education, doesn't it then matter (what he has)?

S: No, he has to -- [Helga reprimands the class with an "SSSH"] get license and things like that from the state!

Helga: Oh yes, the formal side!

S: Yes, and he has to be old enough to get the license --

Helga: Leona!

Leona: [She speaks very fast but her point is that if teachers first needs elementary and secondary school before entering the College of Education, then they will of course be old enough at graduation.]

Angela: I think that Buena --- [Chat.]

Helga: Should we perhaps just take a look at what Leona said? What did you say? What did you say again?

Leona: [Repeats her point from above.]

Helga: Your point is that a certain education is needed to run the schools? [S: ---] But do you think that's enough? What did the kids (in the novel) think of that?

Sophie: I mean --- (age does not matter.) [Noise takes over.]

Helga: Sophie do you perhaps want to give us further reasons for that? Why does that not matter?

Sophie: Because if -- some kid -- is perhaps a much better teacher than a grownup and then (only the grownup) is allowed to be a teacher, but not the kid who is perhaps much better!

Helga: Why is he better?

Sophie: Maybe he has more brains!

Logi: This is like the professor who was a 10 year old kid in a university!

Sophie: Yes, I feel so sorry for him!

Helga: What did you mean when you said he had more brains? Does he then have a special sort of education or -- [chat]?

Sophie: Yes, ---

Helga: You heard, did you hear Sophie's last point? [Chat for a while.] Did you hear Sophie's last point? Sophie, what did you say? Would you please repeat what you said for the ones who didn't hear it?

Sophie: Grownups perhaps, - they don't understand it as well (as kids do) that kids feel that all grownups are boring! They don't mind, all kids understand (it) -

Helga: Uuu, what do you think of what she said? [Directed to class.]

S: She said that kids -- have more brains /

Sophie: Yes, I said --

Helga: We're talking about sentences that very few heard, uu. Are you telling us, Sophie, that grownups do not understand kids as well (as kids do)?

Sophie: NO!

Helga: Not well enough?

Sophie: NO!

Angela: Not all do! ---

Sophie: If some kid -- maybe much better than a grownup --

Angela: Not a kid like that!

Tab: Yes, but it is a question --

Helga: I want to listen to Tab now! -- I didn't hear what he said!

Tab: --- [To much noise for the recorder to pick it up.]

Helga: Can we, Leona says that a grownup is needed. But how must this grownup person be? What virtues does it need to have? Agatha!

Agatha: She needs to be both intelligent and --, she needs to be rather firm.

Leona [An insert to Agatha's speech and a reprimand to her classmates:] Will you cut it out?!

Agatha [continues]: But not too firm. Then just --

Helga: Is there something that needs to be added to this?

Angela: Leona!

Helga: Buena!

Angela: Leona was for sure the first one (to raise her hand)!

It is noteworthy to see how frequent Helga's contributions are, usually she comes in every second to third turn. Her questions drive the students' thinking and she guides the students in their social interactions. But the kids are starting to monitor their classmates behavior; Leona has just reprimanded the whole class for not being silent enough while Agatha was speaking and now Angela just pointed out that Leona should have the next turn although Helga just called on Buena.

Buena: -- Understand the kids --

Helga: To understand the kids. That's rather important.

S: Yes! --

Leona: She could be like you (Helga and Linda) are!

Helga: Like we are! How are we?

Leona: Sometimes you understand us and sometimes you don't! She also needs to be firm!

S's: No, she doesn't!

S's: Yes, she does! ---

Helga: Thomas!

Thomas: ---

Sophie: I feel that you should be more considerate towards us when you have us draw into new groups! If we think someone is boring then we don't want to be in his group! (But) then we have to! I think that's not being considerate!

Helga: But, we have maybe moved up to the point that we are perhaps obliged to do what is best for you?

Chorus: Yes!

Sophie: It is not at all the best for us to sit with boring kids who -, then we just feel badly and that's not good at all!

Tab: --- [Then you must announce who the boring ones are! (Probably implying inconsiderateness.)]

Helga: But couldn't it be good for many of you (to draw in groups)?

Sophie: NO!

Ari: It can well be that one gets to know the kids better! --

Sophie: -- Boring --

Helga: But don't you think that we must sometimes move ahead and decide -

At this point Helga reprimands Louise, Cora, Adelle to be silent.

"You run over people over and over again and I can hear that many students do not like it!" Helga looks at her watch the and shows surprise when she learns that the lesson is just about over.

This lesson was a definite step in the right direction; the agenda was created smoothly and a whole group discussion followed on the agenda, item by item. Helga's contributions were frequent, as I noted, and her questions were good. For sure there were individuals, such as Louise, Cora and Adelle that did not have much to say and were disruptive at times because of their chatting, but Leona's and Angela's efforts to enforce silence and fair order in the class provided some counterbalance to that. Helga was quite happy with the lesson and it was an up in all accounts.

Linda gave her 18th lesson after the break that morning. The students finish their snacks and Linda is just about to start the lesson when Loki asked me why I wouldn't just teach them! (Notes, p. 309a.) I explained

to him that I was not supposed to be their teacher. When all were at their regular tables Linda announced that they would work on exercises very much like the one they did a week ago: "You get four statements and I want to ask you to discuss them thoroughly in your groups. You discuss them in details amongst you and each group tries to reach a conclusion" (Notes, p. 309).

Working on the exercise\* turned out well as all the students were kept busy and they seemed to enjoy having something "concrete" to work on. But their dominant position towards the exercise items was that they could not tell whether the inferences were poor or good.

Gna, Loki, Frigg and Hrund sat to the right in front of the room, close to the door to the hallway. On the same side but to the back were Hlin, Thor and Hildur. In the middle and to the front of the room were Odinn, Hodur, Horn and Syr. Also in the middle but towards the back were Hrist, Freyja and Gefn. Finally Saga, Var, Sjofn, and Fulla sat by the window to the front of the room. Odinn, Saga, Freyja, Hrist, Loki and Thor are among the ones that have something to say when the groups share their conclusions.

In terms of content and personal feeling this lesson was an up, but towards philosophical dialogue as a method of instruction it was indifferent. There was no exploration of reasons through general discussion but only individual work in groups on a exercise.

At our Thursday meeting we spent much time reading and discussing a draft of a letter to parents and their children that I had written because of a parental meeting in a week. Helga was naturally very pleased with her 17th lesson and I talked about it as an example we should try adjusting to. Linda was also pleased in the respect that she

-----

\* Inductive reasoning, Part I p. 112, in Philosophical Inquiry.



thought more and more students were starting to participate and also she noted they were starting to guard against one another's disruptive behavior. I agreed to the last point and then continued:

Me: ... Our next step needs to be, really there are so many next steps, but it is this idea that your burden will become lighter [i.e. not constantly having to ask questions that call for listening and attention]. That gives you more time to think and to stay on top of things, to think of good questions, if they [the kids] start to direct their questions to one another.

Helga: Exactly!

Linda: It takes so much energy [laughs] to keep it (disruptions) down!

Helga: Most of the energy goes into that and then there is little left for one's own thinking!

Linda: That's quite true and then I often lose direction [in the discussion].

Helga: I absolutely agree to that! Yes, I do think that I myself is somehow dragged along with it.

Me: But there are really three steps to this. The first step is to work on the discipline. The next step concerns the dialogue and it really depends for the most part on you. You ask most of the questions and usually every second or third interchange is yours. And, what I am saying is that now we need to push it further. We need to take the third step. [Where the community of inquiry becomes independent, where the teacher is more of a member than the one who controls the inquiry of others].

Helga: There are glimpses in the right direction here and there!

Me: Yes like in your discussion the other day! Do you remember --

Helga: Yes I do! I mean, they just did it themselves! It was only like after ten interchanges that I came in! They just pushed it around!

Me: But then, in relation to, naturally I encourage you to do what you think is best to do and I know we are not in total agreement on how to arrange this, that is to say how we arrange the classroom [and consequently the teaching], and the only thing that I can say ... is that I would do it otherwise myself. For example, I cannot understand your (Linda's) position toward (turntaking in) the reading. Did you (Helga) notice how automatic it was in your class. She never said a word ... it was just automatic and the reading was a continuous whole! (Notes, pp. 319-20).

This comment naturally put Linda in a defensive position and it was evident as often before that she just couldn't justify a situation to herself where one person, Thor, would always not read and be under unnecessary pressure. Helga supported my point and gradually Linda gave in on our position and concluded that she could try asking the kids to take their turns.

At this meeting Linda cited a conversation with Hrist's mother who

stated that Hrist talked about nothing but philosophy at home and that the lessons at school were fun!

In the 18th lesson Helga asked the kids to sit in their regular groups. She put a transparency with the agenda from the 17th lesson on the overhead and together they recollected what they had already discussed and what they had left to talk about. Ari was quite talkative and compared nursing and schooling: both things needs to be learned and therefore kids could not be in control of them. Other kids that had something to say included Leona, Agatha, Thomas, Tab, Titus and Sophie. Helga reviewed the example about the Martians and a discussion opened, but the recording of it is inaudible as there was noise in the classroom and the kids were scattered all over it.

Helga drew a time schedule on the board and she asked the kids to assume that it would be Mark's schedule. She pointed at the two periods in history and they assumed that Mark found them awfully boring. The kids took the topic to the right direction and they discussed whether it could be concluded that all history lessons are boring. They came to the agreement that it could not be concluded from Mark's example that all history lessons are boring and neither could it be concluded that all schools were boring. But in this relation Sophie stated: "All schools that I know of are boring!" (Notes, p. 326).

Helga used this opening as a springboard into an exercise on induction (Philosophical Inquiry p. 112). The kids worked on the exercise in their groups and Helga circled around the room to assist them. In approximately five minutes the groups shared their conclusions. The first item, on whether we can conclude that water boils everywhere at  $100^{\circ}$  C after having done so at three different places in the world, aroused debates. Among the students that expressed their opinions were:

Logi, Ari, Tab, Thomas, Leona, Sophie, Titus, Buena and Erla. The first suggestion was that we could not say whether the inference is good or poor, but after quite some time (three pages in the transcript) the class agreed that it would be a "Poor inference" to conclude that it would boil everywhere.

They were quick to decide that the second item was a poor inference, (I get sick when I eat raspberries, blueberries and blackberries. Therefore, any kind of food makes me sick.) Titus pointed out that berries is just one kind of food, but not fish, meat or something else. Ari announced that #3 is insane, (I always get hiccups when I see a mouse. I only get hiccups when I see a mouse. Therefore, the cause of my hiccups is my seeing a mouse.) but before it could be discussed the lesson was over.

#### Reflections on week seven

The classes departed here as Helga's classroom was in a rapid process of transformation into a community of inquiry. The point of departure came in the 17th lesson when Helga's class went right to work and created the agenda quite smoothly. The content of that lesson was a direct extension of the novel, but what was of most importance was how the class interacted. Helga needed for sure to stay on top of things, but the students were starting to show their acceptance of the social and intellectual responsibilities that a community of inquiry demands.

Linda's 17th lesson was mainly a whole group discussion but the topic and the attitude toward philosophy was negative. For example, the students' reluctance to create an agenda was quite explicit. Despite my advise Linda still considered it to be a part of her job to assign reading turns and reading amounts to her students.

Week eight: Spontaneity versus convention

Our Monday meeting was for the most part a general conversation about the project and we studied transcripts of discussions from last week. When I claimed Hrist had contradicted herself in the discussion on boredom, they said this was nothing new for her, that she often seemed to go in a circle on various issues.

Now Helga and Linda have changed the rules on drawing into groups. They eliminated an option that allowed two and two persons to stick together and they have calculated that in twenty weeks all persons should at some time have worked with everyone else in the classroom.

As a teacher at the College of Education Linda needed to do classroom observations of her students in this week and we had already decided that I would teach the two philosophy lessons in her place. Creating the circle in the beginning of the 19th lesson in her classroom worked out just fine, perhaps because Hrist was late and entered the room when the circle was already there. Thor was a little late too, he took his seat without having his book which he had lost, he claimed.

There was quite some excitement in the air as the kids did not know who would teach them today and I had no answer to that question except for this one lesson. After speculations on this were settled, I opened the lesson:

Me: I hope this lesson will be fun, I think we can work it out that way /

Thor: This will be a boring lesson!

Me: Wel-l-l, I don't know! /

Hrist: This will be a boring lesson as always!

Thor: It has already been decided!

Me: A boring lesson like ALWAYS, oh yeah! Well, we begin to read at page 31, no I'm sorry, at page 21. We will finish chapter five so we are reading a lot....I'm going to use the same method as the last time I was with you, each one of you reads one paragraph.

Freyja: That's so difficult! It's so difficult to follow the reading!

There is always a new and a new reader! /

[Some protest to Freyja, including Loki.]

Me: It will get better as we get trained at it! It should work out just

automatically! I shouldn't need to say a single word! It should just run by itself and those who are not paying attention or if they don't want to read they can just say "pass."

Hildur: But what if everyone says pass?

Me: Then I'll just read for you!

Hrund [giggles]: All right! (Notes, pp. 334-35.)

I asked Hrist to begin and she did. Some of the students did not yet know what a "paragraph" means and I had to cut in with a "Thanks!" to stop them from reading on. Overall the reading worked out well and the classroom was silent. Freyja said pass in her first round, I noticed that the boys had a short conference and when it was their turn they all said pass. In the second round Loki and Odinn read. Hodur started to, but stopped after a couple of words as he seemed to realize that he was doing something he had already decided not to do! Freyja read in the latter round and the Valkyries read in both rounds. Two and a half rounds were completed. After the reading I started:

Me: Well, kids /

Hrist: Let's finish chapter six! - /

Me: No, the reading is not the main point but the talking is /

Hrist: And that's the most boring part!

Me: And I would like to ask you whether there is anything /

Thor: No there is nothing important in this chapter!

Me: Nothing important! Did you decide in advance or /

Hrist: It's always the same!

S: There is one thing I want to talk about! [This I did not hear on the spot and it is weak on the recording. Noise increases.]

Me: Turn back (the pages). Let's take a second look! Let's start on page 21 and turn the pages over /

S's: NO!

Me: And check - /

Frigg: - (It's) stupid to learn to think in schools!

Me: Should we talk about that? [I write as a discussion item on the board!]

S: Stumpid! Stupid! Stumpid!

They read from board and an "n" with two curves is causing the trouble; (in Icelandic I wrote "asnalegt" and they read it "asmalegt"). Hrist uses the opportunity and comments that it is "Stumpid to learn!" Loki corrects her: "STUPID! Don't you know how to read?" A student starts to describe how one is supposed to write, but Hrist interrupts:

"He doesn't know how to write!" I point out what I had written, a student responds: "He writes like Mr. ..."

I try to move on with the lesson, but a quarrel opens on how people are to write letters. Loki defends me and points out that I use a "quick hand" style and that it shouldn't matter. Hodur supports him. The Valkyries quarrel back. I managed to quiet the kids by pointing it out sharply that:

Me: KIDS! I'm not taking a lesson from you on writing! There was another idea in the group about what we could perhaps talk about! We already have one idea, it's no problem to talk about it: It's stupid to learn to think in schools! Wasn't there another idea somewhere?

Thor: --

Me [after him]: What for are we in schools?

Thor: What for are we in schools if it is stupid to learn to think!

Me: Oh yes, that's what you mean! That's rather, that's a rather tricky one! [This is praise!] What for are we then in schools -- [write on board].

Hrund: Yes, tell me!

Hrist: Are you asserting that you're trying to knock something into our heads!? And that one never learns to think independently, that's what we're trying to knock into YOUR heads all the time in relation to this!

Me: What for are we then in schools? [Read from board.]

S: To learn!

S: Naturally to learn!

Loki: Naturally!? You don't want to learn nothing!

Syr: If one learns then one thinks --

S: It's a duty to go to school! (Notes, pp. 336-37.)

Despite a very difficult beginning we seemed all of a sudden to have plenty to talk about. However, I was unable to follow up on it and there was "no" help, cooperation or peace coming from the students and nothing much of a cooperative inquiry occurred. My follow up question, to the last point made above, did not zero in on duty as might have been beneficial, instead I asked: "What do you learn at school?" Naturally the students enumerated most of their subjects!

I tried moving in on Thor's point: Where are we to learn to think if not in schools? At that point we had a knock on the door and a sibling

brings a snack-bag that a student forgot at home that morning. Although unclear the answer to my last question was affirmative and I moved on to ask whether they have opportunities to think independently in other subjects and in the school in general. This opened loud debates, pro and con, among the kids. Loki stated that the philosophy lessons give them opportunities to think independently. Thor does it all the time, he said. Odinn is not used to ask anyone for permission to think independently.

Another debate opened when I asked whether it would be more important to go to school where one learns the answers or where one learns to ask questions. Hrist and Thor want answers, one student wants questions, and most want both. But I utterly failed to ask WHY? So the reasons for the suggested alternatives were not explored.

I brought up one of Harry's point in chapter five: "a lot of stuff taught in schools just can't be made interesting." On this the kids disagreed. Saga claimed that everything could be made interesting. Gna and more students gave examples of subjects they claimed theoretically impossible to make interesting and we come to a "solution" of all problems:

Me: But the question was really whether you knew of anything that would in theory be completely impossible to make interesting?  
 Hrist: Yes, --  
 Loki: It's impossible to make this interesting unless we get paid for it!  
 Hrist: Just disgustingly boring!  
 Me: But, ok, if one would pay you for it, if I would pay you a super wage, should we say like 13 dollars for every half an hour /  
 Thor: Then we'd just work here all day long!  
 Loki: Then we'd --  
 Odinn: Then one would get pleasure from one's work!  
 Loki: Five or ten dollars per sheet or something!  
 Me: So according to you boys, KIDS! Listen to this! We are finding a way to make the school interesting! /  
 Thor: (You mean) to pay us for doing this!? [Surprised.]  
 Me: According to Odinn and Loki we could get rid of all boredom in schools if we'd just pay salaries to students!  
 Girls: Oh yes! Yes (that would be possible)!

Me: It doesn't matter how dead boring they are, no matter how boring the teachers are, and no matter how boring the curricula is, (what is needed is) just to pay you and everything becomes interesting!?

Chorus: Yes!

Hodur: Just enough! [This probably means: It will be interesting if and only if you pay us enough! But what is "enough"?]

Me: Just enough? /

Syr: Yes, then, I think if this is the way it would be then one shouldn't get any money if one doesn't work anything!

S's: No, one shouldn't!

Me: So you want to consider productivity too?

Hrund: It [sic!] (they) would never learn!

Syr: Like if anyone would be stupid enough to let them have 25 dollars for nothing!

Hrist: One would just get a fixed amount for every sheet!

Me: What do you think of that boys, if you would get paid depending on how much you would work?

Odinn: Yes! Oh yeah! Cool!

Thor: Then one would of course work like crazy!

Loki: It would be a little --

S: It depends on --

Thor: Then one would of course work like crazy! [At this point Loki and his chair fall backwards to the floor for the second time during the lesson.]

S: Are you leaving the room? [Joke on Loki's account.]

Me: I think you [Loki] should move in closer to us. [Pause while he does and noise increases.] I kind of think you are telling me that this, that since this would solve all boredom /

S: No it doesn't!

Me: Just to get paid / [Gna is eating candy someone complains. I ignore it since I don't know the room's rules on that issue.] I'm going to, we have one minute left, I don't bother to stay longer!

Thor: Oh yeah! Just go home!

Me: I'm not going to bother fooling around here much longer (the period is over), but I think, wait a second! WAIT A SECOND!

S: Danish is next! [Screams follow like someone is being tortured.]

Me: You are telling me that since, that because you don't get paid for being here, then you you're on no salary now and you're getting nothing out of school!

S: Yes!

Me: That's exactly what you're saying!

Loki: But we get the money when we have finished learning!

Me: But why then don't you want to start right now? (Notes, pp. 345-47).

The period was over and the classroom was extremely noisy. I barely managed to thank for the lesson "although you caused me much disappointment," I told the class. I thanked them again, but Thor had the last words: "Yes, you just go home!"

First after I left the classroom I was indeed extremely disappointed. Later when I read the transcript of the lesson it was not as bad as it



felt when I left the classroom. We did talk together, but a lot of respect was missing, both to persons and ideas.

Helga gave the 19th lesson lesson to her students after the morning break that Tuesday. She began by writing two items that had been left to discuss from the last agenda. The horseshoe was formed without any protests and the reading shifts were automatic and continuous.

Helga: Chapter five is then over!

Sophie: Are we not to read any more?

S: Yes!

Sophie: We are stuck!

Helga: We are not reading more today!

[Some nag about how boring it is to talk "about it," they should read on, the kids claim.]

Sophie: There are 17 chapters (in Harry) and we are supposed to be done with them before Christmas!! [Much noise. Buena needs to stand up to get a paper towel to clean her glasses. The atmosphere is tense.]

Helga: Can I please have your attention! ALL of you! Buena! Erla and Doreen! You are included in "ALL!" - ALL of you, can I please have your attention! Girls, you too! -- Kids, before we read more, will you finish the discussion? -- KIDS! What I was going to say was that the last time we met here in the horseshoe you came with, it was fun being here, you brought up discussion points. I wrote them on the blackboard and (partly we finished), but there were two points left. Now I'm asking you: Is there something you want to add (to the agenda) from what we just read? (Something) more fun /

S's: Yes, oh yes!

Helga: Or more important than other things?

There is much unruliness among the kids but still they are eager to create the discussion agenda. Trausti suggest "the cloud," but no one hears except Torfi and Tab that sit by his side. Tab suggests "the Iceland"\* which is really the same idea. "Did Bill Beck throw the stone" comes from Thomas. "Filling the mind with junk" comes from Agatha and Sophie.

It is interesting to note how eager the kids were to form the agenda and this time the Friends take the lead: Tab, Trausti and Thomas. In the

-----

\* In the American version Harry and Mark are lying on a grassy slope when Mark sees North America in a huge white cloud moving across the clear blue sky. In translation North America is of course replaced by Iceland.

17th lesson where an agenda was first created, all the points came from the Women's organization or their Acquainters.

The kids started talking about the stone, but at the end of chapter five, the reader is informed that it was really Bill Beck that had thrown the stone at Harry. Sophie did not want to do much out of it. Agatha asked what difference it makes, who threw it. Ari and Thomas chatted a lot on one side of the horseshoe, so did Adelle, Angela, Buena, Erla, and Cora at another side of it. But there were many hands in the air expressing willingness to join a discussion, at one time I noticed Leona, Tab, Logi, and Agatha all holding their hands up simultaneously. Helga reprimanded and reprimanded, but it seemed to be for no use; perhaps an exercise might have helped.

At 10:42, two minutes passed the regular shift over to the next subject, Syr and Hildur appeared in the middle of the room to ask for playing cards. Helga kept the class going for a few more minutes.

Helga gives the 20th lesson to her group in first period the morning after. The horseshoe was formed without any protests, Tab Titus and Trausti were the first ones to bring their chairs to it. Helga started by putting up cards on the board with the agenda items from the rest of chapter five, from yesterday.

Helga: ... It's one person in the chapter that has the honor of having really said all this, or touched on it.

S: That's Mark!

Helga: That's Mark Jahorski. How do you like Mark?

Sophie: Poorly!

S: Very much! --

Helga: How do you like him as a character?

S: That depends! --

Helga: How do you like his ideas?

Leona: Well, I'm not into thinking about his ideas at all!

Angela: --- [There is silence in the room, but my recorder was too dusty to work at it's best!]

Helga: But what does Mark think about this? What conclusion did he come to about schools?

S: The school is dead boring! [More students agree to this.]

Helga: Doesn't he think it's boring?  
 S: He thinks it's awfully dead boring! --  
 Helga: -- And how does he come to that conclusion?  
 [Silence and no answer.]  
 Helga: Then I want to ask you another question: How do you think the school should be?  
 S: --- [It should be fun!]  
 Helga: But could it happen that we would start to get bored by all the fun?  
 S: Yes!  
 S: No!  
 Helga: Yes, how do you support that? -- Can you give me examples? ....

Three girls, Angela, Sophie and one more, gave examples of what they thought was fun when they were younger. Logi pointed out it that would be no fun to play soccer from eight in mornings to ten at evenings. Helga came back to schools:

Helga: -- But what is it that makes the school boring?  
 Thomas: Drawing into groups! That's what I think!  
 Agatha: If one doesn't like something then one's mood gets bad and also if one doesn't succeed!  
 S: Bad mood?!  
 Helga: Sophie what do you find boring?  
 Sophie: Look, I'm bored in -, and I'm bored in math, and I'm sometimes bored in English, and I'm always bored in social studies [i.e. philosophy]!  
 Helga: Are there more of you that want to present their ideas?  
 Louise: It's fantastic being in the lessons on Icelandic!  
 Helga: Yes, (perhaps we should talk about what it is that makes the school fun?) ....

Again the kids enumerated their subjects and the suggestions poured out: Art, gymnastics, crafts, music. Sophie repeatedly announced that she did not like gymnastics. No one suggested that Danish, English, Math, Religion, or Science were fun!

Helga: But then it fits in to think about how you would like to have the school! How would you like it to be?  
 S: Just the same way it is!  
 Helga: Just the same way it is! Do you agree with that?  
 Agatha: ---[You want to have the school all fun], but that's impossible!  
 Helga: Buena, what did you say? BOYS! Did you get this? - We are trying to talk together but not having each talking in his corner! Now we are talking about how you would like to have the school!  
 Thomas: We are talking about what we think is boring and --  
 Helga: I would like to hear a little of, just to hear from you how you would like to have the school? Whether you have any firm opinions on that? But passed Buena, what was it you wanted to say?

Buena's voice is too weak to be heard clearly and Sophie, Logi and one or two more students start to chat while she speaks. Helga might have asked someone to repeat her point, but I am sure that the students sitting next to Buena heard what she had to say. Helga's remark that she had passed Buena is noteworthy as it is an implicit invitation to the kids to remind her of fair procedures in the classroom.

Helga: - But should we imagine that there is a new school being built and you, the kids in this class, are asked to organize it, in all details. What they would teach, what the teachers would be like, what the students would be like, how would you arrange this school?

S: [We would have it fun!]

S: [We have no control over the students!] ---

Helga: Can I hear from one and one person at a time? Thomas, weren't you the first one?

Thomas: No, not me! Trausti was!

Trausti: ME!

Thomas: He (Trausti) was saying that he is looking very much forward to it when they start to teach on computers!

Helga: So if we think of this new school, you would like to have more subjects there? Am I understanding you correctly?

Trausti/Thomas: Yes! ....

Again, Helga implicitly asked the kids to help her conducting the discussion fairly. In other words, she invited the kids to accept responsibility for monitoring their own interactions by keeping track of who's turn it really should be. But this incident also tells something of Trausti's character, I believe: He is too shy to speak openly to the whole class, although he is on task with his chat partner.

In continuation of the points above they use their imagination to play with the issue of what the new school should look like indoor and outdoor.

Helga: - But what is education?

Angela: Yes! (What is it?)

Thomas: What is education?! To learn, of course!

Helga: Do you learn the education just in schools?

Girls: No, we don't!

Thomas: I do not get educated otherwise!

Sophie: I get more education (from tasks or studies at home!)

Helga: Now I want to hear what Cora has to say!

Cora: ---

Angela: Yes! [Agrees with what Cora said and so does Sophie.]

Helga: Wait a second now we are into ... (personal business)!

....[Adelle, Cora and Louise start to tell stories of some of the Valkyries, the "green mushrooms," how no one in other classes can stand them!]

Helga: Can I point your attention to a good point, perhaps. What did you say again? Would you please repeat it?

Sophie: I learn more at home than I do here!

S: I don't!

Angela: I learn more math here than I do at home! [More students share their experience of this.]

Helga: Do you (Sophie) mean that you can educate yourself at home just like at school?

Sophie: No, of course not in any subject, - (but in) geography and things -- (like that).

Helga: Do you agree that you often learn more at home than at school?

Chorus: NO! ---

Thomas: Perhaps one learns at home, but we understand it here!

Sophie: I'm not talking about schoolwork!

Helga: No, we can perhaps think about -- /

Thomas: What do you (Sophie) then mean?

Sophie: I'm learning, learning, just you know, learning independently! Reading some books that are there and things like that!

Some students protest, Titus most clearly. He takes "reading" as an example, but the context is not clear to me. Thomas's question to Sophie is an example of how the students can internalize the teacher's questioning. As such thing happen, the kids come in charge of the discussion, instead of being totally dependent on the teacher in that respect.

Sophie: Yes, but don't you think that my mother can't teach me how to read, don't you!

Boy: If she is not too lazy!

Sophie: No, she wasn't too lazy at all!

S: ---

Sophie: She did! My father taught me how to do math and my mother taught me to read!

Helga: But kids you do learn something at home, don't you?

S's: Yes we do!

Adelle: Yes, yesterday I was reading the story of Njall!\*

Angela: Yuk!

Sophie: Really! You were?

Adelle: Yes, my father forced me to do it! ....

Helga: ... What is education?

Leona: We can get ourselves educated at all things!

Helga: What about an illiterate person? Could he educate himself?

-----

\*Many say the best of the old Icelandic sagas.

Chorus: No, no, he can't!

S: He would have to learn how to read!

Helga: Wait a second! What are you saying?

S: He would have to learn how to read!

Helga: Does he have to learn how to read!?

Logi: Nah!

Sophie: No, he could do math!

Logi: Look, he really must know how to read because there are letters in the reading and -- He has to be able to read for example books --

Helga: But /

Sophie: He could just educate himself in math!

Helga: Kids, are you telling me that we cannot educate ourselves unless we read in books?

Leona: It is highly improbable!

Helga: How come, Leona?

....

Helga: But if we think about this man, he /

Angela: Shut up there! [Directed at classmates.]

Helga: Can I have silence, please! Think about this man, this illiterate man, he wants to educate himself such that he wants to learn how to do bookbinding... Could he do it without knowing how to read?

Chorus: Yes!

There is something fundamentally wrong, both in Icelandic and English, with the question: Do you learn the education at schools? This question assumes that to become educated is a matter of mastering something finite! Education is partly a question of mastering finite (or closed) technical skills, but it is also a question of infinite (or open) application of the basic skills. However, it may help to differentiate between education in a narrow sense and education in a broad sense. A book-binder is educated in a narrow sense as his education is basically a matter of mastering technical skills and being able to apply them in such a way that his craftsmanship becomes a continuous whole; but not a matter of discrete operations on the assembly line. To become educated in a broad sense has to do with nurturing our respect to other people and their ideas. Thus, a person that is educated in a broad sense should be capable of entertaining different possibilities when confronted with new situations. This requires not only some technical skills but also imagination and empathy for fellow human beings that are expressed

through discourse and action. Joining a discourse is sometimes the only action that is open, especially as further actions can call for violence and all violence is incompatible with behavior that is educated in a broad sense.

Helga's question, "Do you just learn the education in schools?" is thought provoking, but her questioning revolved around the theme of learning to become educated, but not simply about learning the education. Furthermore, the example of the illiterate man is her own, i.e. not taken from the manual, and it is also thought provoking as it is essentially a thought experiment.

Helga: How could he do it being illiterate? You were just saying that he couldn't do it if he couldn't read!?

S: Yes, he just finds the page numbers!

Helga: Yes, he might recognize numbers, how could he (learn bookbinding without knowing how to read)?

S: ---

Sophie: BOYS!

S: He could go to a workshop!

Helga: Workshop, yes!

Angela. First he would just learn how to read!

Helga: Would he have to first learn how to read?

S: No, not necessarily!

Leona: Someone could just show him!

Helga: Someone could just show him! ---

Sophie: He could listen to some explanations!

Helga: But hasn't he then really educated himself? Hasn't he finished educating himself in how to do bookbinding?

Tab: (If one is to learn something academic one has to know how to read but one doesn't need that to do such things.)

It is tempting to interpret Tab's comment as if he wanted to make a distinction between education in a broad sense and education in a narrow sense, but that is not the case. Of course his distinction might lead into that area, if explored further, but the fact is that academic learning gives quite often a very narrow, if any, education.

Helga: You are really saying that he would have to read for himself in books?

Tab: Yes!

S: That's not enough!

Tab: He must read to ---

Titus: (He could use) -- a recorder --

Helga: ---

Sophie: He could read a picture book!

Helga: When you first started school, you hadn't learned anything?

Leona: I can remember that when I started school I hadn't learned a thing!

Helga: What did you learn before you started at school? At home?

S: The letters --- [Cloud of birds!]

This was a fine lesson in all respects, but it was most noteworthy for application of dialogue as a instructional method. We saw that the discussion depended much on Helga's questioning and orchestration, but the students were cooperative and quite interested in coming to grips with the issues in respectable manner. It may be noted that Helga did not hold on to particular exercises or discussion plans and perhaps that helped making the lesson a successful one. However, I am not claiming that exercises and discussion plans are of minor importance, but simply that they should, in general, be applied after the class has put their teeth into issues that relate to them. Furthermore, it is not a "duty" to apply an exercise or a discussion plan in every lesson. Such an approach may even prevent the teacher and the classroom community from practicing independent inquiry. But all things considered, it would certainly be suspicious if teachers would never take the advantage of applying exercises or discussion plans as they usually have structures and analytic themes that will hardly be brought about by teachers' reflection on the spot.

I had urged the teachers to "take off" in their discussions. The lesson above was an example of such a discussion, but it was kept on a steady course through the agenda and the teacher's line of questioning. Helga was naturally very pleased with the lesson as we can see from the opening of our Thursday meeting that was just between the two of us as we were speculating on the social taxonomy within her group:



Me: I think there is something positive happening (in your class)!

Helga: I absolutely agree. I was rather pleased with the lesson yesterday, for the first time, well "first time!" At least it was one of few cases where it has worked out to keep a discussion like that rolling along for such a long period!

Me: - It was most prominent to me that the girls are beginning to come in, Angela, Adelle, even Louise, although she did not say very much.

Helga: Yes, I did notice that she entered (the discussion) for a short while.

Me: But then we have this chat among the boys!

Helga: Yes, there was much chatting as you must have heard on the recording!

Me: Yes, ... but I noticed from my seat that they were not just chatting off task! (Notes, pp. 378).

This was all that we had to say about that fine lesson which proved to me that Helga's student had "taken" philosophy. The boys needed to improve their listening but overall the class was engaged in reflective inquiry. The context for philosophy was set.

Because of her classroom observations Linda is absent in the 20th lesson that I gave to her students. When the kids were about to finish their snack, Loki asked whether they should go into the horseshoe. This aroused loud protests from other students. I asked "How many want to go into the horseshoe?" Only Loki and Saga raised their hands to this question and I decided to go along with this conclusion. I had also decided to give the class some honest exhortation for which they did not need to sit in a circle. I started:

Me: Kids, this will be a very serious lesson! [They are still moving around and chatting.] Are you ready? Can I have silence, please! Everyone take their (regular) seats! I'm going to begin by nagging at you! You are already 12 years old and you should be able to accept some nagging! I'm sure there are, that there are plenty of people that nag at you! As I nag I want to try to explain things (what we are supposed to be doing). Well, in relation to what we are trying to do I must say that I have been disappointed! Please give us silence, for a change! I am going to review our process a little. We usually begin by reading and then you are asked: "What do you want to talk about?" or something in that spirit. "What was most fun?" We always have the same question, no, I mean the same answer [a misstatement]. Usually we have the same question, we also have the same answer: "Nothing! It was all dead boring!" But this is a key to the lesson: you can yourself decide what we will talk

about just by making a suggestion of it. You have suggested that this is all dead boring and then we have talked about boredom! But you seem to lack the imagination to suggest something positive!

The class was dead silent. From the recording I hear someone rightly object to my last point: "No, I don't think so!" But I was not listening to the students and went right on.

Then there is another thing that has injured our success: We have perhaps had one item up on the discussion agenda. /BOYS! This is exactly what I was going to talk with you about. It has been awfully difficult to have peace to work so that one and only one person speaks at one time so that we listen and respond to what that person is saying. The teacher's preparation is such that one tries to see in advance what you may like to talk about, and one has a lot of questions in mind and one tries to follow up on what you're saying. But when you act like this, all talking at the same time, it's very difficult for the teacher to develop the discussion.

One more point on this: You can help a lot by silencing one another. Often it has occurred that you do just that! [Someone couldn't help it, I think that it was Loki, and he starts "SSSH-ing] It is very positive if you continue doing that. It, look, it takes some stress off the teacher because one always forgets what the next question is about or what one is thinking if always needing/

Hildur: Stress!? Teachers are not supposed to be stressed!

Me: But sometimes we cannot help it under such circumstances. But what we are really doing is investigating this text (the novel) and ideas that lead from it. And such investigations, you shouldn't think that they just happen in schools because, look, this happens (the investigations) in the kitchen at home, at places of work, when friends are playing together, people are always, listen now! [The class is silent but I obviously want complete silence] People are always talking together and reflecting on the latest rumor or something else that may be on their minds, and there is always some talking together. And what we are trying to do in this classroom during discussion is to investigate what people are often thinking about in a constructive manner. That is to say, what I'm telling you, what

I'm complaining over and nagging about is that I think you will to cooperate is minimal and that you are not interested in talking about our ideas in a constructive way! [From the recording I hear that someone inserts or maybe he or she is just thinking aloud: "Yes, I know it!"] I know that this has been boring, but it is not totally our's, the teachers', fault, or the book's fault, I think that you had a rather large share in making this boring by deciding --/

Hirst: We don't decide nothing that this is boring! It is /

Me: It only is boring: you have already decided!

S's: --- [Protest.]

Me: But you are not interested in having interest for it!

S: No!

S: No we don't!

S: No we don't want to!

Me: But my dear ones! I'm not going to be only so negative! You don't need to take me too seriously, -- but I hope that you can accept what I'm saying. Now I want to show what could be done and what has been done in the other room (Helga's class).

Hildur [sound argry]: Yes, just show us!

S: What for are we learning this? (Notes, pp. 363-66).

At this point I put a transparency that I had borrowed from Helga of the agenda that came up in her 17th lesson. I commented on the agenda point by point. The kids were attentive and behaved, except for Loki. Somehow he got a hold of a roll of toilet paper which he wrapped around his head such that only his eyes could be seen! I asked him to remove it. He didn't and he got away with it! Having commented on the agenda, the lesson continued:

Me: Those are all very good points to talk about! If you would show some will to cooperate I'm pretty sure you could do it too (to create an agenda), but the dominating spirit here seems to be that nobody has the courage to make any suggestions!

S's: --- [They protest but I cut in on them without listening to what they are saying!]

Me: Everyone have the same point to make: "This is boring!" That's the only idea you've got!

S: Yes!

Thor: We just suggest to skip this lesson!

Me: But, but this you can fix!

S: Fix?

Me: Yes, you can!

Thor: Do you think the book will get any better?

Me: Are you really being serious? Did you think for example that chapter five was boring!?

Chorus: Yes!

Hrund: There was one thing fun about it! -- (They talked about how boring schools are!)

Frigg: One doesn't do a thing with this! (It has no utility!) After one has read this chapter there is nothing more! Then we just start to talk about something! --

Me: But reading the book is not the main point, that's a minor point! The main point rests with the dialogue that is supposed to follow!

Hildur: Why don't we have the courage to suggest anything!?

Hrund: We can easily make suggestions --

Me: Well, unfortunately I haven't seen that up to this point! [A gross lie!] But what do you say about this agenda on the screen? Do you want to discuss any of the points there?

S: No we don't!

Loki: Why don't you just ask us what's on the movies? -- Let's go to a movie! (Notes, pp. 366-67.)

In times of trouble Loki stands by his peers and the kids support his suggestion, but I claim that they are telling me that they want to behave just as they please. They admit that I am hearing them right and then I scold them some more:

Me:... I can also tell you that if I would, for example, be the only person in control, if I would have a school by myself, then I'd have given a lot of you a vacation!

S: What!?

Me: It's no fun having boring students, but unfortunately that doesn't work out (to have a school by oneself)! ....

Me: I want to give this point over to you: Who can run the schools and who cannot?

Gna: Not you at least! [I didn't hear this comment on the spot and would probably just have ignored it anyway!]

S: The principal for example!

Me: Principals!

Loki: Martians!

S: Grownups!

S: Teachers!

S: Child-nurses!

Odinn: Apprentice nurses!

S: Young teachers!

Thor: The mentally ill!

Me: The mentally ill! How would the mentally ill run teachers, no (I mean) schools?

Girl: Just like they do it here!

S: They can learn how to!

Me: Now let's try to speak one and one person at a time! Thor suggested that the mentally ill could run schools. Let's just listen to him expand on that point! Listen to him! [Someone "SSSH-es"] Thor! Now you can explain this to us, what would a school be like if run by the mentally ill?

S: What, like this one!

Gna: It'll just be the same! [Are they defending Thor by answering for him?]

Thor: Like this one!

Me: The point that you are making is that the principal here and those who run this school are mentally ill?

S: For sure!

Thor [in a weak voice]: No, I'm not!

Me: Then you are saying that it makes no difference!? ---

The suggestions of martians, grownups, teachers and nurses, could all easily be related to chapter five of Harry. Suggesting that the mentally ill could run schools was not presented there and in this context it shows how Thor plays along with the other boys, but both Loki and Odinn had made their suggestions. I think I surprised both Thor and the class by taking his comment quite seriously and I think they became aware that this idea was worth some exploration. My exploration centers on drawing out the implications of Thor's remark.

There were no decisive answers to my last question. Some kids talked

simultaneously and I reminded them of talking one and one person at a time.

Gna: They need to have education!

Me: You're saying that those over here [point at items on board: teachers, grownups, child nurses].

Gna: They need to have education to be able to teach us!

Freyja: Then the mentally ill could just as well teach us if they perhaps have education!

Me: But perhaps something can prevent a person from using the education that one has, and it really is a question whether it isn't exactly the case that mental illnesses prevent people from using their education! [This was a bad move as I switch over to lecturing mode and the students had no real opportunities to respond to this idea.] Is there anything more than education and interest that those who run schools need to have? [Hlin had suggested "interest" somewhere along the way.]

Frigg: Patience!

Freyja: Why is that needed?

Me: Why is that needed? Freyja is asking Frigg!

Frigg: ---

Me: One and one person at a time! Frigg is speaking!

Frigg: -- (If) I cannot understand explanations -- (then the teacher needs to be) patient and explain better (but) not just become (mad).

Me: But let's assume that there would be no patience present, let's say that we were in some school where nobody would be patient. It would just be, you know, total dictatorship or something, would that be a poor school?

S's: Yes, it would! [A weak "no" is heard too on the recording.]

Me: Kids! Please concentrate! USS! Sit properly!

Hrund: We do sit properly!

S: No, not Hodur! (Notes, pp. 368-71).

Hodur was lying half on a chair and half on a pillow and as he did not change position although having been asked to, I walked over to him and pulled him up into a proper position. I guess both of us were thinking of Loki's example with the toilet paper. Hodur taking it as an example to follow, the teacher taking it as an example that must be prevented from occurring again.

The lesson continued for quite some time (6 pages in the transcript). It cannot be labeled as "cooperative inquiry" although I tried as hard as I could to involve the students while I worked my way from an exercise<sup>"</sup> on meanings of "good" and "right" in various contexts (Philosophical Inquiry, pp. 124-125).

It must be noted that although I set the scene for a negative

atmosphere in the the beginning of the lesson, it was more positive than my words indicate. For example, I was neither mad nor screaming but primarily honest although I exaggerated my points.

#### Reflection on week eight

The progress that Helga's class had made was evident in this week. More and more students were entering the discussion spontaneously and obviously enjoying it. Their comments were quite spontaneous and simultaneously the students were starting to take care of basic procedures, such as reprimanding for chat and keeping an informal but accurate record of who should speak next. In practice the kids were rejecting their own thesis that philosophy is too boring and childish for them.

But Linda's class was not giving their conventional ideas up: School is boring and philosophy is most boring. I am not sure whether my scolds were appropriate. In retrospect, I would at least have liked to be more positive toward the class. However, I must admit that I found the social and the intellectual habits of the students as a group dead boring and hostile to cooperative inquiry. As a teacher I felt obliged to tell them the truth to ease for their self-correction. Notice that I did not harass any particular students, but I attacked the social habits of the group as a whole and appealed both to their reason and emotions.

My approach to Linda's students can partly be explained by my impatience; I wanted the kids to succeed and time was gradually running out. Most likely I was asking for too much too quickly from them. They had hardly got used to me as a teacher and they also knew that their regular teacher would behave differently from me; Linda tries to be positive at all times and adjustive to the kids in her approach.

Week nine: Community of inquiry at work

Our Monday meeting we spent preparing for chapter six. Helga was pleased with the progress in her room. Linda was in less touch with her classroom due to her absence, I thought. For myself I wanted to work in a more positive spirit than I had been doing with her students and I was sure that Linda's presence would help in smoothing our interactions, but she had commented that the kids' behavior toward me was typical for kids when trying out a substitute teacher. She took Hildur as an example, but once she had asked me totally out of context: "Where are you from?" So, Linda asked me whether I wanted to teach both lessons in this week, but I thought one would be enough for my purpose.

When I came to school the morning after to teach the 21st lesson in Linda's class, I found out that she was absent as her young child had become ill. When I entered the classroom two gerbils were in a box to the front of the room. Vidarr had brought them for exhibition and most of the kids circled around them. I started by asking the class to form a horseshoe, that worked out all right but they moved slowly. Hrist was not present so that might explain the lack of protests. The boys were the last one's to move their chairs. I had to walk over and ask them.

When it came to the reading it took a long while, I thought, to have the silence needed before we could start. The reading worked out just fine, Hodur "passed" in the first round but read in the second one, so did one girl, but I'm not sure exactly who it was. Thor said "pass" in both rounds but he sat by my side in the circle. When I asked whether they had any points for the agenda "everyone" seemed to start talking simultaneously and the suggestions were negative. Hildur stated for example that "It is stupid to think about things like this!" When I inquired what "things like this meant" it was rephrased to "thoughts"



and in the agenda the point became: "It is stupid to think about thoughts!" Hlin brought up a positive point about the mind being a part of the brain.

But the discussion itself was difficult to handle and our performance was such that I saw no point in trying to transcribe it. However, I did notice Hlin being very supportive to me, over and over again she tried to quiet her classmates down and she did participate in the "discussion" I tried to run on thoughts, thinking, mind, and brain. Loki asked for permission to go to the lavatory just after we started and he was surprised when I refused to let him. Loki, Thor, Hildur and Hrund went later up to the front to take a look at the gerbils, but they did return at once when I asked them to.

In the coffee break I shared my experience with two male teachers. In response one of them told me that he had often wondered about the different mix up of groups, for example, the two groups in the eight grade are very different in that one of them "takes anything as an answer" the other asks questions and doesn't take all answers as equally good and is more demanding in all matters. The other teacher shared with us his experience from teaching foreign language to the group I was coming from. For example, he taught a lesson after I had left them this morning and he said he had been unable to have the class silent for the two or three minutes needed to explain a task (Notes, pp. 392). The week before I had learned from this teacher that the kids, especially "some" girls in Linda's group were "unbelievably impudent" to him as a teacher. So I think it is fair to claim that the kids' negative behavior was not isolated to the philosophy lessons.

After the coffee break I got unexpectedly delayed and was only present for the last five minutes or so to the 21st lesson in Helga's room.

Helga quickly told me that they had just finished reading and that they had had no peace to work because of constant interruptions from across the hall. (Linda's class must have spent the period in their room without a teacher as Linda was at home and there is no substitute teacher that stands by if head-teacher or principal cannot fill in.) I had just taken a seat, for example, when Thor and Vidarr entered the room with no obvious purpose in mind, except maybe to interrupt. I stood up and got them out of the room, but I had hardly closed the door when Thor opened it again. I reprimanded him and the door was not opened for the few minutes left.

Although the class was loud and many talking simultaneously, it was all on task. While some talked others waited with their hands raised among them I noted: Salome, Angela, Agatha, Leona, Ari, Thomas and Tab. Others made points without raising hands and there I noticed: Sophie, Adelle, Louise and Titus.

Ari was obviously excited and he asked Sophie how she knew that the mind is not just made of some steamy stuff. Sophie acted as if that question was an insult to her and answered: "You think I don't know, don't you!?" Thomas and Tab both argued that we had no idea of what the mind is made from. Thomas asked why they were learning this as there were just different "theories" in the chapter about the nature of mind. Helga answered: "Why not? There are so many other things that we learn about?" (Notes, p. 408.) That answer seemed to settle his doubt for the moment.

Afterwards Helga said that the kids had a spark of interest for the chapter and that she would follow up on it tomorrow.

She did and that was the 22nd lesson in her group. When asked the kids were quick to form the horseshoe and they took the following places

in the circle: Helga, Sophie, Salome, Doreen, Erla, Buena, Adelle, Cora, Angela, Leona, Thomas, Ari, Zophon, Tab, Titus, Torfi, Trausti and Helga again.

I sat by the teacher's desk behind the boys. Although Torfi and Trausti were that close to Helga they did chat as so often before. I picked some of it up and on my way out, after the lesson, I stopped by them and asked whether they were interested in computers, which they admitted. I told them I had heard them say that school was like a collection of computer programs. Trausti corrected me and said they had been talking about the brain as being like a collection of computer programs.

Helga noted that yesterday she had been without a chalk and therefore the board had been empty, but now she wrote the following points as having been suggested for the agenda yesterday: (1) What is mind? (2) What are thoughts? (3) What is the mind made of? (Steamy stuff!) (4) Dreams (thoughts)! To this she added two points: (5) Imagination and (6) Memory, that they had talked about yesterday.

Helga: When I was thinking about our lesson from yesterday, I thought those were the ideas we thought about. -- [Leona claims she doesn't remember a thing when Helga reminds her that she talked about dreams yesterday and that she had claimed that if one thinks hard enough about dreams it can lead into further dreams. Leona tries to be funny and asks whether the mind is in a sauna if it is a steamy stuff.] --

Angela: (About) the mind, I would say it is imagination. Imagination with memory!

--- [Here a debate opens from yesterday: Sophie maintains that she can feel her mind and know it. Ari does not agree with her.]

Helga: Ari, what do you know about your mind?

Girl [Buena(?)] : Yes, we know nothing about it!

Helga: How do you know that you have a mind?

Ari: --- [Inaudible.]

Helga: Wait a second, are you saying that the brain is the same as the mind?

Ari: No!

Tab: If one cannot think with the brain then [one doesn't exist!]

Ari: The brain thinks for the body, but the mind thinks for, for oneself!

Sophie: For the soul!

Helga: But tell me another thing, when one says: "I have this tune on my brain!" What do we then mean?

Leona: Can I answer this?

Ari: It's rather on one's mind!

Helga: It's rather on one's mind! Leona!

Leona tried a joke on brains and broken record players that the class did not get. What she was actually trying to say was that 'having a tune on one's brain' is like 'having a record player stuck on a track.' But that simile was only implicit in her remark, she would have needed some help to clarify it. Helga took the remark as being totally off track:

Helga: No, do you think so! Let's get a sensible answer to this. Buena!

Buena: Sophie doesn't know nothing how this is, I mean -- /

Sophie: I must know /

Leona (?): How? Have you seen it? (The mind.)

Angela: She feels IT!! The mind is --- [Debates.]

Adelle: How do you feel it?

Sophie: How do I feel it?

S: Yes!

Sophie: Of course you feel it if I kick you! --

Angela: Do you have a (feeling in your mind?) --

Leona: Can I? Helga? Ok, she can maybe imagine that it is this way! /

Angela: YES, she can! [Debates but in a while Angela comes to the front again:] The imagination is mind, thinking!

Leona: If there is steam in the mind why does it then have to be made?

Sophie: There is no steam in the brain, and there is no steam inside one's head!

Leona: Yes, it can just be some kind of a material!

Sophie: - At least not in my head! Maybe in yours!

Helga: Buena, what's your opinion on this?

Buena: She doesn't know a thing about this, she hasn't taken her head apart to check on it!

Helga: No, but perhaps we can use our imagination. --

Ari: One cannot figure it out if -- (one takes the head apart!)

Helga: Do you think that the mind is like the body, that it is made from some material, a substance?

S's: No!

Helga: Isn't it made from no material!?

S's: No, no!

S: Yes!

Ari: I think it is very much like the brain!

Helga: Ari, what are you saying?

Ari: I think it is very much like the brain!

Helga: That the mind is very much like the brain?

Ari: It thinks for you yourself, but the brain thinks for the body!

Girl: The brain thinks independently!

Sophie: The brain doesn't only think for the body! [At this point Leona complains that they sit like gurus pretending to be talking but without raising their hands!] -- When you learn something you use your brain but not your mind!

Helga: Titus! Let's allow Titus to speak up! [Sophie and Ari continue talking while Titus makes his point.] ---

Helga: Do you agree with what Titus said? If we turn our attention to what he said!

Leona: What did Titus say?

Helga: He said, would you perhaps repeat it? You can do it much better than I! You remember more of it!

Titus: It, look, (thinking is related to the memory, we need to search in the memory like in a file!) [Atypically Titus spoke slowly and finished what he was saying, but his voice was weak.]

Helga: Perhaps the mind is a file! [Chat and debates break out. Helga draws on the board.] If we have a small baby over here and it thinks about /

Leona: A car!

Helga: Yeah, but no! It doesn't think about anything, someone says something in particular to it! Look! It is being spoken at, don't you agree with that, we do speak at babies?

S: Yes we do!

Helga: Uu, But through our speaking they maybe come to have a [Pauses].

S: A memory!

Helga: A memory! And what Titus said, and Ari touched on was that it (memory) is a file! /

Angela or Leona: Not a chance! There is no space for it!

Helga: Or we can think of it as tracks in the brain or in thinking. What do you have to say about this theory? [Pause.]

Leona: Maybe you are made out of robots but I'm not! --

Tab: --- [Inaudible.]

Helga: Wait! Uss, SSSH!

Tab: -- One uses the body to -- (do physical things) but if one is learning then one has to use the brain - to write, or read.

Sophie: When one is reading one doesn't use the body no more than, one really doesn't use the hands and stuff like that, one uses the eyes maybe, (and) the hands to hold the book /

Leona: One uses the brain the most, I'd say!

Sophie: Yes, that's what I'm saying! One also uses the brain the most!

Ari: And one's sight too!

Helga: But what is this "brain"?

Angela: It's here blob-blob! [Points at her head.]

Helga: Something material, isn't it?

S's: Yes!

Helga: But is it something more than that?

Leona: There are nerves and stuff /

Helga: Sophie, you are perhaps saying that mind and brain are identical?

Sophie: NooO! I'm saying they are different!

Thomas (?): Yes, that's what I'd say!

Helga: That they are two different things?

Titus: (If the brain and the mind) are two different things then we must have a second memory for the mind!

Angela: Mind is just an instrument!

Helga: The mind is [completely different]. Do you agree with that?

At this point Titus starts talking at Tab, he is on task and he can be heard to take an example of "the desk over there." Titus has taken an

empiricistic stance on the issue and he is quite consistent in that position. Helga paused and listened to Titus while he was "chatting" (or primarily speaking) with Tab:

Helga: Do you mean, Titus, that our thoughts, that we cannot think about nothing except it is outside of the mind?  
 Titus: Except we just look at it!  
 Tab: Then are --/  
 Helga: Let's think about this question: Can we not think about anything except that which is outside of the brain?  
 Chorus: Yes, we can!  
 Ari: I can think about Martians and all kind of things, whatever, really! One can have an idea that no one has ever had before!  
 Helga: Are we then refuting this theory that the mind is -- [memory]? ---  
 S: I once thought that --  
 Helga: One can think about something very unrealistic without it being in existence! But from where does the thinking come?  
 Leona: From the brain!  
 Sophie: It comes from the outside!  
 Helga: Does it come from the outside?  
 S: Well, it comes somewhere from! [Torfi and Trausti chat.]  
 Helga: Did you hear this?  
 Ari: I agree very much with that, because it must come from somewhere outside! One has to get the ideas from some place outside, and then afterwards one can think independently. But one just doesn't have an idea all of a sudden without ever having heard anything!

A few interchanges above Ari said he could have ideas that no one has ever had before! How does this go together?

Helga: Yes Ari, you mean that one can start thinking about something that no one has ever thought of, but haven't you heard it someplace before?  
 Ari: Yeaah, no, I mean, one can have an idea of something that one has never heard about but there is something, look, there is something, then one is comparing it to something that one has heard!  
 Leona: No, not necessarily!  
 Ari: One has always mastered what one has heard and one gets the ideas (from that)!  
 Sophie: I tell you! --  
 Angela or Cora: Tab has his hand raised!  
 Leona: No, Sophie was first, then Tab before me!  
 Helga: All right! Sophie is the first one!  
 Sophie: -- (You have) some mystery creature and then that mystery vision is put together from some other animals and we perhaps really don't know it! - [Her voice is unusually weak.]  
 Helga: So you are basing it on something which is outside the mind?  
 Sophie: Yes, but you say maybe, I mean, for example a lion, let's take that, then you could just as well have that as the mystery creature! It would look like a lion and then you would maybe think it would be a lion but then it could be that this lion couldn't eat meat, it would eat grass and et cetera. It is always put together from some

other animals or in -  
 Helga: Leona!  
 Leona: Like the man who built the first automobile, he has sure needed to do a lot of thinking before he started making the car!  
 Helga: Yes, -- /  
 Leona: And dreams are really just thoughts I think!  
 Helga: That brings us to inventions and discoveries! Remember when we were talking about that?  
 S's: Yes! ....  
 Helga: Tab!  
 Tab: If the brain thinks for the body why can it then not also think for the mind?  
 Helga: Can you answer that?  
 Sophie: -- The brain can really think --  
 Leona: Are you perhaps made out of paint? [Nobody laughs and the students keep on talking for a moment while Helga prepares a new move:]  
 Helga: Tell me, if you get toothaches, do you then have the pain in your mind, in your brain, in your head, or in your teeth?  
 Angela: In the mouth!  
 Helga: What did you say, Buena?  
 Buena: In the mouth or here underneath the teeth!  
 Helga: In your mouth!?  
 Leona: Yes, then you just have --  
 Sophie: We need to get into biology to think about this, look -. If the hole is by the nerve which is in the tooth, then the - brain goes to a dentist! -- [Chat.]  
 Helga: So this is all like chain-reacting?  
 Sophie: Yes it is! [Some agree.]  
 Helga: That is to say, one thing follows another?  
 Buena: ---  
 Sophie: The brain tells you to go to a dentist or to do something!  
 Helga: And you start thinking of going to a dentist?  
 Buena (?): Yes.  
 Helga: So we cannot really say that the pain is in one particular spot?  
 Buena: No!  
 Helga: Leona!  
 Leona: Like if, or are we necessarily supposed to talk about teeth now?  
 Helga: Yes, we were talking about them!  
 Leona: Listen! Can I talk about teeth?  
 Helga: Yes, but please wait a second, I want to hear what Doreen has to say!  
 Doreen: - (What we do during days appears in our dreams.)  
 Helga: Yes, exactly! Then we have moved over to this point here. Should we just, Leona, what was it you wanted to say before we moved into the dreams?  
 Leona: I just wanted to say that one is perhaps walking outside with a friend and she is maybe asking about something and then all of a sudden she forgets what she was talking about, and then she asks about what she was saying, and one does tell her, then one says it, then it just gets imprinted in here! [Points at her head.]  
 S: (That's) memory! -- ["Chat" on memory.]  
 Sophie: (Oh, I cant stand it) when I forget what I'm just about to say!

-----

\* Do only human beings have minds? Philosophical Inquiry, pp. 152-155.

Helga: Yes, then we have arrived to something which is named memory!  
 Leona: Are we not going into the dreams?  
 Helga: Should we maybe rather do that?  
 S: Yes!  
 Helga: Doreen you were talking about that what we do during days appears in our dreams during nights?  
 Sophie: -  
 Helga: Wait! Now there is (too much) noise!  
 Sophie: - (Let's pretend we are) - in a zoo taking a look at the animals and then one goes to a fun park and then one goes somewhere else and then home to sleep and when one goes to sleep one can perhaps dream that some animals are digging a canal in the park. - A thing which one has never seen before -!  
 Helga: But how do dreams relate to thinking and the mind?  
 S: ---  
 Helga: Adelle, what are you saying?  
 Adelle: What one thinks about often appears in dreams!  
 Ari: If one is into bed or something and perhaps if one (is just laying there) and then one maybe starts thinking about how one fell asleep, or no, (one) dreams whether one fell asleep!  
 Helga: What was that!? Oh yes, ... (the first part confused me)! But do we think when we dream?  
 S: Well, only --  
 Sophie: Yes we do! We can't help it! One cannot stop thinking! I cannot, at least, because I've often tried to stop thinking, but then I always start thinking about that I'm not thinking and then I start to think!  
 Angela: It's impossible!  
 Helga: Those thoughts are funny! [S: --] But how does thinking take place?  
 Angela: Leona has something!  
 Leona: I've my raised hand! [Sic!]  
 Angela: Hand raised!

Here Angela corrects Leona on a grammatical error: her termination of "hand" was incorrect. Titus is simultaneously "chatting" in a low voice and again Helga listens and rephrases:

Helga: That is to say, the brain is put out (cf. putting a light out)! But what about the mind? [Tab starts on something, but it is inaudible.] Where is the mind when we are asleep?  
 Sophie: The mind is really in the brain! --  
 Helga: So you want to say they are identical?  
 Sophie: No!  
 Helga: Uss! Leona, (is it) in relation to what we were speaking about now?  
 Leona: What were you talking about?  
 Helga: We were really talking about dreams and and how thinking can affect our dreams! [Chat.] Tab, what do think about it?  
 Tab: If one puts the brain out when one goes to sleep, but if one falls out of bed, is the brain then put on again?  
 Sophie: One wakes up! If it makes one wake up! [Debates and Tab tries to make point.]



Helga: Wait a second! [Laughs.] What do you (Tab) mean?

Tab: ---

Helga: Do you mean that you couldn't know that you fell if the brain had been put out?

Titus: He'd feel it!

Tab: But what if one doesn't wake up?

Helga: So your point is that it is still on?

Tab: (Yes, it is!) [Debates.]

Helga: Trausti! I want to hear what Trausti has to say!

Leona [frowns]: You mean to go all over the group and just skip me?

Helga: Oh Leona, my dear! I'm sorry! I'll come to you the next time --

Trausti: When we are asleep and (we) dream all night long the brain is at work!

I am sure this was a great step for Trausti as he was in general too shy to join the discussion openly. Because of this it is quite understandable that Helga bypassed Leona in an excitement to hear from Trausti.

Helga: Do you then agree that the brain can be working all night long?

S: Yes!

Tab: Yes, it is always on guard!

Helga: Is it always on guard?

Tab: Yes it is!

[Debates. Titus and Sophie are most clearly heard.]

Leona: Aren't you done with one (turn)?

Helga: Yes, dear! Leona, now it's your turn!

Angela (?): Finally (it is)!

Leona: You were saying that the brain would put oneself out when we go to sleep. But then I've a question whether it is operated on batteries?

Angela (?): Oh my!

Helga: Do you mean that the brain could be some kind of an energy?

Leona: Yes, but I suppose it can put itself off and on and then it doesn't need to stop thinking!

Angela: That only happens in Donald's Duck cartoons!

Helga: Now we have a new perspective: The idea that the brain could be energy! It could be energy!

[Debates.]

Leona's question about whether the brain is operated on batteries was typical of her "joke-remarks." In this case Helga was on top of the situation and she made sense of the "joke" on the spot. I guess it helped Helga that this possibility was entertained both in the novel and the manual. Leona's comment that followed Helga's clarification shows that underneath she was quite serious in her "battery" comment.

But now Tab had something to say that few heard.

Helga: Did you notice what Tab said? --- [More debates.]

Sophie: -- The brain is an organ like the other --(organs).

Titus: Does one perhaps have two brains? --

Helga: The mind is in the soul!? [This is a repetition, originally coming from Salome, I think.]

Sophie: The mind is really a kind of brain in the soul!

Helga [surprised]: Yes!

S: But the mind is in - (us)!

Helga: Yes, that is to say that we agree that the mind could be energy, it could be memory, it could be the brain, --

Sophie: The brain is an organ, but it is not --

Helga: Then you have made a sharp distinction between brain and mind, isn't that so? [---] Do you think we have discussed this thoroughly enough?

S's: Yes! The period is over!

S: Doreen has a point!

Doreen is one of the students that does usually not join discussions openly. Like in Titus's case it is understandable that Helga wants to have the class build on her comment. Doreen's point was too weak for the recorder to pick it up, but it was a question in the direction of what happens when we get tired.

Helga: Let's wait now! Has anyone an answer to this?

Leona: Let me (try)! Then just -- (the body) has become tired!

Helga: Physically or mentally?

Sophie: ---

Adelle: Thomas and Tab! [A reminder that they have their hands raised!]

Sophie: -- Still one doesn't stop to think! ---

Tab: (If one has a headache, does one then need to rest the brain to get more energy?) ---

Sophie: When one is tired and things like that, - (and one) goes to sleep then the mind starts working, then it just takes control over the brain!

Helga: That is to say, the mind can be at work all the time?

Sophie: Yes, it (the mind) only takes control of it (the brain), just completely!

Helga: What is this "mind"?

Buena: -- some place ---

Tab: How did we ever get that false idea that we could manage without the brain?

Leona: How come that we got brains?

Helga: How did we ever get that false idea that we could manage without the brain? ---

Sophie: And if some Martians would exist then they would think that inhabitants of Earth would - ("be" or "become") some horrible beasts, like, green, blue and --

Helga: Sophie, now you are really drilling inside of the Martian's way of thinking! You are trying to find out how they would think about us,

you are opening up a totally -- (new perspective)! There you have a brand new idea that perhaps no one has ever thought of before! Does that need to be based on the memory? What do you think? [The kids are getting unruly and there are no clear answers to this question and Helga closes the lesson:] Well, this can be discussed forever, but didn't you enjoy reflecting on this?

S's: Yeah, oh yes!

S: Yes, I did! [No one protests or complains of boredom!] (Notes, pp. 401-415.)

This lesson shows that a community of inquiry has just established itself in Helga's classroom. When the lesson opened the class went right to work and it was as if they had internalized and accepted a definite context for working on philosophy. Most of them participated openly, it was only Cora, Erla and Zophon that did not have something to say. Titus's participation was unexpected and his relaxation while speaking was quite a surprise. He appeared relaxed because he spoke slower than often before and in this lesson he completed his sentences. Our descriptions of him as a "nagger" and as a machine gun skipping every third bullet did not ring true at all during this lesson.

Helga called me later that evening to excuse her absence on our meeting the morning after. As natural she was very pleased with the lesson above and she talked about it as if she had not needed to do anything herself, the kids had themselves been in control of the lesson. At our next Monday meeting she expressed her pleasure again:

...I was very pleased with the kids in this lesson and I thought they often didn't need me! They kept it rolling! .... I must admit I had great fun in this lesson. I liked it very much to sit there and listen to them, it was great! (Notes, pp. 432-33).

Linda gave the 22nd lesson to her students in my absence. The absence was my idea as I thought the kids might have had too much of me in the last three lessons. In this lesson they worked in their regular groups on an exercise in detecting assumptions\*

-----  
\* Logic review, part IV, p. 159 in Philosophical Inquiry. In copying Linda removed four out of nine items out of the exercise as she knew they

At the following Thursday meeting Linda reported that her 22nd lesson worked out well and also that she had been amazed when she peeked in on Helga's 22nd lesson and saw how relaxed and busy the kids had been at the discussion.

Reflection on week nine

Helga's 21st lesson suffered from too much outside interruptions to be a real lesson. But her 22nd lesson was delightful and showed a community of inquiry at work in her classroom.

Linda's absence in the 21st lesson with her students was bad luck on my part! I do not know for sure whether the class would have been much different with Linda present, but I originally wanted to teach the lesson because I thought so. As that lesson worked out, my exhortation from the week before had not triggered any sudden change in the students' social habits, except for Hlin perhaps. In my judgment, and given the aim of forming a community of inquiry, her class did not need to work in small groups on more sheetwork exercises. But given the fact that Linda had been absent from her classroom three philosophy periods in a row, while I had been messing around with her kids, it was most sensible for her to pick the thread up again through sheetwork exercises.

-----  
would not have time to complete the whole exercise in one teaching hour.

Week ten: Commitment to the procedures of inquiry

At our Monday meeting we browsed through the transcript of Helga's last discussion, but we had had the weekend to look it over. Most of the meeting we spent on preparing for chapter seven.

Linda stated that it had been too long since she had worked on a discussion lesson and that now she wanted to emphasize that part in the next lessons (Notes, pp. 437-438).

Linda gave the 23rd lesson to her students in a first period on Tuesday. The horseshoe was formed smoothly although both Hrist and Thor were present. Overall the interchanges in this lesson were much improved from most other lessons. There was no reading during the lesson just discussion in a positive environment. The transcript took 17 pages (pp. 442-59) of non-stop discussion. However, most of the discussion was not philosophical in character but mainly an exchange of opinions and experience.

The lesson began by Linda asking whether they remembered what the 6th chapter had been about. Hlin was the first one to respond that it had been about the girl's sleepover. Next Linda asked about what they had been talking and the suggestions poured in: It was about thinking, mind, brain, electricity. Somehow this led into talking about how many different things a person can do simultaneously and it peaks with Hrund's comment on her grandfather:

Hrund: Grandfather can listen to the weather forecast (on the radio), listen to the news (on radio or TV), watch TV, and he can sleep and read the newspaper; all at the same time!

Linda: Does he then have a somewhat better brain or mind than we have?

Hildur: He just reads, holds the book, listens to the radio, watches TV

---

Linda: So your point is that he cannot do all of those things at the same time? That he does all of those things one by one?

Gna: The best way to do them is to do them one by one! (Notes, p. 446.)

In continuation of this Linda moves to the issue whether animals can

think just as well as humans can. The kids were eager to exchange opinions and experience on this and they went on for quite a while (Notes, pp. 448-457). But as Linda pointed out afterwards she soon found out that she needed concepts from chapter seven to work with in the discussion. But one of the chapter's leading ideas is to introduce differences of degree and kind, the idea is also presented that the difference between animals and man is that only the latter can invent things.

When a student stated that cats have their own culture, Linda directed the discussion to that issue:

Linda: Yes, what do you mean by culture? Can I just give that question over to you?

Hrist: Animals, look they are by far more clever than people!

Linda: What is culture? Freyja was asking about that! Girls, what is a culture?

Thor: Just, humans living together!\*

Linda: Just human life! Not life of animals? Or dog-life? What do you think of this explanation that culture is human life and then you probably mean that which men do?

Thor: Just where you have many people. Down town, for example! That's culture!

Linda: Where we have many people, we have a culture?

Freyja: There can also be culture where we have many animals!

Gna: A different culture!

Linda: A different culture among animals! So you do mean that the animals have culture?

Freyja: You must tell us what culture is!

Linda: What do you think culture is?

We are getting towards the end of the period and there is some noise here, but throughout the lesson the kids have been quiet. Now Syr makes an inaudible point.

Linda: Syr, what did you say?

Syr: -- Animals they cannot learn nothing, (they cannot) go to school and start to earn a living, -- [they cannot support] a family or something --

-----

\* Icelandic for "culture" is "menning" which has the same stem as "man" in English. Icelandic for "man" is "maður." So when Thor said: "Just, humans living together!" his Icelandic words were: "Bara mannlíf!" (Literally: Just man-life!)

Linda: That is to say, animals cannot go to school and they do not earn a living like we do!

Syr: -- Family --

Frigg: Animals are different!

Saga: Usually (they are)!

[Linda reprimands Hrund and Hildur and asks Odinn to take his seat again and she asks the boys to relax until the period is over.]

Frigg: Cats and humans are different, -- it could be that they know something that we don't! -- [Talks about learning and family.] -- Their way of life is different!

Linda: So Frigg, you're trying to tell us that humans think in a different way from animals and that perhaps /

Frigg: Well, perhaps they don't think -- (differently), but they live differently!

Linda: But doesn't that relate to the thinking?

Frigg: Well, it could be that they think similarly! [Frigg pauses and there is chat in the background.] But we don't think exactly the same way!

Linda: But let's try to pull this together as the period is almost over! Kids, what would you state as the main difference between the thinking of humans and animals? From what we have been discussing now?

Freyja: It's the way of life! (Notes, pp. 457-59).

After a few more interchanges the lesson was over. At our Thursday meeting Linda said that she had liked this lesson very much although she felt the difficulty of not having read chapter seven when the lesson progressed further. In other words, the class was cooperative during the discussion, but concepts from the novel were missing. Not only were the concepts missing but also the frame of reference, or the context that was set in the novel. So, the class showed much improvement in their verbal interactions although their inquiry needed sharper focus. Throughout the lesson the boys were silent and not disruptive and Thor participated as usual.

Helga gave the 23rd lesson to her students after the coffee break that morning. The lesson was about to start when the nurse brought the kids a fluoride solution to wash their mouths with. At 10:28 they got to form the horseshoe, quickly and without any protests. From left to right their seats were: Helga, Agatha, Doreen, Erla, Cora, Buena, Adelle, Angela, Sophie, Ari, Torfi, Thomas, Titus, Zophon, Trausti, Tab

and Helga.

The reading ran smoothly, Tab was absent minded in the second round. Adelle and friends reminded him of his turn. Trausti noticed a missing letter in one word. Sophie had a paragraph of one line to read and she continued into the next one, but Adelle and more girls cut her off. After her turn in the first round Leona took a sheet of paper and started to draw something. In a short while she put the paper aside and took the novel up again, but she did not know the location in her second turn. When chapter seven was done Helga opened the agenda by asking: "What were we reading about?" The responses poured in and Helga put them on the blackboard. She did not put names in parenthesis after the discussion items, that she only did in the 17th lesson. In what follows the points she wrote up will be underlined.

The first point came from Buena, but more students were already talking about the same idea. It ended on the board as: Differences of kind - Differences of degrees. The students kept on making their suggestions:

Angela: That she had forgot what her dad had been talking about!

[Pauses, then she adds.] But still it interested Harry!

Tab: Inventions, the difference ---

Trausti: Nature! [This point can be heard clearly from the recording, but there was too much going on in the classroom for Helga to notice and Trausti did not repeat it.]

Helga: Yes, Buena's point was about the difference between differences of degrees and kinds. [The classroom is very noisy! Helga refers next to Angela's point and writes it on the board as:] To forget - Harry's interest. Anything else. Tab?

Tab: Yes: Human inventions.

Helga: Human inventions [on board].

Sophie: Bill Beck is jealous of Harry! If that is true that he is jealous of him, then it can be that he threw the stone!

Helga: Perhaps we can get to know more about the relation between Bill and Harry by thinking about this sentence. Are there more ideas that come to you? Then for the few minutes that we have left I want to start on this point! [Points on board at "Human inventions.]

Adelle (?): Do we have one minute left?

Helga: We have a few minutes because we started so late! And it was



Tab, if I remember correctly, that brought this up. What do they say in the chapter about this?

The class is unruly, especially the boys. The unruliness is more of an excitement and I think the reason for it is that the kids know that do not have much time for the discussion.

Ari and Trausti debate whether animals can make inventions and Zophon joins them:

Helga: Wait! Wait a second! Now we have two poles (talking at the same time)! There was someone in the corner over here, was it you Zophon, that said that animals couldn't make inventions?

[Disagreements on the point.] -- You do not agree on that! Adelle, you said that animals could make inventions. I want to ---

[Inaudible because of noise.] - but what about the other animals?

Adelle: They can also invent how to drink and eat and things like that.

Helga: Thomas, can I hear (what you want to say)?

Thomas: Birds --

Helga: Birds can invent the best way of making a nest!

Ari: Crocodiles invent how they are to lay eggs!

Helga: But do you think these are inventions?

Agatha: These are not inventions, it is their nature!

Helga: It is their nature! Why do you say that?

Titus: They progress --

Helga: Agatha doesn't agree that this can be (a question about) inventions. This is just something innate, this is their nature!

Simultaneously a "No!" was heard from the boys and a debate opened, primarily between Titus and Ari. Helga reprimanded them but they kept on talking. Ari claimed that it is our nature to wear clothes, but then Torfi reprimands him:

Torfi: Ari, you are not to interrupt!

Helga: Perhaps we then have to make a distinction between what is due to upbringing and what is due to nature? Tab do you have a comment to make on this?

Tab: -- It (a bird) must have had a special reason for making this - (nest)!

Ari: To protect the young one!

Helga: So that it did not make this to begin with?

Tab: It didn't invent it! No way!

Ari: There must have been a reason for this!

Thomas: But if the bird goes up in the tree to --. Then that's invention!

Tab: ---

Trausti: I think that whales were forced to become sea animals because of eruptions and things like that.

Tab spoke simultaneously and he started earlier so very few, except my recorder, pick Trausti's comment up. Trausti seems to be close to entering the discussion. It helps that he is much interested in the issue he mentioned in the beginning of the lesson; nature.

Helga: --Sophie!

Sophie: For example, if some man would be out in a forest /

Helga: - (Ari cut the chat out!) Sophie is making a point now!

Sophie: -- The man doesn't have no nature like the animals, he can do nothing! -- like to scratch animals to death, bite them and run them up and things lie that. Then he has to make an axe and things like that and he has to start make -(weapons). He always needs a stick! The animals just have a different nature!

Angela: No, they do not!

Leona: Can I?

Titus: Humans --

[Debates.]

Sophie: There is a species of birds that uses instruments to open eggs! They pick up stones and let them fall!

Helga: But this, Sophie, can I just ask you! You said that humans invent things, but that the animals have a different nature?

Sophie: Yes I did!

Helga: In what way?

Sophie: Humans have just advanced the most in terms of evolution!

Thomas: Humans are just imitating all the others!

Leona: Can I? Can I?

Helga: But still you (Sophie) claim that/

Sophie: Humans have just advanced the most in terms of evolution, but they are the species that have least of capacities that's why they must really - (transcend) their physical capacities!

Given the narrow time limitation I think the discussion had by now advanced further than Helga expected. The time limitations can also explain why Helga bypassed making a connection to the point about differences of degree and kinds. Sophie's last point certainly opened a path in that direction.

Thomas: Physical!?

Helga: So man has had to use the mind more than the matter?

Sophie: Yes, --

Leona: Can I?

Helga: You were before Tab?

Leona: Yes I was!

Helga: Let me hear!

Leona: -- In ancient times we were considered like half-wild animals. Then we didn't make axes and things like that. Nowadays we don't need that stuff because we have become so, somehow, we just have machines in place of this!

Angela: I wonder what it will be like in 100 years!

Helga: Yes, can we then say that we have evolved to the point of having a particular culture?

Leona: Then we'll just have robots! [Answer to Angela.]

Tab: A better world -- but we have developed ourselves and that's why we have come so far in evolution!

Sophie: We needed it the most, we, the animals didn't need it (evolution) as much as we did to have a thing like that!

Tab: Yes, but we (couldn't do a thing against dinosaurs or something like that!)

Sophie: Yes, but I'm making the same point! I'm saying the same thing as you are! The animals do not need as much to defend themselves!

This is atypical point for Sophie. Usually she stated her position without minding much how it related to the general discussion. We have even seen her complain about her classmates' lack of understanding.

This incident is descriptive of the process when students learn as a group, but not only as individuals.

Helga: Thomas!

Thomas: When humans, look,

Helga: Dear Agatha, sit down!

Thomas: -- (When humans made) inventions, all that they thought up was really imitation from the animals! [Pause.]

Helga: Can you give us an example?

Thomas: An example? Flying, for example! And -- ("weapons" or "killing"), they can't kill no animals!

Tab: That's no invention!

Thomas: Yes, it is invention!

Sophie: They make the weapons from animals' teeth and things like that!

Angela: Yes, those are inventions!

Helga: Ari!

Ari: It is in the nature of animals to creep up to their enemies!

Sophie: Yes, at least that's what some animals do!

Ari: Lions and tigers, they creep about in tall grass so they can catch antelopes and things -. Instead of running! Is this their nature?

Helga: Can you answer that question?

Sophie: This is just their nature, look, like humans for example. It's just their nature, like the animals' nature; things like eating are in the nature of all men and animals. It is just their nature!

Angela: To eat is naturally the nature of animals! But hunting, that's an invention! That is an invention of the animal!

Sophie: That's nature!

Angela: No, it isn't!

Ari: To hunt is nature!

[Debates.]

Sophie: But it is not just one lion that does it! The lions that do it are many and it takes centuries! - It takes many centuries for the lions to learn this! (To hunt in groups.)

Leona: Yes, this is a discovery!

Angela: Many centuries!!

Sophie: OH! You don't understand this!

Angela: I think it is only you that doesn't understand this!

Sophie: I understand completely what I'm saying! It is just YOU that don't understand it!

Helga: Look, can you tell me in a few words what they mean? [Directed to other members of the class.]

Sophie: Look, what I mean is that, for example, it is said that, perhaps, you know, it wasn't one lion that walked, perhaps, that was running around the antelopes and then she saw that the antelopes ran away! Then nobody said: "Aha! One has to creep to get close to them!" It was not a one lion's invention! They were MANY! It took MANY centuries!

[Loud debates!]

Thomas (?): You were a lion or what in your former life!?

Angela: Sophie, were you a lion in your former life!?

Sophie: No, I wasn't!

Ari: - You are making statements on something you know nothing about, like you did about the mind! You asserted that your mind was some kind of a steam!

Sophie: - It is no steam! One can't see it!

[Loud debates.]

Helga: Kids! We have talked a lot about --

[The students keep on and run over her and gradually it is clear that Sophie is arguing against all the rest.]

Helga: Kids! I want to cut in on this discussion. I am going to ask you, from what Sophie was saying, can you think about it whether there is any difference between the minds of animals and humans? -  
- Is there a difference?

Sophie: -- Look, if it is a discovery [I think she meant to say "invention"] to creep around like that, then -- men are much faster in --

Tab: Lions have not evolved as far, they can just --

Thomas: If we assume, look, if we assume that there are two animals in existence! There are two lions, one of them discovers how to creep about, then that's a discovery! Then, if we say, lions are always in groups or something, then it is an invention in the group! This is always an invention!

In the interchanges above we see that the students are increasingly starting to direct questions and comments to one another. They are even starting to play explicitly with assumptions as Thomas's last point indicates. Now Helga does not need to spend as much energy on controlling the kids as she needed in the early lessons. Instead of having to jump in, in every second turn, the teacher's dilemma is now when to jump into the discussion and when not. The goal is to have the kids manage and control their discussion as much as possible and Helga's kids are moving in the right direction.

Helga: Can we maybe move over to different kinds of animals and have more examples of animals? Once you read about bees, how is this with them? ---

Leona: How to fly, was invented by humans!

Sophie: Humans also invented how to let bees fly for them! It's easier for them (than for humans) to get to the honey!

Angela: They, they discovered /

Helga: Then you're talking about division of classes!

Thomas: The bees discovered that there was honey and things like that!

Sophie: NO! We discovered that it could be eaten!

Thomas: Yes, but I'm talking about --, they didn't discover no --. They discovered how to collect it!

Helga: It is a discovery in your opinion?

---

Helga: Are we then slowly recognizing that animals can make inventions just like humans can?

Chorus: YES!

Helga: Trausti, you were about to say something!

S: We are animals!

Trausti: Men invented gliding kites from others, (from) eagles, and sea birds where the up-current is extremely strong!

Tab: Also, sharks always close their eyes before they attack, then (how should sharks have seen that they always damage their eyes after an attack)!

Helga: Can I make one point before we finish? /

Titus: The eyes are so much to the front on sharks! [A few days earlier there had been wild life show on sharks on TV.]

Tab: I know, they need to be closed!

Helga: Do the animals then have a mind? Can they /

Angela: They sense things!

---

Helga: Doreen!

Doreen: (Animals can just as well have minds as humans can!) Animals can be very wise!

Helga: Doreen says that animals can be very wise! Do you agree with that?

S's: Yes!

Helga: Leona!

Leona: Like with horses in cow boy movies. There the horses just get crazy when they sense -

[The boys are "chatting" among themselves: "A mind is needed to know!" Ari is loud.]

Helga: That is to say that the animals can have some kind of a mind?

S's: Yes they have!

Helga: Angela!

Angela: Yes, flies do! It was in some show on the TV, they just see a tiny bit, all in mist, (but) when one gets closer they take off! They sense that there is someone there!

Helga: But is it --

[Ari comes in again from the background: "Its nature is to kick -"]

Helga: -- You were saying: This is a sensation! /

Leona: Yes, it is a sensation!

Helga: - Is that the same as -?

S: No!

Helga: But Mr. Portos says, in the chapter, Jane's father (in the

novel), that the difference between animals and humans is that humans can invent things, that that is their culture, but not the animals'?

S: --

Sophie: Perhaps the difference is that he is meaning inventions like machines, but animals have, at least there are very few animals that have invented some machines! ---

Helga: Is there a difference in this? What is that difference?

Now we are getting close to the first point of the agenda, but it is somewhat surprising to me that no one has made explicit connections to it. The fact is that although there is an agenda on the board there is no way to predict the exact course of a philosophical discussion. However, the advantages of the agenda are obvious. For example, it makes reflection easier for the teacher, both on the spot ("Aha! It would help us now to connect this issue to that point!" "This moves us to the next point!") and in retrospection: ("What would have happened if I would have moved on to, or connected the discussion to point x?" "What prevented us to build a discussion on that fine point?")

Sophie: Animals discover that they can do things this way, but men would start to make nets or something!

Helga: Tab and then Leona is the last one!

Tab: Perhaps they have no --

Helga: That is to say, this animal, has learned this and then brought it over to the next generation so it will do likewise? Is that an invention?

Adelle (?): Leona has her hand raised!

Sophie: Leona has had her hand up there for almost ten years!

Helga: Leona, it's your turn!

Leona: It can just as well be that some animal has invented something in a very far, far away place and the humans have not invented it yet!

Helga: Exactly! It's hard to say! [Her intonation indicates that the lesson is over.] ---

Leona: Like when a monkey went to the moon --

Angela: Monkeys (cannot be in a band)! [Debate among Angela, Sophie, Leona, Adelle and Tab. Ari starts to sing a tune.]

Helga: Do we evolve? Who make the inventions? Let's make those our final words today! (Notes, pp. 461-472).

Overall there was some unruliness among the kids during this lesson, most likely because they knew that their time was limited. At least, it was not because of lack of interest as they were eager to discuss the

issues they brought up and no one pointed out that they should have shifted long time ago into the next lesson. In the discussion the students both asked questions of one another and kept a record of who should be the next speaker. Thus the lesson was not only a successful one in terms of applying dialogue as a method of teaching, but it also showed that as a group the students were starting to internalize the method in their conduct. In terms of content, the dialogue could even have been stronger if "human inventions" had been related to the first point on the agenda: "Differences of degrees - differences of kinds." As can be expected Helga had no reason but to be pleased with lesson above.

Helga gave the 24th lesson to her students in first period the next morning. Torfi was the first one to ask whether they should not form the horseshoe and when Helga affirmed he moved his chair in. Tab and Trausti followed him. From left to right the order of seats were: Helga, Doreen, Sophie, Louise, Agatha, Erla, Buena, Adelle, Angela, Ari, Titus, Thomas, Zophon, Tab, Trausti, Torfi, Logi and Helga. Helga started by reminding them that they had talked about human inventions yesterday and as soon as she mentioned the item the kids went off again on the same subject.

Agatha asked whether they should have their books ready for reading and Helga answered that it was quite uncertain whether they would read at all and she stood up to write the agenda from yesterday on the board:

- (1) Differences of kind - Differences of degrees.
- (2) To forget - Harry's interest.
- (3) Human inventions.
- (4) Bill beck is jealous of Harry!

And to the side of it she wrote two columns of Humans and Animals under the heading INVENTIONS. In the former column she wrote:

Airplanes, boats, computers. The latter column of inventions by animals had: Nest-making, Lions creep at prey, Birds break eggs. When done she asked about how we maintain human inventions. Trausti had the first suggestion: "By continue making them!" "By writing them down!" was Tab's suggestion. Then Trausti added: "By making drawings of them!"

Trausti and Torfi had a conversation on electricity that Helga asked them to share with the others. Sophie added a point about evolution. Soon the discussion came to culture of humans and to the question whether animals have culture. Ari claimed that animals do have culture and slowly the discussion built on that point, but Helga did not switch over to the first point of the agenda which is logically prior to comparisons between different cultures.

Now we will let the class speak for itself:

Sophie: We have a better culture than they do!

Helga: Do we have a better culture? Do you think there is any difference between their cultures?

Sophie: We make much more perfect things and [pause].

Helga: We make more perfect things!

Sophie: Like for example the spider that is, it makes a web /

Helga: Yes! Girls! Cut it out! This is not the appropriate place for this! [Reprimands Buena that chats and chats with Adelle.] Sophie would you please repeat what you were saying? [Here Ari raises his hand as he calls out:]

Ari: Sophie, they make much stronger webs than one thinks! It is an EXTREMELY strong material they have for it, if it would be as thick as steel then it would have more strength than steel! They only (make their webs) so EXTREMELY thin.

Helga: But is there still a difference? /

Ari: If the spiders would be as big as the man then it's web would be AWFULLY strong!

Helga: So if we compare them in terms of size then (they do a fine job)?

Sophie: No, it isn't (that strong)! There are webs --. Humans can perhaps make threads that are as wide as and - they could be much stronger!

Helga: Thomas, you were about to say something!

Thomas: Yes, about ---

Helga: (You're saying) it is not a good word to use "strong" over what the animals do!

Sophie: Stronger! --

Angela: There are also small animals that can attack people! --

Helga: Tab! [Debates in the background.]

Tab: The spider makes a stronger web --- [I think he repeated Ari's



point.]

Sophie: Man can utilize metals and things and that the animals cannot!

Thomas (?): Animals can just --

Tab: -- /

Sophie: Have you ever seen an elephant mining for metals or something?

[Titus, Angela, Ari and more protest to Sophie's argumentation.]

Helga: Titus, what did you say? I couldn't hear it?

Titus: (Comparison to such a small animal is inappropriate!)

Sophie: I'm not saying that! They make things, (but) men make much stronger things! /

Thomas: You said: If men were stronger!

Sophie: NO! I said that men make stronger things!

Thomas: Before you said that /

Sophie: No! I NEVER said that! I have NEVER said that! You just shut up!

Helga: There is perhaps a misunderstanding causing this?

Sophie, Titus and Thomas enter a short debate and most likely it is a misunderstanding that causes it. Sophie was talking about the things that men make, but the boys maintained that she had been talking about man himself. Perhaps Sophie did, but the boys did not give her much room to correct her statement. Perhaps they were teasing Sophie although they were quite serious on the spot and I find it more likely that they were trying to "nail" her; to show that she had been inconsistent. Sophie did get irritated and reacted accordingly; now she did not complain over stupidity but simply told the boys to shut up!

Soon Helga managed to silence them and the discussion continued.

Helga: Angela, what were you going to say?

Angela: I think that animals do not make many things!

Helga: But you do agree that this word "strong" is not a good one to describe the difference between inventions by people and by animals? You do agree on that, don't you?

Sophie: Man is physically much weaker than animals, but they make stronger things! You dummy! (Thomas.)

Helga: Sophie, could you perhaps give reasons for what you are saying by an example?

Sophie: Yes, for example when animals make such thin threads. People have made threads that are as thin but still they much stronger! That's a great --

....[Debates.]

Sophie: -- Oh! You are so stupid!

S: You said he was stronger!

Sophie: I NEVER SAID THAT MAN IS THE STRONGER ONE! ---

Helga: Wait a second! What is this all about really? Sophie is evaluating things from her perspective, what she means by "strong,"

she cannot do it except on her own premises, that is to say, what is weak and what is strong (in fact). It sounds to me as you are taking it from the animal itself. It is a small one, but in terms of its size and available materials it makes fine things. That is to say, we are speaking of two different things!

S's: Yes!

Notice what a fine job Helga did in pinpointing the different perspectives that the kids were coming from. She moves on by making a nice connection to the agenda:

Helga: From what she thinks is strong, she cannot put it on another basis. Should we assume we are talking about the spider's invention of its web and about human invention of some web? Is there some word that we can use to describe this difference? Some word over here on the blackboard that we can use?

Ari: Difference of degree, but /

Helga: Difference of degree?

Ari: No, it's a difference of kind! Difference of kind!

Helga: You said difference of degree!

Girl: No, Ari said difference of degree! ....

Ari: This is really a difference of degree! This is exactly the same!

Helga: Uu, Ari! First you said difference of kind?

Ari: First I said difference of degree, then I wasn't quite sure, but I still think it's a difference of degree!

Ari's contribution is a fine example of reflective thinking and then Helga brings in the criteria of consistency. Ari could have been asked to explain "Why" he got confused and the discussion could have kept building from there. But the class took another route as they sensed that a definition was needed before proceeding further. They defined by giving examples:

Tab: Difference of kind is when --

Helga: What is difference of degree? If, let's say /

Ari: The difference in intelligence between babies and grownups!

Helga: That is then a clear example of difference of degree?

Ari: From it follows that there is a difference of degree if the spider makes a web out of some material and man makes a web of other material!

Helga: Is that comparable?

S: Yes!

Helga: Couldn't it be a difference of kind? What do you say?

Ari: The web could be of different kind but not the -("making").

Helga: What is a difference of kind? If we play around with these words? Can you give an example of a difference of kind? We already had an example of difference of degree, about the intelligence. Can we say, if we change man's inventions to an

apple [i.e. if we put an "apple" instead of "invention" on board] /  
 S: Into an apple!?  
 Helga: You are not to understand it as an apple, but what we do is to  
 put an apple in place of this and a potato in place of that! /  
 Ari: That's a difference of kind!  
 Helga: That's a difference of kind?  
 Ari: That's a completely different thing!  
 Helga: That's a completely different thing! You mean two different  
 groups?  
 Ari: There we have ---  
 [Ari, Tab and Helga talk for a moment.]  
 Helga: I would like to have more of you entering the discussion!  
 Sophie: Listen! I think it is, concerning the man making stronger  
 things, that we are really right on both sides! -- Still it is  
 right!

Sophie cannot be heard well as Louise and Agatha are talking  
 together. Helga reprimands them. It is noteworthy that Sophie has been  
 silent since Helga pointed out the different perspectives that were  
 causing Sophie's debate with the boys. That Sophie has been quiet for  
 so many interchanges supports the idea that she has been reflecting on  
 the issue. Now she called out to announce that both parties had really  
 been right, but still she seems to have problems with two "right"  
 perspectives as her way is "really" the right one:

Ari: Sophie! [Calling on Sophie in a weak voice.]  
 Helga: Is it then just the animals' circumstances?  
 Sophie: Yes, then it is the same way with them, but in reality my  
 position is really right! --  
 Ari: Sophie! If for example the animals would use cost-fiber to make  
 their threads instead of -- (their natural material)  
 Sophie: I DON'T HEAR NOTHING OF WHAT ARI IS SAYING!  
 Louise: Yes, you just YELL across to him!  
 Helga: Let's have a good silence!  
 Ari: If the animals would make their webs out of cost-fiber instead of a  
 silver thread, in place of this thread, then it would even get much  
 stronger than the men!  
 S: Yes!  
 Angela: No!  
 Helga: That brings us back to the material available to each (maker).  
 Sophie: Yes, the animals don't have that -- (selection of materials).  
 Ari: There is no one here talking about metals!  
 Sophie: Metals are materials too, and when --  
 Angela: The animals can't make no inventions --  
 Helga: We are about to -- What were you going to say?  
 Torfi: Animals make no inventions. Martians --  
 Helga: Then it a question of how do you know that?  
 [Debates.]

Helga: I think we can state the conclusion of our discussion as that there is some difference between humans and animals, but we do not quite agree on whether it is difference of degree or of kind!

Buena: (What is the difference between differences of degrees and kinds?)

S: You weren't listening?

Buena: Yes I was, but I just don't understand it!

Helga: Should we maybe take a very short one (example) before we quit: What's the difference between differences of kinds and degrees?

[Some start giving examples but Ari takes over.]

Ari: I really must consider this to be a difference of degree because the day might come that the animals will become (like humans). Once we, the humans, were just as immature as the animals are, we were just monkeys! Perhaps they will become, perhaps they really can become as mature as we in a few millions of years!

Helga: -- /

Sophie: We are still ahead of them on the road of evolution! (And that's why they'll never catch up with us!) - Do you think we will stop somewhere on the road of evolution?

Helga: Why hasn't that then happened, Sophie? Why haven't we been superior in that respect?

Tab: It is because --/

Ari: We are a different species with a bigger brain!

----(Notes, pp. 473-83.)

By now the period was over and the class got unruly, but in closing the lesson Helga asked Adelle and Buena to stand up and go side by side so that all could "see" the difference in degree between their heights. Thomas also announced his confusion over the difference between differences of degree and kinds. This incident prompts us that the content of the discussion could have been improved by incorporating appropriate exercises from the manual. In this case it could have been done at various points in the lesson above, but it would also be appropriate to start the next lesson by reminding them of their confusion and have the group work on an exercise from the manual. However, the most important thing is that the students realize and admit that they do not understand what is at stake.

Overall this was a good lesson which Helga and her students enjoyed, they were eager to discuss the issues brought up and they also asked questions of one another. In general, the students who did not

participate openly in the discussion listened as, for example, the underlined question above from an unknown student to Buena indicates. Thus the lesson was not only successful in terms of applying dialogue as a method of teaching, but the method now constituted the normal context for the philosophy lessons.

Linda gave the 24th lesson to her students after the morning break that day. She did not read them a story as she hoped the kids would instead use the snack-time to take most of the chat out of their chests. The snack-time period was approximately ten minutes or unusually short. When Linda asked them to move over to the circle I only heard one low "yuk" from one individual. The kids were quick to form the circle and their were from left to right: Linda, Sjöfn, Var, Gefn, Gna, Frigg, Freyja, Odinn, Loki, Hodur, Thor, Syr, Saga, Snotra, Fulla, Hlin, Horn, Vidarr, Hrund, Hildur, Hrist and Linda again.

Linda announced that they would read all of chapter seven today and that they would do it by each person reading one paragraph. Hildur started the reading and the turns went from right to left. Both Hodur and Thor said pass, but Loki was absent minded when his turn came up. Saga called on him and right away he read his paragraph. When done, Linda began:

Linda: Well, then we are done reading chapter seven!

S: ---

Linda: No, we are not reading chapter eight right now! BOYS! Don't you throw your books to the floor like that! What kind of childishness is this?! What are you saying girls?

(Syr) and Saga: ---

Linda: You don't get the difference between difference of kind and difference of degree? ...

S: ---

Linda: Difference of degree: High, higher, highest. This is just like how the adjectives go, isn't it?

S: What's difference of kind?

Linda: Girls, what do you say? Difference of degree would then be? - But then difference of kind?

Frigg: There is a difference of kind between men and /

Linda: Frigg, what are you saying?

Frigg: There is also a difference of kind between men and cats --

Linda: What do the rest of you think? Is that a difference of degree, the difference between men and cats?

Thor: Isn't that just a difference of degree?

Linda: Is it a difference of degree or a difference of kind, the difference between men and cats?

Thor: It's a difference of degrees!

Linda: Can I just have your opinions on this? Is it a difference of degree or a difference of kind, the difference between men and cats and why is it a difference of kinds?

S: ---

Linda: Because there is a difference of kind between weight and height and you think this is comparable? Well, should we take this example on the one hand, the difference between men and cats and the difference between babies and men on the other? Are those differences of degrees or of kinds?

Frigg: There is a difference of degrees between men! Their way of life is the same and things like that!

Linda: They have the same way of life --?

Frigg: It's the same being!

Linda: What do you think of this definition over here, kids? Will you please pay attention to this! Loki, please! Loki! Shouldn't we discuss broken fingers later? -- Some other time?

Hrist: No, let's talk about it now! This is a very serious matter! (Notes, pp. 484-86).

There were evidently two poles in the classroom. On the one hand, some students, Frigg, Saga, Syr, and Thor, showed their interest openly and were helpful and quite willing to participate. On the other hand, the boys and the Valkyries were busy having a fight. The fight lasted throughout the lesson and their disruptions became more serious, especially between Hildur and Odinn. The situation was a difficult one for the teacher to handle, Linda tried to continue with the discussion for at least five more minutes, then she switched over to an exercise on differences of degrees and differences of kinds (Philosophical Inquiry p. 174). The class worked on the exercise in a whole group format. Frigg, Saga, Hrist, Thor, Hildur, Gna, Freyja, Syr were among the ones that spoke on the items.

At the Thursday meeting Linda expressed her disappointment because of the disruptions, but she walked into the classroom with great

expectations because of 23rd lesson. She complained of never having had the working peace she needed and finally she had moved in on the exercise "to hold on to something" (Notes, p. 406). There is no doubt that switching over to the exercise helped working on the content and it did also serve as an instrument to enforce discipline.

On the brighter side came the fact that Thor participated and did not join Odinn, Loki and Hodur in their behavior although he sat right next to them. In general Linda thought Thor had become more relaxed lately and she stated that he now worked busily in all subjects. She admitted that taking turns by paragraphs in the reading had worked out just fine, but still she thought it sad to know that one person would always say "pass."

In general Linda thought she was starting to see great improvements in the group and that they were certainly moving in the right direction. The main problem now being the uncontrollable unrest that could pop up at unpredictable moments.

#### Reflections on week ten

Although moving slowly in the right direction the conditions for a community of inquiry to operate had not been established in Linda's class; as values the needed respect to persons and ideas was not shared by the group. By themselves, I think most of her students met the conditions, but it only took the conflicts between the Boys and the Valkyries to set the classroom off track.

Helga's class had not only improved greatly in terms of establishing the objective and subjective conditions needed for a community of inquiry to operate (since the 17th lesson), but the conditions have become valuable to them. They have become committed to the procedures

of inquiry, to responsible manners of listening and talking, while inquiring at the same time.

I felt it was about time to check on whether habits and dispositions created in their community of inquiry would show up outside the philosophy lessons. That was the area that I was originally most interested to research, but it was the same story with this project as with too many innovations in schools: When much time and effort "finally" brings about good things and educationally worthwhile, the researchers usually must write their reports and teachers are ready for normal schoolwork as they feel guilty of having taken time away from their students' regular learning activities which are meant to prepare them for the "real" (i.e. the same) world that students were prepared for last year.

In the early lessons it made sense to distinguish between content, method and the teachers' personal perception of their teaching. Now, when Helga's classroom has converted into a community of inquiry, this distinction breaks down. It becomes inapplicable to isolate the "content" of the lesson from the "method" of teaching, the content becomes one with the dialogue. The method becomes a way of life, so to speak, and perceptions of success move from having control, be it over the kids, over the dialogue, or over the content, to respect shown to individuals and their ideas. Success becomes a question of cooperation in coming to grips with the issues, the ideas, under investigation. In a community of inquiry, both the success of individuals and the group becomes deeper than in classrooms where students learn and succeed only as individuals.

The last part of the Thursday meeting this week we spent on previewing my agenda for a parental meeting that was held that evening.



My points were under five headings and my outline follows on the next page. When it came to point III.c. Linda could not help commenting that she had been watching two politicians debating on TV last night and she had thought to herself: "Oh my God! This needs to be taught in schools! They are not talking together and they are just in a group of TWO!" (notes, p. 499). Seeing the flounder on TV made her feel more comfortable about her own class.

At point IV.d. both of them agreed that the kids boredom is not genuine. In relation to point IV.a. Helga revealed that when I missed the beginning of the 21st lesson the kids had started looking for me and talked about me as the "Thinker!" Linda has not heard this expression in her group. About point IV.b. Linda comments that the the way of discussing we have been trying to establish is more aimful than in discussions they have used before in their teaching. In relation to this point they start talking about their insecurity towards the subject which got reflected over to the kids, and that they had not really been ready for the project. To this I add that my own preparation had not been perfect and the following conversation took place:

Linda: I think I know the mistakes we did in the beginning. I think we were too undecided, we didn't really know to what degree we should be firm and all those things. Everyone was talking simultaneously and things like that.

Helga: Yes, I think we took you (H.P.) too literally at times: "Let them take off in the discussion." Things (you said) like that! And that made us nervous to tackle some things well enough.

Me: ...I am learning a lot from this and this is a part of it: How to arrange for a project like this. We have a question of priorities and I think it has become evidently clear that... we must have a peace to work before we can take off.

Linda: Exactly!

Helga: Yes, we must!

Linda: It was also really stupid on our behalf, we should have known that it would not work out that way in the beginning. But somehow we were extremely optimistic and somehow we thought we already had good enough control over the kids for this to be no problem. I think we were just so insecure and that it reflected over to the kids and that is why we received those (negative) responses,

LOOKING BACK: AGENDA FOR PARENTAL MEETING

## I. WHAT IS THE CURRICULA ABOUT?

- a. A series of six novels and manuals. How they came about and from where.
- b. Harry Stottlemeier's Discovery: Starts from perplexities. Logic and search for good reasons with emphasis on dialogue. Give an example how this works in teaching.

## II. HOW PHILOSOPHY COULD FIT IN WITH SCHOOLWORK!

- a. Across subjects to glue them together.
- b. As a subject in its own right.
- c. How does this fit in with our curriculum guide?

## III. POSSIBLE BENEFITS

- a. Democratic: The aim is to reflect on our world of ideas and things. To enable students to work on their knowledge but not simply add to it. (Presumed by any democracy.)
- b. Reasoning: Criteria from logic to distinguish between sloppy thinking and good thinking. Easily measurable.
- c. Morality: Sitting and discussing in a circle requires certain moral virtues and skills: Listening, respect, tolerance. The class dialogue serves both as a model and as a training field for critical thinking in a community. (When a certain stage in morality is reached as an aim that serves, in turn, as a means towards the democratic ideal.)

## IV. HOW HAS IT WORKED OUT?

- a. Slower than we expected.
- b. From cloud of birds to decent working peace.
- c. From reprimands to positive atmosphere.
- d. From (faked) boredom to a everyday context. Students have begun working on philosophy as on any ordinary task.

## V. EXPLANATIONS!

- a. The kids feel themselves in a laboratory circumstances. They know and have commented on the project as being experimental.
- b. When introducing new curricula and new methods difficulties are to be expected, because the:
  - Curriculum is different and new to students and teachers.
  - Dialogue as method of teaching is different and new to students and teachers.
  - Students are conservative, they hold on to what they already have.

because (when) we are so undecided and insecure we get altogether different responses than when we know what we are doing and how we are doing it.

Helga: That's just natural!

Me: For one thing I'm out of line with reality (as it has been established in the classrooms), but for another thing I'm pretty sure that the next time (if there will be a "next time") you do this you would go differently about it. For example with the reading and the agenda, isn't that so? (Notes, pp. 501-502).

There are no clear answers to my question except that Linda agrees that she likes the arrangement it gives and in turn that takes us into a discussion on Thor. It still hurts her to know that he is the one that has to say pass. I talk about "best possible world" where it should be no problem for Thor not to read.

When it came to the point about the students being conservative both Helga and Linda showed strong agreements and Linda gave a most enlightening comment:

Yes, to that I agree! They are awfully conservative! It doesn't seem to make a difference what we are trying out with those kids. They always come and complain: "Listen, why don't we do it the same way as they do it in some other school! They do it that way over there!" I have sometimes had the feeling that the kids here, in this school, they often get to try much more and different methods than I know of (in other schools). For example, more different than those practiced in the school that my son goes to. They have gotten so used to it, that new and interesting methods are often tried out with them, that there is nothing new to it anymore! (Notes, p. 503).

The parental meeting that evening went as planned except for participation. Only five parents, two fathers and three mothers showed up to begin with and one more mother showed up at the end of the meeting and commented: "At least I showed up!" The five parents were all to girls; four of them in Linda's class and one in Helga's class. Overall the meeting was supportive to the project, the most positive comment coming from Sjöfn's father that commented that his daughter liked the classes and that she had interest for the subject. However, she had complained at home of her comments not being taken seriously and

therefore she had stopped trying to participate openly in the discussions.

I learned afterwards that parents usually make a good attendance at the first general meeting in the fall semester, but a poor one to other meetings. Our meeting was no exception to that "rule."

RECREATION AND POSTSCRIPT

There were no classes at school in the eleventh week, as students and staff devoted their activities to prepare for and conduct an art festival held at the Training School for themselves and the parents. I used this week to read and study my Notes. I wish I had had more time to spend for that purpose earlier.

The three of us met again on Monday in the beginning of week twelve. We prepared for chapter eight and both Helga and Linda admitted being nervous starting again after the week of art. The Christmas break was also due in two weeks and in the meantime they had some examinations to do. These circumstances called for a different atmosphere and both of them had low expectations for their upcoming classes. Because of these extraordinary circumstances I look at this week as a postscript to our research period.

Linda gave the 25th lesson to her students in the first period Tuesday morning. The kids formed the circle without any protests and their places were from left to right: Linda, Vidarr, Snotra, Frigg, Hildur, Hrund, Hodur, Loki, Odinn, Gefn, Freyja, Syr, Saga, Fulla, Var, Horn, Hlin, Gna, Sjofn, Thor and Linda again. They read the first part of chapter eight by taking automatic turns and it worked out smoothly although Hodur, Loki, Odinn and Thor, and Freyja passed in both of their turns. Hlin and Gna passed in the first turn but read in the latter one.

When Linda suggested that they would create an agenda like they were at a "real meeting" Hildur was the first one to react, but when asked to repeat the point she backed off. So Linda decided the first point herself. Loki asked: "When does the Christmas break start?" (Notes, p. 522). But pretty soon the kids got caught on and when done with the

agenda it looked like this on the blackboard:

1. Can a woman from Vietnam become a minister of fishing? (Linda)
2. Did the gerbils get something to drink? (Saga)
3. How did the rats get into Luther's house? (Hlin)
4. Mars! (Sjofn)
5. What color would be most beautiful for the flowers (to paint them in)? (Syr)
6. The color of the sky! (Hildur)

From my point of view, creation of the agenda was a big step forward. However, the discussion that followed was meager, but not because of interruptions from students. It just seemed to be a day for scattered points to be made. Also there were about five minutes left of the hour when the librarian entered to remind the kids of returning overdue books. The last words of the lesson were though positive and came from Frigg: "Ok! We'll keep on with this tomorrow!"

Helga gave the 25th lesson to her students after the morning break that day. They were quick to form the circle and from left to right their places were: Helga, Salome, Angela, Adelle, Agatha, Leona, Erla, Louise, Thomas, Trausti, Tab, Titus, Torfi, Ari, Logi, Sophie, and Helga. The reading worked out fine except that Logi stands up to take a picture of the group and that causes a short interruption, and Ari was absent minded when his turn came. Leona reprimanded him sharply: "I can't stand this! Ari go on! You're supposed to pay attention! Oh boy, what are you really thinking about?" (Notes, p. 526).

They read three pages and when Helga asked them to stop they wanted to read more but Helga refused and Leona commented that she (Helga) is the one that always has the final decision on everything. Other students made no big deal out of this.

Helga's first question was: "What were the kids doing?" Leona came with the first suggestion: "They were thinking!" Erla added: "Thinking about whether a woman could be the minister of fishing!" Tab simply

said: "Mars!" This did not go to the agenda but Helga repeated her question; the kids were thinking but what were they doing? She encouraged the kids to take a second look at the reading and soon seven different mental acts had been enumerated and they constituted the agenda. But the class was difficult to handle. Adelle and Angela chatted and so did Erla and Louise. Titus was easy going but Torfi rolled his book to form a trumpet and he shouted through it: "Isn't the test about to begin?" (Notes, p. 526). The fact was that they had a test to take in the next lesson. In a short while Helga commented that they would just discuss the chapter later as it was too difficult for them at this hour.

Helga's 26th and last lesson (cf. Notes, pp. 528-529b) was in a first period Wednesday. Helga began by writing the agenda from yesterday on the board. But the discussion did not take off, perhaps an exercise would have helped here. Leona commented that last night she had dreamt about being in a university! Helga decided to finish the chapter and they read on and almost finished five pages. The order of seats in the circle was as follows: Helga, Salome, Louise, Angela, Adelle, Leona, Agatha, Erla, Buena, Torfi, Trausti, Tab, Titus, Zophon, Thomas, Doreen, Sophie and Helga again.

At one spot during the reading Leona complained that they needed better silence and louder reading and when they read about 'relationships that sort of carry over,' she could not help asking what they were. They read on and Leona's question became the first item on the agenda. Angela added: "Activities of thinking are interesting!" More suggestions started to pour in, but Helga announced that the agenda was closed and that they would work on relationships that carry over. She asked whether anyone could explain what this relationship is all about. Sophie had the

answer right away: "One takes two sentences and by putting them together one can figure the third one out!" Helga asked for an example and she wrote it on the board after Sophie: (1) The yellow pencil is longer than the red pencil. (2) The red pencil is longer than the blue pencil. The conclusion is that the yellow pencil is longer than the blue one. Agatha came with an example that did not work and what was left of the hour they spent reflecting on how carry over relationships work.

Ari showed up when approximately five minutes were left of the lesson. He quickly skimmed over the chapter that was read and he gave one of the final comments when he announced: "We (humans) are more disgusting than all the other animals combined!" Unfortunately the context for his comment was not clear to me.

Linda called me Tuesday and we speculated on possible ways of discussing Syr's point: What color would be most beautiful for the flowers?

Linda gave the 26th and last lesson to her students after the morning break Wednesday. While the students ate their snack Linda read them a ghost story by a candle light. The circle was then formed without any protests and their order of seats was as follows: Linda, Gna, Freyja, Hodur, Loki, Thor, Hildur, Frigg, Hrund, Odinn, Hlin, Fulla, Sjöfn, Saga, Syr, Snotra, Gefn, Horn, Var and Linda again. The lesson began:

Linda: Well, let's begin by giving a good silence! You'll remember that yesterday we made an agenda of six items and we discussed three of them, so the next item to discuss is Syr's point, (What color would be most beautiful for the flowers?) Syr you might want to explain it a little further for us? -- What was it that you wanted to talk about in relation to this?

Syr: I don't know why I did (say) this!

Linda: It just came to your mind, just like that?

Syr: Yes!

Linda: But what color would be most beautiful for the flowers?

S: It doesn't matter!

[More students enter, Fulla and Gefn among them.]

Linda: -- Can you measure beauty, whether something is beautiful?



---

Syr: Once when we were talking about it that philosophy is boring, then it was just because we thought it would be boring! Then it became boring because we thought it would be!

Linda: Are you saying that it is comparable? That is to say, you thought that philosophy would be boring and it did become boring and you think the color would be beautiful and then it does become beautiful?

S: If one thinks blue is beautiful then --

Linda: But why do some think that blue is more beautiful than red? Is it measurable?

S: (It depends on) whether it fits with people!

Fulla: -- (It depends on what the color is on! Orange is all right for a sweater but not for a sofa!) (Notes, pp. 530-531).

Next Linda took the discussion to the question: What is beauty? They discussed fashion at different periods and how that affects our conceptions of beauty. The discussion seemed to be off for a fine beginning when Odinn and Hrund got into some conflicts. This time it was not as much a conflict as just fooling around and to everyone's surprise Frigg joined them. At one point, for example, they stood up and left the circle so Linda had to go and bring them back. But the discussion moved on and next they took landscape into consideration and they came to the conclusion that Reykjavikian's favorite mountain, Esja, would not fit into the landscape around Akureyri in northern Iceland. They moved on:

Linda: Can it then be that the beauty is often related to ourselves and to our personality?

S: Yes it is!\*

Freyja: (Hofi would not be beautiful if she would be greedy!)

Linda: Do you agree that Hofi would not be nice if she would be greedy?

Chorus: No she wouldn't (be nice)! [Debates.] ---

Linda: But if she would be on TV and she'd say: "I don't know anything about that! I'm not obliged to answer for that! [Intonation of arrogancy.]

S: She'd be a bore --

Freyja: Then I would loose all respect for her! ---

Var: It is not only the appearance -- (that matters)?

Linda: ....Are you telling me that there is both an inner and an outer beauty? / HRUND! Please be silent! You're disrupting us an awful lot!

Hrund: Me?

Linda: Yes, you! -- Inner beauty, what is that? Gna, are you going to describe it to us?

-----

\* Hofi is an Icелander and was Miss World 1986.

Gna: Outer beauty is just looks, inner beauty is the personality --  
(Notes, p. 532).

After the next interchange Odinn claimed that the period was over. More students repeated it after him and he, Hrund and Frigg stood up. They took their seats again when Linda asked them to. They continued to explore inner and outer indications of beauty but unruliness increased and it centered around Odinn, Hrund and Frigg.

Linda had mixed feelings about this lesson. She was pleased with the working peace she had in the beginning as well as with the discussion in general. But she was disappointed with constant interruptions from Odinn, Hrund and Frigg. Frigg's behavior was a great surprise and disappointment to her.

#### Reflections on postscript

Helga's class showed interest to philosophy this week, but their success as a community of inquiry was meager. The break and ongoing examinations are likely to have affected their performance. It would also be most outrageous to expect that a community of inquiry had been permanently established in Helga's classroom. On the contrary, it was doomed to be still-born as reflective inquiry is not practiced in Icelandic compulsory "education" (i.e. learning), except by accidents (cf. Arango Vila-Belda, Faulkes, and Robinson, 1987, for indirect support). I see no reason to conclude that the Training School is any different in this respect.

Linda's class showed great improvement during this week despite still having some way to go before forming a community of inquiry. The basic conditions of showing respect to persons and ideas were not stable enough and they were far from being shared as values by the group.

Looking back with Helga and Linda

In the 13th week the New Jersey Test of Reasoning Skills was conducted and the results are discussed in the next chapter. At our Monday meeting that week we looked back and a brief enumeration of the main points follows.

They both agreed having needed more preparation for their teaching than they had imagined beforehand. Helga claimed having spent 8-9 hours at the beginning when she taught three lessons in a week. Linda estimated that sometimes it took her 2-3 hours to prepare for one lesson. In short they said they would recommend teachers to attend workshops in Philosophy for Children before starting to work in this domain. If working with adults they would not need to worry about misbehavior and that should allow for studying the novel and the manual in depth. I added that such a preparation would give them more freedom in working from and covering the novel.

They both mentioned their insecurity toward the subject as having injured their progress. Linda complained that sometimes the novel and the manual are too abstract and too complex with too much logic. Also she suggested it might be beneficial, in general, to work more at first with small groups, for example in groups of ten before moving on to discussions with the big group.\* Both of them talked about good and bad

-----  
 \* This is a fine idea if it could be arranged for in implementation. This way the teacher could model the kind of questions and attitudes the students are to pick up and later the students could apply it either in smaller or bigger groups. But working with many small groups simultaneously has the implied disadvantage that the teacher's modeling is never continuous to any one group because he or she has to leave for the next group. When students have internalized the dispositions and skills needed for philosophical inquiry this disadvantage should disappear, but then they are ready to work on more viewpoints than are typically presented in a group of four. Also, when a group of twenty is not committed to inquiry it is of course more difficult to handle than a

lessons coming in periods but overall the project was a positive experience to them:

Me: -- This is my last point ... I was wondering whether you had learned something from this (the project)?

Linda: Yes, a lot!

Helga: Yes, quite a lot! It sharpens (our) thinking!

Linda: Yes it does and the transcripts have been of immeasurable value to me. It really has been! One can see how awfully messed up one was at times! [Laughs.] I just think it's great to have myself all on a written record! [Laughs.] It is fun to reflect on it, that is to say: "I can do better in this and that respect. This is rather good, this is no good!" I think it is just great to (have the transcripts to) do this!

Helga: I think so too!

....

Me: Well, it's good to hear that you learned something!

Helga: Yes, oh yes! I just think that I have grown in maturity!

Linda: I think so too!

Helga: At home I'm getting right to the point, I'm beginning to see things from a completely different perspective than I used to [Linda and I giggle] and I just think it's for the better!

Linda: Yes, I think it's good being through this.

Helga: For myself I think I have been going to school this semester for this project! (Notes, pp. 558-60.)

I must admit that this last conversation, especially Helga's comment on her growing maturity, lighted my day. Although I was tenacious enough not to leave the site and just thank the participants for their time and effort, I was often nagged by one question: "Why are you trying to implement Harry the wrong way?" "Wrong" because of lack of workshop preparation. Because of this I often thought my demands toward the teachers were unfair. Those demands I did not express explicitly, but implicitly I did so by talking about how the discussions "could be" and that "I just knew it in my heart" that doing philosophy with children could work out.

-----

group of ten students. The disadvantage being unnecessary strain and stress for the teacher as well as for the students involved.

## CHAPTER IV : CONCLUSION

Improved reasoning

After reading Chapter III the reader may think of Helga's group as clearly coming out ahead of Linda's group in all respects. This is not so as the following results, from the New Jersey Test of Reasoning Skills, indicate. The test consists of 50 items, representing 22 skill areas (cf. Table VII p. 284). Students were pre-tested September 10th, 13 days before the philosophy teaching started, and they were post-tested December 16 just after the philosophy teaching finished.

Helga's group improved its performance of 4.2 points, from 30.5 to 34.7 correct scores, but Linda's group improved its score by 5.8 points, from 28.6 to 34.4 correct scores. In percentages Helga's group improved its performance by 13.8% but Linda's group by 20.3%, which is a difference of 6.5% to Linda's group's favor. These results indicate that there was more intellectual growth in Linda's group than Helga's. This is a surprising conclusion, as social togetherness and intellectual openness was overall more limited in Linda's group.

However, in terms of actual scores, Helga's group was slightly higher on the post-test with an average score of 34.7 versus 34.4 of Linda's group. This difference in the average scores indicates that from the pre-test Linda's students reached up to same level as Helga's on the post-test. This clearly shows if we look at distribution of scores at pre- and post-tests.

TABLE VI: DISTRIBUTION OF SCORES IN PRE- AND POST-TESTS

| Score | Linda's class    |      | Helga's class    |      |
|-------|------------------|------|------------------|------|
|       | <u>Frequency</u> |      | <u>Frequency</u> |      |
|       | Pre              | Post | Pre              | Post |
| 46-50 | 0                | 0    | 1                | 0    |
| 41-45 | 0                | 3    | 0                | 2    |
| 36-40 | 2                | 3    | 2                | 5    |
| 31-35 | 5                | 7    | 7                | 7*   |
| 26-30 | 4                | 2    | 5                | 2    |
| 21-25 | 5                | 2    | 2                | 1    |
| 16-20 | 0                | 0    | 0                | 0    |
| 11-15 | 1                | 0    | 0                | 0    |
|       | (n=17)**         |      | (n=17)           |      |

\* Buena and Leona come in here instead of Ari and Cora (pre-scores of 47 & 31); therefore an "n" of 17 in both tests.

\*\* Vidarr scored 20 on post-test and Loki scored 28 on pre-test; neither one is included. Hodur missed both tests.

---

In terms of scoring the differences in distribution at the pre-test are at the top and especially at the bottom rank: Helga had 10 students who scored above 31, Linda had 7, Linda had 6 students that score below 25, Helga had only 2 in that area. But at the post-test the distribution was very similar in both classes.\*

When distribution of errors (see Table VII on the next page) is compared between the groups, six classes roughly come up. First, stable performance in both classes at both tests. Five areas, analogical reasoning, syllogistic reasoning (categorical), transitive relationships, recognizing dubious authorities and reasoning with four possibilities matrix, come under this heading. Both classes show good mastery of these areas except for syllogistic reasoning. Second, both classes increase their scores and have similar post-scores. Five areas, Inclusion/exclusion, detecting ambiguities, distinguishing differences of

-----

\* See Appendix B for individual scores and performance within skill areas.

TABLE VII: DISTRIBUTION OF ERRORS

## A. DISTRIBUTION OF ITEMS ON N.J. REASONING TEST BY SKILL AREAS

| <u>Skill area</u>                                        | <u>Items</u>  |
|----------------------------------------------------------|---------------|
| 1: Converting Statements.....                            | (1,25)        |
| 2: Standardizing statements.....                         | (2,14,19)     |
| 3: Inclusion/exclusion.....                              | (3,6,7,11)    |
| 4: Recognizing improper question.....                    | (4)           |
| 5: Avoiding jumping to conclusions.....                  | (5)           |
| 6: Analogical reasoning.....                             | (8)           |
| 7: Detecting underlying assumptions.....                 | (9,10,18)     |
| 8: Eliminating alternatives.....                         | (12)          |
| 9: Inductive reasoning.....                              | (13,21)       |
| 10: Reasoning with relationships.....                    | (15,22,24)    |
| 11: Detecting ambiguities.....                           | (16,23,49)    |
| 12: Identifying good reasons.....                        | (17,20,27,40) |
| 13: Recognizing symmetrical relationships.....           | (26,28)       |
| 14: Syllogistic reasoning (categorical).....             | (29,32,36)    |
| 15: Distinguishing differences of kinds and degrees..... | (30,35)       |
| 16: Recognizing transitive relationships.....            | (31,34)       |
| 17: Recognizing dubious authority.....                   | (33)          |
| 18: Reasoning with 4-possibilities matrix.....           | (37)          |
| 19: Contradicting statements.....                        | (38,42,44)    |
| 20: Whole-part reasoning and part-whole reasoning...     | (39,41,43)    |
| 21: Syllogistic reasoning (conditional).....             | (45,46,50)    |
| 22: Discerning causal relationships.....                 | (47,48)       |

## B. DISTRIBUTION OF ERRORS BY SKILL AREAS AND CLASSES

| <u>Linda's class</u><br>n=17 |      |      |      |        | <u>Helga's class</u><br>n=15 |      |      |       |
|------------------------------|------|------|------|--------|------------------------------|------|------|-------|
| Area                         | Pre- | Post | Diff | Pdiff* | Pre-                         | Post | Diff | Pdiff |
| 1:                           | 6    | 8    | -2   | -.02   | 7                            | 5    | 2    | .03   |
| 2:                           | 13   | 5    | 8    | .08    | 10                           | 11   | 1    | -.02  |
| 3:                           | 29   | 17   | 12   | .12    | 28                           | 19   | 9    | .14   |
| 4:                           | 12   | 7    | 5    | .05    | 5                            | 1    | 4    | .06   |
| 5:                           | 7    | 7    | 0    | 0      | 9                            | 2    | 7    | .11   |
| 6:                           | 8    | 7    | 1    | .01    | 7                            | 8    | -1   | -.02  |
| 7:                           | 31   | 22   | 9    | .09    | 33                           | 25   | 8    | .13   |
| 8:                           | 8    | 5    | 3    | .03    | 4                            | 4    | 0    | 0     |
| 9:                           | 15   | 7    | 8    | .08    | 9                            | 4    | 5    | .08   |
| 10:                          | 18   | 13   | 5    | .05    | 11                           | 10   | 1    | .02   |
| 11:                          | 41   | 25   | 16   | .16    | 32                           | 23   | 9    | .14   |
| 12:                          | 24   | 31   | -7   | -.07   | 20                           | 24   | -4   | -.06  |
| 13:                          | 2    | 4    | -2   | -.02   | 8                            | 4    | 4    | .06   |
| 14:                          | 32   | 30   | 2    | .02    | 24                           | 24   | 0    | 0     |
| 15:                          | 16   | 8    | 8    | .08    | 12                           | 9    | 3    | .05   |
| 16:                          | 8    | 4    | 4    | .04    | 5                            | 3    | 2    | .03   |
| 17:                          | 3    | 2    | 1    | .01    | 3                            | 1    | 2    | .03   |
| 18:                          | 4    | 2    | 2    | .02    | 2                            | 1    | 1    | .02   |
| 19:                          | 34   | 28   | 6    | .06    | 24                           | 26   | -2   | -.03  |
| 20:                          | 17   | 11   | 6    | .06    | 14                           | 10   | 4    | .06   |
| 21:                          | 22   | 12   | 10   | .10    | 17                           | 9    | 8    | .13   |
| 22:                          | 13   | 11   | 2    | .02    | 8                            | 4    | 4    | .06   |
| TOTAL                        | 363  | 266  | 97   | .97    | 292                          | 229  | 63   | 1.02  |
| Average                      | 21.4 | 15.6 | 5.7  |        | 19.5                         | 15.3 | 4.2  |       |

\* Proportional difference=diff(ERENCE)/total diff(ERENCE)

kinds and degrees, whole-part reasoning, and syllogistic reasoning (conditional), come under this heading. Third, both groups increase their score but Helga's class shows better mastery in three areas: recognizing improper question, inductive reasoning, and discerning causal relationships. Fourth, both classes increase their score but Linda's class shows better mastery. One area, detecting underlying assumptions comes under this heading. Fifth, Linda's class increases their score while Helga's is stable or declines. Four areas, standardizing statements, eliminating alternatives, reasoning with relationships, and contradicting statements, come under this heading. Sixth, Helga's class increases their score while Linda's is stable or declines. Three areas, converting statements, avoiding jumping to conclusions, and recognizing symmetrical relationships, come under this heading. Here, Linda's class seems to better master symmetrical relationships, especially on the pre-test.

If one concentrates on the areas of growth, where most of the points came in, four areas are most evident in both classes: Inclusion/exclusion, detecting underlying assumptions, detecting ambiguities, and conditional syllogistic reasoning. Proportionally Linda's class gained 47% of its points in these areas and Helga's class gained 51% of its points. Avoiding jumping to conclusions brings Helga's class 11% of its points but zero to the other class.

The only area where both groups declined in their scores was on identifying good reasons! This must be speculated on. This is one of the areas which was not covered in the teaching. We only got into chapter eight and this area is covered primarily in chapters nine and ten. The areas that we should have covered by nature of novel and manual include roughly 1-11; we did no work on areas 6 and 10, but then we did



work in area 15. (See Appendix B for individual students' performance in the skill areas.)

But a deeper explanation may also explain the weaker performance. Peirce (1877) sees our opinions to be movable from doubt to belief and from belief to doubt. To change our opinions or beliefs we have to doubt them, to settle our doubt we have to come to stable beliefs. Peirce argues that the bridge between doubt and belief is inquiry. Inspired by this I can only state that the philosophy classes aroused doubt in the students, but the inquiry had not reached far enough to settle their doubts nor to improve their performance in identifying good reasons.

As this result is perplexing to me, I will give you a detailed picture of this area of identifying good reasons. By reading Appendix B you can create a similar picture of the other areas. At the pre-test Loki was the only individual to have 4 out of 4 items incorrect in this area and he missed the post-test. Thor had 3 of 4 incorrect on both tests. Other pupils did better. Nine of Helga's students had stable performance but six of Linda's: Adelle, Angela, Agatha, Torfi, and Thomas had 2 of 4 incorrect on both tests, Erla, Zophon and Tab had 1 of 4 incorrect, and Titus had all items correct on both tests. In Linda's class Thor had 3 of 4 incorrect on both tests, Snotra and Hrist had 2 of 4 incorrect, Frigg and Horn had 1 of 4 incorrect, and Freyja had all items correct on both tests.

Nine of Linda's students and five in Helga's lost points. Fulla was the only one to move from having 4 to 3 of 4 correct and Gefn was the only one to loose 2 points, from 3 to 1 of 4 correct. Saga, Hrund, Hildur, and Syr declined from having 2 correct to 1 correct of 4; Var, Gna, Odinn moved from 3 to 2 correct of 4 and so did Logi, Doreen, Salome, Louise and Trausti in the other class. In Linda's class Hlin

gained 2 points from 2 correct to 4 of 4 correct, Sjofn gained 1 point, from 3 correct to 4 of 4 correct. In Helga's class Sophie was the only student to gain a point, from 2 to 3 correct of 4 items.

Several factors come to mind as being different between the groups and thus they are likely to be of value in explaining the differences in the groups' performances: (1) The groups were different to begin with as Linda's group was both socially and intellectually weaker. Average scores indicate that intellectually Linda's group reached Helga's. However, the scores result from the individual's performance under test situation and thus they index what the students learned as individuals, but not what they learned as a group. Social and intellectual habits are not measured by the New Jersey Test of Reasoning Skills, but in terms of these habits Helga's group was stronger and grew more than Linda's, proportionally much more than the differences in the test scores were.

(2) The researcher spent more time teaching with Linda's group. He taught three lessons by himself, modeled two, and participated in one lesson in Linda's group, but taught only one lesson by himself and modeled two in Helga's group. It is unlikely that this factor is of much importance in accounting for intellectual growth as the lessons the researcher taught by himself were primarily aimed at changing the students' social habits.

(3) Linda's group had more teaching time as the first period was approximately 10-15 minutes longer than the third period that started by the students' snacktime. Linda's group had 10 of its 26 lessons in the third period whereas 16 of Helga's 26 lessons were in the third one. Helga often mentioned that the third period was more difficult for her than the first one. Although difficult to evaluate, this factor is bound to have affected the groups. for example, after Helga's students caught

on to the philosophy lessons, it seemed to make them unruly knowing that they had narrow limitations in time (cf. weeks nine and ten).

(4) Linda was more driven towards sheetwork exercises than Helga; 8 of the 21 lessons that Linda taught were primarily sheetwork exercises in the students' regular groups. Of the 23 lessons Helga taught, only 5 were mainly structured as sheetwork exercises. In my judgment this factor is of most importance in explaining the jump in performance that Linda's group took on the reasoning test.

#### Reasoning and conduct

The upshot of comparing results from the New Jersey Test of Reasoning Skills to the students conduct, or to what actually took place during the research period, is that a community of inquiry is not necessary to improve students' reasoning when working with the Philosophy for Children program. It works the other way too. Improvement in reasoning is not necessary in order to form a community of inquiry. Those are, indeed, two aims or objectives that can be served separately. This means that these two factors need to be evaluated by different means; even though the two aims need not be separated in practice. For example, Lipman's curricula, and any teaching consistent with his ideas, serves both aims. Since a community of inquiry serves as a training field for inquiry, from doubt to application of new ideas springing from the students' experience and intellect, it is reasonable to expect improved reasoning as its byproduct. Other approaches to teach reasoning, such as through drill and sheetwork, may prove more powerful in the short run. But only using drill and sheetwork would be an overreach into having individuals work on problems without providing them with opportunities to practice reasoning in language under real dialogical circumstances. Drill and sheetwork can

certainly reach to improve test results, but the question is whether the students' social and intellectual habits are affected for the better.

To support further the claim that reasoning can be improved without converting the classroom into a community of inquiry, I can cite Beinteinsson, my colleague, who worked on a small scale comparative study between two classes of twelve year olds during the schoolyear 1986-87. His control group (n=15) was located approximately 45 miles from Reykjavik. He pre-tested the group on October 10th (a month later than at the Training school) and the average score was 26.3 and he post-tested on Mars 6th and the average score was 27.4 Beinteinsson's experimental group (n=16), was located approximately the same distance from Reykjavik but in a different village from the control group. The experimental group was taught by himself and they scored 25.8 at pre-test (September 19-20th) and 30.1 at post-test (Mars 6th). In terms of percentages this gives following figures for improvement: Beinteinsson's control group: 4.2% Beinteinsson's experimental group: 16.7% Helga's group: 13.8% Linda's group: 20.3%\*

Beinteinsson's experimental group had a history of severe behavioral problems. Indeed, he gave up on teaching them philosophy and he was much disappointed by his students' lack of cooperation and interest for doing

-----  
\* That the actual scores of the control group and Beinteinsson's are lower need not surprise anyone as both group have less educational opportunities than students 45 miles away in the Reykjavik area.

According to information from Institute for the Advancement of Philosophy for Children the average number of right answers on the New Jersey Reasoning Test in 1983-84 were: 22.7 for 2nd grade (n=80) 27.7 for 3rd grade (n=85); 34.5 for 4th grade (n=502); 35.8 for 5th grade (n=3,036); 37.3 for 6th grade (n=590) but at this grade-level the scores stabilize and in grade 13 (college freshmen) the average score is 38.2 (n=850). One can only wonder whether scores would stabilize at a similar level in Iceland. It is noteworthy that 6th graders in the U.S. have more than a five point higher average score than Linda's and Helga's students, but as noted earlier the U.S. students have also more schooling.

philosophy. In other words, there was no community of inquiry at work in his class despite his students' improvement in reasoning.

Although on its way a community of inquiry was not formed in Linda's class. Such a formation takes time, but perhaps she can be criticized for leaning too much toward her old teaching habits. For example, it was only in the 25th lesson that she succeeded in creating an agenda and she was reluctant to allow her students to take their reading turns automatically. One way to look at most of her philosophy teaching is to see it as an adjustment, in the context of a new curriculum and a new method, to her regular style of teaching.

Helga can perhaps be criticized for becoming too fond of listening to her students after the community of inquiry got to work in her classroom; she could have made more use of exercises from the teaching manual in her last eight lessons. However, reducing work on exercises and emphasizing the dialogue was in accordance with the advisor's suggestions at the time.

Furthermore, the teachers deserve no criticism as their training was the single factor that was most seriously lacking in this project. In the teachers' own opinion their lack of philosophical background made them feel insecure in their teaching and that was reflected to the students. This fact is likely to have increased boredom in the classrooms as it also related to the fact that the teachers were not good at conceptual play and they complained during the modeling period that they were not good at identifying philosophical ideas during discussions. In other words, their success was hindered by lack of training in reflective inquiry, and formal background in philosophy is no guarantee for that training. Although impossible to ascertain, the possibility must be entertained that their teaching experience was of limited help to them, even a hindrance to philosophical inquiry.

### Review of research questions

The research project was based on the faulty assumption that the basic conditions for communities of inquiry were already in place at the site. As this proved not to be the case the project turned into an attempt to bring about the social togetherness and the intellectual openness needed for communities of inquiry to operate. With this shift the teachers and their teaching came more into the spotlight than originally planned.

### The General Questions

The first set of questions had to do with the formation of a community of inquiry in general. (1) To what extent, if any, is such a community already in place in the ordinary classroom? (2) How are rules and roles negotiated? (3) How do the participants view themselves? (4) How does the development of the community contribute to the development of good thinking? (5) Does working with philosophy trigger its formation?

Based on my observations I cannot but conclude that communities of inquiry were not present in either of the classrooms studied. The major explanation for this is that the students' regular schoolwork did not nurture the kind of respect that is required by a community of inquiry. A community of inquiry requires both listening and disciplined discussion; this includes drawing out implications by making inferences. The teaching activities I observed did not require listening and discussions in this sense; usually students had only to listen to short directions or explanations from teacher or they listened to students' reports or to one another in small groups. These activities did not focus on cooperative reasoning but on exchange of directions, explanations or information.

When answering how rules and roles were negotiated, it should be kept in mind that the teachers and their students had worked together for

several years. So their rules and roles were relatively settled when I entered, but the philosophy teaching demanded that teachers and students would take new rules and roles on. The rules were not decided on beforehand, they were simple and they were created when the need for them was felt.

In the very beginning of the project the teachers had thought of setting and enforcing the rule that students should raise their hands and that one person should speak at a time. However, they noted that this rule would take the spark out of the discussions so they decided not to enforce it. In the latter part of the project, when it was evident that more orderliness was needed in the discussions in Linda's classroom, she often reminded her students to have one person speaking at a time. This was Linda's attempt to bring about the working peace that was needed in her classroom, but she often commented on their, the teachers', lack of firmness in the beginning of the project as contributing to the limited progress.

Helga reprimanded her students for talking simultaneously, that they were chatting in every corner without listening or allowing the interested parties to talk together. But as Helga's classroom community of inquiry began to establish itself, the students' behavior changed for the better. The students sensed the need for and they internalized and monitored a major rule, or a principle, for conducting their discussions: Turns at speaking should be taken in the order that the students had raised their hands to indicate that they wanted to speak. The students had evidently realized that this rule both gave fairness and discipline to the procedural side of their dialogue. The students enforced the rule themselves, even if it meant reminding the teacher who should really be speaking. So, by the end of the project one and one student spoke at a

time while the others listened and in this respect there is no question that a qualitative difference took place in the students' interactions.

Negotiation of roles came nowhere as clearly to the surface as in deciding reading turns and seating arrangement. To begin with, both teachers assumed it to be their role and responsibility to assign reading turns to their students. Helga was rather quick to give this unnecessary role up, but Linda, because of Thor, was extremely slow to give it up although being urged to. Linda's class also showed more reluctance to sit in a circle and thus change their everyday seating arrangement, which was in small groups. Linda favored working in small groups and talked about it as a means toward having the students sit in a circle. As an advisor I always emphasized the circle arrangement and I even suggested that she would change the every day seating arrangement to a big circle. Naturally, Linda was caught between my advice and "some" of her students' (especially Hrist's) reluctance to sit in a circle. In Helga's group the sitting in a circle never became a big deal, on the contrary it became a part of their everyday context for the philosophy lessons.

Looking back at the research period, the most general summarizing of the results is to assert that the teachers did not succeed at their negotiations with the students as the teachers' did not master philosophical discussion as a teaching method. In other words, the students could not grasp what they were being offered and therefore they were unwilling to change their ordinary schoolwork. But that would not be the whole story as we saw that Helga's students showed a cooperative spirit in the very first lesson, but Linda's students were hostile to any changes from the start. It seemed as if they wanted to hold on to what they already had. This reminds us that to form a community of inquiry every classroom must be worked with on its own terms and although



teachers have a definite goal in mind, their actions and decisions must be rooted in the context at hand. As already noted the two studied classrooms were different to begin with and that must be considered when Linda's groups performance is evaluated. Forming a community of inquiry makes heavy demands on the teachers involved; they need to be clear on their aim as well as mastering philosophical discussion as a method of teaching. Working with a difficult classroom like Linda's makes these demands all the more evident.

In terms of the third question, how the participants viewed themselves, Linda's students thought of themselves as being no "children." They were for example too old to be at a discotheque with 4th and 5th graders, but wanted to be with 6th and 7th graders. In school they wanted to receive something that has or could be of utility, of practical value, to them. Reading Harry was all right, perhaps because it gave the feeling of having done or covered something, but philosophical discussions, as they conceived them, were of no utility as they just talked and that is the boring part.

Helga's students did overall not think of themselves as being as grownup as Linda's students, which is no wonder as fewer students had matured into the puberty phase in Helga's group. The conception of philosophy as having no practical value was also more evident in Linda's classroom and expressed by Frigg, Odinn, Loki, Thor, Hrist, Hildur and Hrund. However, this conception was also aired in Helga's class, by Logi, Sophie and Adelle.

The attitude of being silent and not interruptive was also expressed by many in Linda's class: Var, Horn, Vidarr, Snotra, Sjöfn and Gefn. But in Helga's class Zophon, Salome and Doreen had this attitude. Although we do have access to the students' self images through observation of

their behavior, lack of access to their personal history prevents drawing a detailed picture of every student. However, through interviews we got to know some of the information needed for this task. For example, Logi has gained more and more recognition from his peers through the years and Trausti has gained personal confidence. Sophie has a history of being intuitive and imaginative. Salome likes having Sophie in front of her. Hrist is nervous, but her intuition is sharp. Odinn is bored at most things in school, yet he is rather smart. Loki likes philosophy although it is about nothing, in his opinion. Horn does not say a word but jumps forward in her reasoning. Thor has wit and words, but he is without the courage to read openly.

This enumeration takes us into too many different and sensitive dimensions. But keeping an overall perspective in mind, it is fair, I think, to state that the students looked at themselves as technicians in the classrooms that have their work cut out for them. By this I mean that the students were used to have their teachers organize their learning around exercises and other classroom activities that aimed at passing knowledge or skills to the students. The philosophy teaching asked for the students' acceptance of responsibility for their own education; the students were invited to set an agenda to their lessons and the teachers' task was both to model a questioning attitude and to help the students create knowledge by exploring the agenda.

We have already speculated some on how the development of a community contributes to the development of good thinking, the fourth question. Let it just be emphasized that there is a moral code of basic procedures operating within a community of inquiry. Participants cannot speak all at the same time, but when they speak they should be allowed to finish. Thereafter they can be questioned further by classmates or their teacher

because they are being listened to and their ideas come under scrutiny of other classmembers. Such a cooperative setting, where turntaking and thinking is monitored, is bound to affect both the groups' and the individual's thinking for the better in the long run.

In relation to the fifth question, on whether working with philosophy triggers the formation of a community of inquiry, we must conclude that it is not enough to work with a philosophical text. The instructional method and the conceptual play employed must also be philosophical in nature as well as the issues that are raised. If teachers know the educational aim of a community of inquiry and if they have a basic mastery of philosophical discussion as a method of instruction, I see no reason but to believe that their orchestration of philosophical inquiry would trigger the formation of a community of inquiry. However, I see no reason to believe that either reading a philosophical novel or working on logical exercises would trigger a formation of a community of inquiry.

Although the teachers' competence is of central importance, it takes time for any skillful teacher to create a community of inquiry from scratch. That is a process that revolves around the students and it cannot be isolated from the social and intellectual context that they are embedded in. The students' circumstances are, I assume, so different from site to site that detailed generalizations on how to form communities of inquiry are inappropriate.

The next set of the general questions circled around the teacher:

(1) How do teachers create a community of inquiry? (2) What pedagogical techniques are used? (3) Is it simply a matter of technique? What techniques? If no, what else is needed? (4) How are students viewed in such a community from the teacher's perspective?

Three components are central to teacher education in the Philosophy for Children program: Explanation, modeling and experiencing of what it

means to work in a community of inquiry. The teacher educator can provide the first two components, but not the third one which teachers must themselves acquire as participants in philosophical inquiry. The modeling component serves as a bridge between (theoretical) explanations and (practical) experience. Through modeling teachers are provided with opportunities to participate in a philosophical inquiry, but the real challenge they face in their classrooms where they have opportunities to gain personal experience in conducting such inquiries.

In this project the teachers were provided with plenty of written and verbal explanations, but modeling was provided only after they had attempted to conduct philosophical discussions on their own. In the teachers' own judgment the modeling period set them a clear example of how philosophical discussions could be used as a method of instruction; verbal and written explanation did not have as much practical value to them as did the modeling. This meant that after the modeling period the teachers' experience took on a new direction and a new meaning to them. Jumping over modeling and participation in a philosophical inquiry, directly into the phase of the teachers' experience of teaching new curriculum by a new method, proved not to work in this project.

In short, it is simply unreasonable to expect teachers to create communities of inquiry unless they are provided with the knowledge and training needed to.

In terms of the second question, philosophical discussions call for three basic pedagogical techniques: (a) A circle, a horseshoe or some other physical arrangement that allows everyone to see everyone else in the classroom. (b) Students' automatic turntaking in reading by paragraphs. Other reading arrangements, such as reading by roles, can be appropriate but the automatic turntaking is democratic in nature and

prevents teachers from giving their students unequal opportunities to read. In addition, this arrangement gives the teacher extra time to think and observe students. (c) An explicit agenda (on board or overhead) generated from the students' own ideas. Less vital but still important techniques include (d) using the blackboard as a pad to compare and contrast ideas. (e) Location of teacher and other arrangements in space and time. For example, teachers need to reduce outside interruptions by hanging sign at doors or by not taking calls during lessons. Also, closeness in space of teacher to student, is often powerful to stop or prevent chatting.

Except for the first one, the teachers had difficulties in mastering the techniques above in a fruitful way. The major explanation being that they did not apply them regularly in their ordinary teaching and simply lacked experience in using them.

Although important, doing philosophy is not only a question of mastering techniques. Philosophical intuition or sense for conceptual perplexities is needed. A philosophical sense is closely related to wonderment, an ability that is natural to young children but distinct in most adults. Awakening and nurturing philosophical sense in adults is the single most important challenge for philosophers as educators.

There is a element of art in practice, or spontaneity on the spot in doing philosophy, an element which transcends application of pure techniques. It is a product of imaginative combination of knowledge and techniques. This is an element of craft and it is the most evident of the elements involved in doing philosophy with children. The community of inquiry searches for usable material (substance) when constructing the agenda. It tries to come to grips with the material and checks its quality in the discussion. The outcomes (the form) of philosophical

discussions are sometimes as breathtaking as objects of art are. But just like in arts and crafts, there is no way to guarantee that every discussion will lead to such a conclusion, the probabilities for it can be increased.

The fourth question, how teachers view students in a community of inquiry, is a question that for our purposes only applies to Helga. She experienced relatively few lessons where the community of inquiry was at work in her classroom, but her dominant reaction was that the students gave her pleasure and she liked watching them, listening to them, and in short she liked being with them. This does not mean that Helga did not like being with her students in other lessons, but only that the student-teacher relationship was different in philosophy. I saw it to be more on a mutual ground, students started to take care of things that Helga would ordinarily have to do: assign reading turns, reprimand for chat. As a philosophy teacher Helga had to adjust to her students' ideas on the spot, she could not plan in advance what would be the exact content of each lesson as in other subjects. However, this does absolutely not mean that a philosophy teacher cannot prepare his or her lessons. On the contrary, philosophy requires much preparation as underlying themes of the novel and possible lines of thought must be clear to the teacher and fresh in his or her mind.

The last set of the general questions focused on the students.

(1) How do students react to doing philosophy? (2) Do they see their role as being different in philosophy from other classes?

It seems obvious that the first question should be answered this way: Linda's students hated doing philosophy and Helga's students did so at times too. However, that would be jumping to conclusions. Linda often talked about the boredom that her students complained about as a surface

phenomenon, she even compared it to mob hysteria. So we have some reason to think that the philosophy lessons were not as bad and boring to the students as they claimed. Another thing to note is that a "philosophy lesson" and "doing philosophy" are not identical terms. We cannot really answer the question above because the students had too many philosophy lessons before they started doing philosophy. It really is no wonder that the students got confused on what was happening as it was not meaningful to them. When Helga's students started to discover meanings in their discussions we were in for better times.

For sure, the students saw their role to be different in the philosophy classes. In ordinary classes they were supposed to work, in philosophy they were supposed to do nothing! Just talk! It was only gradually that they discovered that there is a difference between talking and discussing.

#### The Middle-Level Questions

In the middle-level questions the concern was with the participants' talking in the classrooms:

(1) Who does the talking? (2) What kinds of questions are being asked? Who is being asked? (3) Who responds to questions? How do they respond? (4) Are the discussions philosophical in nature, semi-philosophical or "mere talking?"

During regular teaching hours, i.e. when dialogue was not employed as a teaching method, students sat for the most parts in their groups and worked while the teachers circled around the rooms. Under this arrangement the students did a lot of talking in their groups, both on and off their tasks. The teachers talked a lot too, especially to single students or to single groups, but not that much to the class as a whole. When dialogue was employed as a teaching method, the students usually sat

in a big circle. At first, under this arrangement, there was a lot of talk, on and off task, among "chat-partners", just like when they worked in small groups. As the community of inquiry established itself in Helga's group the talk gradually became less private and more public as students started to share their comments and ideas with the whole group. The same process took place in Linda's group, but not to the same extent.

In regular teaching hours most official questions were from students to teacher: "How am I to do this?" "What do we do next?" Some questions were more of requests: "[Will you] come and help me!" When teachers asked students, their questions typically involved getting the students to report on their knowledge or on what they had learned. These questions were often directed to the groups' reporters and then to the class in general: "How did you answer item X in the exercise?" The correct answers to these questions were known to the teachers beforehand. When dialogue was employed as a method of instruction, the teachers asked questions they did not always know correct answers to. Until the community of inquiry established itself in Helga's classroom, it was a regular pattern for the teachers to do most of the questioning and for the students to respond (or sometimes did not respond). As time passed we saw that Helga's students had internalized a questioning attitude; they started to direct similar questions, as had been directed to them, to one another. These were questions such as: "How do you know?" "What do you mean?" "Can you compare this to...?" "Why do you think...?" Questions that were typically asked in philosophy but not in other lessons.

Various individuals responded to questions that were asked during discussions. Some tended to attack all questions: Thor, Hrist, Loki, Frigg, Sophie, Leona, Tab. The quiet one's, Var, Gefn, Sjöfn, Snotra,



Fulla, Horn, Zophon, Doreen, Trausti, Erla, Salome and Torfi, tended not to respond. This pattern was quite different when dialogue was not employed, as students worked in groups on defined tasks or on a set of questions. Such questions or tasks are quite different from the ones that spring out of the context of a philosophical discussion.

Some of the discussions, especially in the beginning, are best described as chaotic speech, at least it reminded me of a cloud of birds. Other discussions were semi-philosophical in the sense that the issues were really philosophical, but they were not worked on in a philosophical spirit (cf. Linda's discussion on culture before they read chapter seven). Closely related were discussions of mere talking where information and anecdotes of personal experience were exchanged without drawing philosophical implications out.

To find out the proportions between discussions that were "mere talking, semi-philosophy, or philosophy," the dialogues could be coded, by using corresponding categories. Such a coding would be interesting, but for our purposes the point is that no coding is needed to see that the discussions improved with time; there was a qualitative difference between the first discussions and the discussions that took place in the latter part of the research period.

#### Questions to begin with

Originally I had questions under the heading: Questions on the particular, which were focused on habits and dispositions created in a community of inquiry. As a community of inquiry was only established in one of the classrooms, and for a relatively short observational time, my basis is too narrow for answering questions in that direction. The research took me to more basic questions that I now state. These

questions were never explicitly stated during the observational phase of the study, but only during its analytical phase:

- (1) What are the conditions under which a community of inquiry operates? (2) What are the procedural conditions for its operation?

I came to the conclusion that the conditions referred to in the first question, had to do with social togetherness and intellectual openness. By "social togetherness" is meant a classroom situation where students listen to one another and monitor their own interactions. When social togetherness is not in place the students fight external authorities, be it other students, teachers, principals or other sources of power. When social togetherness is in place, students take external rules and demands onto themselves and thus they submit to internal authority. In short, this means showing respect to persons.

Intellectual openness is a question of respect for ideas, both of one's own ideas and other persons' ideas. Such a respect is expressed through willingness to discuss and investigate ideas as well as by settling disagreements with openness to evidence and reason.

Increased social togetherness and intellectual openness came about gradually along with increased quality of discussions in method and content. Philosophy is not, of course, the only medium for improvement of social togetherness and intellectual openness, but it does have internal connections to these areas.\*

-----  
\* In a simplified version, philosophy starts from and seeks conceptual difficulties which practitioners of philosophy try to solve by combining logical and imaginative thinking. When such a reflective thinking is practiced in a community setting it most likely prevents social disorder. When reflective thinking is practiced in a hostile environment it may help to increase social disorder, but those are only the short time consequences. If we want our children to be reasonable people we cannot do without practice of and care for reflective thinking!

### Weaknesses of the study

In my proposal for this study I was most interested in studying habits and dispositions, or outcomes, brought about by participation in a community of inquiry. However, I never got to study that area but only to conditions that need to be in place as community of inquiry is established. Although this is not in line with my original research proposal it can also be seen as its strength, because conditions are logically prior to outcomes. Given this, the present research should be of help to those who might want to conduct a study on habits and dispositions created in a community of inquiry.

Typically, case studies are reports on particular settings, and various contexts for activities within them. For this purpose researchers join in with the daily activities of their subjects. In my case, I not only joined in, but I also brought different ideas about the context that should be in place in the classrooms. So, this was not only an observational study of a particular context for teaching philosophy to kids, but also a study of bringing such a context about. Those who prefer such a division of work that allows the researcher only to observe things and not to change them, would, no doubt, direct severe criticisms to this study.

This brings us to the most serious weakness to the study which has to do with implementation of philosophy as a subject for teaching. Originally, my plan was to prepare the teachers through creating a community of inquiry with people outside of their classrooms. This did not work out because of the researcher's clumsiness and it blurred role boundaries between researcher and advisor after the philosophy teaching started at the site.

## **APPENDICES**

## APPENDIX A: A distant perspective on Iceland

A resent American visitor to Iceland has noted that wherever " visitor goes he meets statistical boasts and curiosities" (Leithauser, 1987, p. 32). Among Iceland's many "world records" that Leithauser heard of were:

Iceland has the highest per capita number of chess grand masters in the world. It has the highest proportion of VCRs to households in the world. Icelanders have the highest life expectancy of any nationality (a contention disputed my many, including the Japanese). Icelanders have the highest literacy rate in the world (again disputed by the Japanese) And - a superlative evidently not open to question - Iceland publishes more books per capita than any other country (1987, p. 32).

Among the things Tomasson, a U.S.-American sociologist (1980), noticed is the compassion that Icelanders have in owning books: "The contention that virtually all Icelandic homes at whatever class level contain books is substantiated. So is the belief that the overwhelming majority of Icelanders read books, at least occasionally. Such statements probably cannot be made of any other society" (p. 145). He also notes that Icelanders had in 1969 one bookstore for every 2,300 inhabitants and a best-seller in the United States should sell in 6 to 7 million copies to be equivalent to an Icelandic best-seller (p. 124).

As a language Icelandic is more transparent than English but Tomasson notices:

Icelandic is an archaic language. For this reason, few foreigners, including students of Icelandic literature, have been able to master the language in detail. Icelandic has retained the four cases (nominative, accusative, dative, genitive), singular and plural forms, the three genders (masculine, feminine, neuter), strong and weak models for the declension of nouns and adjectives, which have 48 potential forms. Personal names as well as numbers are inflected. Verbs have different declensions, strong and weak, plus tense and aspect, voice and mood, person and number. The other Scandinavian languages, English, and the Romance languages have shed much of this traditional grammatical baggage in their transitions to their modern forms. They have moved from what linguists call synthetic languages to analytical languages and use prepositions to do the work of the case endings. German, like Icelandic, has remained an inflected language, and it has a grammatical structure analogous to Icelandic. Because of this characteristic, German

provides a better background for learning Icelandic than do the Modern Scandinavian languages, even though they share more cognates with Icelandic than German does (Tomasson, 1980, p. 151).

The Icelandic Broadcasting Service (IBS) had a monopoly right to operate TV and radio until 1986. The TV programs used to run from 7:30 p.m. to 11:00 p.m. four days a week; on Saturdays they started at 4 p.m. and ran to 1 a.m.; on Sundays they began at 4 p.m. and close around 11 p.m. Advertisements only came in between programs. The station did not operate on Thursdays until in the fall of 1987. This situation changed in the fall of 1986 when a private TV station opened operating with full day full week operation. The first private radio station opened also in the fall of 1986 and 3 more stations have opened since then. Western pop music constitutes most programs at all stations except at IBS.

According to a recent Gallup-poll, (from 1984 or 1985) Icelanders consider themselves to be the happiest of nations and most religious. But "church attendance on an average Sunday ... is not more than 1 or 2 percent of the population" (Tomasson, 1980, p. 176). "No modern society, except Sweden, has approached Iceland's level of illegitimacy since the advent of modern vital statistics" (Tomasson, 1980, p. 93). Alcoholism is recognized as being a nation wide health-problem, but "few Icelanders drink frequently". The problem is that "when Icelanders do drink, they drink relatively large quantities and show marked changes in their behavior. They get very drunk" (Tomasson, 1980, p. 187). Specialized institutions have gained very good treatment results in fighting alcoholism. At present there is no beer allowed in Iceland that has more than 2.25% alcohol per volume. Crimes are relatively few compared to U.S.A., but in the last decade there has been a steady increase of all kinds of crimes. Recently child abuse, incest and prostitution have been brought to public attention.

Tomasson grouped religion, literature, and alcohol together under one chapter heading. One of the similarities that he saw between these fields is the implicit attempt to transcend reality through belief, reading/writing, or drinking.

Inflation runs high, usually 30-50% per year. National debts to foreign creditors are alarmingly high. There is no poverty and no unemployment in Iceland if compared to the United States, but there is poverty in Iceland in the sense that a standard family cannot be supported on single wages. Icelanders need to, and do work a lot in overtime to keep up their high living standard and it is common knowledge that this reduces the time that families can spend together. There is no Army in Iceland, only a coastguard and a police force. Iceland has been a member of NATO since 1956, often a hotly debated issue. Our contribution to NATO is to "allow" the USA to have a base in Iceland without any "charges."

Tomasson's (1980) notes that Icelanders are "ethnocentric" (pp. 40, 201-202). "They read their own literature more than any other ... and often have little awareness of the insignificance of Iceland in the world. Politics center on domestic issues and domestic issues often shape foreign policy decisions" (p. 40). Tomasson also noted that Icelanders and U.S.-Americans share many basic values (p. 201).

Iceland is a democratic republic. The Parliament, Althing, has 63 representatives chosen from at least five parties in open elections. Usually the government is formed by Althing with a majority support. The prime minister is officially the most powerful figure. The president is elected separately and represents the nation in a similar way as a king or queen would do. The present president is a single woman, Vigdis Finnbogadottir, a former teacher and theatre director.

# APPENDIX B: TABLES OF INDIVIDUAL STUDENTS' PERFORMANCE

TABLE VIII: LINDA'S STUDENTS' REASONING SCORES\*

| Pre-<br>place | Name     | Pre<br>score | Post<br>score | Post-<br>Pre<br>Dif'e | Post-<br>place | Linda's<br>match to<br>pretest |     |   |   |                 |
|---------------|----------|--------------|---------------|-----------------------|----------------|--------------------------------|-----|---|---|-----------------|
|               |          |              |               |                       |                |                                | M   | I | T | Q <sup>1)</sup> |
| 1-2           | Freyja   | 40           | 45            | 5                     | 11             | 40                             |     | I | T |                 |
| 1-2           | Var      | 40           | 41            | 1                     | 13             | 33                             | -7  |   |   | Q               |
| 3             | Odinn    | 35           | 40            | 5                     | 14-5           | 24                             | -11 | I |   | t               |
| 4-5           | Frigg    | 33           | 42            | 9                     | 12             | 31                             |     | I | T |                 |
| 4-5           | Gefn     | 33           | 35            | 2                     | 17-8           | 25                             | -8  |   |   | Q               |
| 6-7           | Sjofn    | 31           | 33            | 2                     | 11-13          | 29                             |     |   |   | Q               |
| 6-7           | Hrund    | 31           | 35            | 4                     | 17-8           | 23                             | -8  | I | T |                 |
| 8             | Snotra   | 30           | 33            | 3                     | 11-13          | 26                             | -4  |   |   | Q               |
| 9-10          | Hlin     | 29           | 40            | 11                    | 14-5           | 40                             | +11 | I | T |                 |
| 9-10          | Hildur   | 29           | 34            | 5                     | 19-10          | 28                             |     | I | T |                 |
| 12            | Gna      | 26           | 28            | 2                     | 14-15          | 29                             |     |   | T |                 |
| 13            | Hrist    | 25           | 33            | 8                     | 11-13          | 23                             |     | I | T |                 |
| 14            | Syr      | 24           | 28            | 4                     | 14-15          | 22                             |     | I | T |                 |
| 15-16         | Saga     | 23           | 36            | 13                    | 16             | 31                             | +8  | I | T |                 |
| 15-16         | Thor     | 23           | 22            | -1                    | 17             | 33                             | +10 |   | T |                 |
| 17            | Fulla    | 22           | 34            | 12                    | 19-10          | 30                             | +8  | I | t | Q               |
| 18            | Horn     | 13           | 25            | 12                    | 16             | 13                             |     | I |   | Q               |
| TOTAL         |          | 487(pre)     | 584(post)     | 97(dif'e)             |                |                                |     |   |   |                 |
| x=28.6(pre)   |          | 34.4(post)   | 5.8(post-pre) | (n=17)                |                |                                |     |   |   |                 |
| 11            | Loki**   | 28           |               |                       |                | 35                             | +7  |   | T |                 |
| 19            | Vidarr** |              | 20            |                       |                | 25-                            |     |   |   | Q               |
| 20            | Hodur    |              |               |                       |                | 30+                            |     |   | t |                 |

1)

M: Linda mismatched pupil +/- 4 or more points from actual score.

I: Pupil's score improved for 4 or more points from pre- to post-test.

T: Pupil talked often during discussions.

Q: Pupil was mostly quiet during discussions.

\*Explanation: Two months after the pre-test which, individual results which she did not know, Linda was given the task of matching her students' names with their scores on the New Jersey Test of Reasoning Skills. The names were written in one row in a random order, the scores were written in another row starting with highest scores on top. The average score was written on the bottom of the page. The 5th column, "Post-Pre Dif'e," is meant to stand for difference, or improvement, between scores at Pre- and Post-test.

\*\* Vidarr started school late and missed the pre-test. Hodur missed both tests by chance and so did Loki on the post-test as students were tested unexpectedly.



**TABLE IX: HELGA'S STUDENTS' REASONING SCORES**

| Pre-<br>place | Name    | Pre Post<br>score score | Pre  Post- <br>Dif'e | Helga's  <br>match to |    |   |      | M | I | T | Q |
|---------------|---------|-------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|----|---|------|---|---|---|---|
| 2             | Zophon  | 40   45                 | 5   12               | 34                    | -6 | I | Q    |   |   |   |   |
| 3             | Sophie  | 37   41                 | 4   13               | 37                    |    | I | T    |   |   |   |   |
| 4-5           | Tab     | 34   40                 | 6   14               | 40                    | +6 | I | T    |   |   |   |   |
| 4-5           | Agatha  | 34   34                 | 0   9-11             | 32                    |    |   | T    |   |   |   |   |
| 6-7           | Doreen  | 32   39                 | 7   15-6             | 29                    |    | I | Q    |   |   |   |   |
| 6-7           | Thomas  | 32   39                 | 7   15-6             | 34                    |    | I | T    |   |   |   |   |
| 8-9           | Trausti | 31   36                 | 5   18               | 24                    | -7 | I | Q    |   |   |   |   |
| 8-9           | Louise  | 31   29                 | -2   14              | 31                    |    |   | t  q |   |   |   |   |
| 10            | Erla    | 30   34                 | 4   9-11             | 29                    |    | I | q    |   |   |   |   |
| 11-12         | Titus   | 29   34                 | 5   9-11             | 30                    |    | I | t    |   |   |   |   |
| 11-12         | Adelle  | 29   32                 | 3   12-13            | 32                    |    |   | t    |   |   |   |   |
| 13            | Salome  | 28   38                 | 10   17              | 27                    |    | I | Q    |   |   |   |   |
| 14            | Logi    | 27   26                 | -1   15              | 31                    | +4 |   | T    |   |   |   |   |
| 15            | Angela  | 24   32                 | 8   12-13            | 31                    | +7 | I | T    |   |   |   |   |
| 16            | Torfi   | 20   22                 | 2   16               | 20                    |    |   | Q    |   |   |   |   |

|              |            |            |           |
|--------------|------------|------------|-----------|
| <b>TOTAL</b> | <b>458</b> | <b>521</b> | <b>63</b> |
|--------------|------------|------------|-----------|

**x=30.5(pre) 34.7(post) 4.2(post-pre) (n=15)**

|      |         |    |    |  |       |    |  |  |   |   |
|------|---------|----|----|--|-------|----|--|--|---|---|
| 1    | Harry** | 47 |    |  |       | 40 |  |  | T |   |
| 8-10 | Cora**  | 31 |    |  |       | 28 |  |  |   | Q |
|      | Leona** |    | 35 |  | 18-9  | 31 |  |  | T |   |
|      | Buena** |    | 33 |  | 11-12 | 20 |  |  | I | t |

1)

**M: Helga mismatched pupil +/- 4 or more points from actual score.**

**I: Pupil's score improved for 4 or more points from pre- to posttest.**

**T: Pupil talked often during discussions.**

**Q: Pupil was mostly quiet during discussions.**

Capitals (more) and small letters (less) indicate differences of degrees.

\* Explanation: Two months after the pretest which, individual results which she did not know, Helga was given the task of matching her students' names with their scores on the New Jersey Test of Reasoning Skills. The names were written in one row in a random order, the scores were written in another row starting with highest scores on top. The average score was written on the bottom of the page. The difference between Helga's and the students' actual score on the pre-test is shown in the "Pre +/- match" column. "Post - Pre Dif'e" is meant to stand for differences at pre- and post-test. Results of Helga's match and the difference to the pretest are in the two last row of numbers.

Harry and Cora both missed the posttest and Leona missed the pretest. Buena didn't finish the pretest.

TABLE XI: HELGA'S STUDENTS PERFORMANCE WITHIN SKILL AREAS ON THE NEW JERSEY TEST OF REASONING SKILLS

Areas on New Jersey Test of Reasoning Skills

| *            | 1    | 2    | 3    | 4    | 5    | 6    | 7    | 8    | 9    | 10   | 11   | 12   | 13   | 14   | 15   | 16   | 17   | 18   | 19   | 20      | 21   | 22   | TOTAL |
|--------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|---------|------|------|-------|
| Areas        | 1    | 2    | 3    | 4    | 5    | 6    | 7    | 8    | 9    | 10   | 11   | 12   | 13   | 14   | 15   | 16   | 17   | 18   | 19   | 20      | 21   | 22   | TOTAL |
| Full house   | 2    | 3    | 4    | 1    | 1    | 1    | 3    | 1    | 2    | 3    | 3    | 4    | 2    | 3    | 2    | 2    | 1    | 1    | 3    | 3       | 3    | 3    | 50    |
| Before/after | B/A  | B/A  | B/A  | B/A  | B/A  | B/A  | B/A  | B/A  | B/A  | B/A  | B/A  | B/A  | B/A  | B/A  | B/A  | B/A  | B/A  | B/A  | B/A  | B/A     | B/A  | B/A  | B/A   |
| Student      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |         |      |      |       |
| CORE         |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |         |      |      |       |
| Adelle       | 10/1 | 10/2 | 12/1 | 10/1 | 11/0 |      | 13/2 | 11/0 | 11/0 | 11/1 | 13/1 | 2/2  |      | 11/2 |      |      |      | 11/0 | 11/2 | 21/12/2 |      |      | 21/18 |
| Agatha       |      | 11/0 | 10/1 | 11/0 | 11/0 | 11/1 | 12/3 | 0/1  | 10/1 |      | 12/2 | 2/2  | 01/2 | 11/1 |      |      |      | 12/2 |      |         |      |      | 16/16 |
| Angela       | 10/1 | 11/1 | 12/1 |      | 11/0 |      | 13/2 | 11/0 | 11/0 | 12/1 | 13/3 | 2/2  |      | 11/1 | 11/1 | 11/1 |      | 11/0 | 13/2 | 21/10/1 | 11/0 |      | 26/18 |
| FOLLOWERS    |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |         |      |      |       |
| Cora         | 11/  |      | 12/  |      | 11/  |      | 13/  |      | 11/  |      | 13/  | 2/   |      | 11/  | 11/0 | 11/  |      | 12/  |      |         |      | 11/  | 18/   |
| Erla         | 10/1 | 10/1 | 13/2 |      |      |      | 13/2 | 11/0 |      | 11/0 | 12/2 | 11/1 | 11/0 | 11/1 | 10/1 | 11/0 |      | 12/2 | 11/1 | 12/1    | 11/1 |      | 20/16 |
| ACQUAINTERS  |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |         |      |      |       |
| Buena        | 11/1 | 12/0 | 14/1 |      |      | 11/1 | 13/2 |      | 11/0 | 10/1 | 10/1 | 2/2  | 11/0 | 12/1 | 12/1 | 11/1 |      | 11/1 |      |         |      | 12/1 | 15/29 |
| Leona        |      |      | 1/1  |      |      | 1/1  | 13/1 | 1/1  | 1/1  | 1/1  | 1/2  | 12/1 |      | 11/1 |      |      |      | 12/1 |      |         |      | 15   |       |
| Louise       | 10/1 | 12/3 | 11/2 | 11/0 | 11/0 | 10/1 | 12/3 |      | 10/1 | 10/1 | 11/2 | 11/2 | 11/0 | 12/1 | 11/0 |      |      | 11/0 | 13/3 | 11/1    | 11/0 |      | 19/21 |
| PARTNERS     |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |         |      |      |       |
| Sophie       | 12/0 |      | 11/0 |      | 11/1 | 10/1 |      |      |      | 11/0 | 11/2 | 21/1 | 11/0 | 11/3 | 11/0 |      |      | 10/1 | 11/0 | 11/0    |      |      | 13/9  |
| Salome       | 12/0 | 12/1 |      | 11/0 | 11/1 | 13/2 |      | 11/0 | 11/0 | 13/1 | 11/0 | 11/2 | 11/0 | 12/2 |      |      | 11/0 | 11/0 | 12/1 | 11/0    | 11/0 |      | 22/12 |
| CHARACTERS   |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |         |      |      |       |
| Doreen       | 11/0 |      | 11/1 |      | 11/0 | 11/0 | 13/1 |      | 10/1 |      | 11/0 | 11/2 |      | 11/3 | 12/2 | 11/0 |      | 12/1 |      | 11/0    | 11/0 |      | 18/11 |
| Logi         | 11/0 | 11/1 | 13/2 | 11/0 |      | 10/1 | 13/3 | 10/1 | 11/0 | 11/3 | 11/1 | 11/2 | 11/1 | 13/3 | 11/1 | 11/0 | 10/1 | 11/2 | 11/0 | 11/1    | 11/1 |      | 23/24 |
| Zophon       |      |      | 12/1 | 11/0 |      | 11/0 |      |      |      |      | 12/1 | 11/0 | 11/1 | 11/1 | 11/0 |      |      | 11/0 |      |         |      |      | 10/5  |
| Ari          |      | 12/  | 11/  |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |         |      | 3/   |       |
| FRIENDS      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |         |      |      |       |
| Iab          |      | 10/1 | 13/0 |      |      | 11/0 | 12/2 |      |      |      | 13/2 | 11/1 |      | 12/1 | 11/1 |      |      |      | 11/0 | 11/1    | 11/1 |      | 16/10 |
| Thomas       | 11/0 |      | 12/2 |      | 11/0 | 10/1 | 13/1 |      |      |      | 13/1 | 2/2  | 11/0 | 12/1 |      |      |      | 11/3 | 11/0 | 11/0    |      |      | 18/11 |
| Titus        |      | 11/1 | 12/1 | 11/0 |      | 11/1 | 13/1 | 10/1 | 11/0 | 2/2  | 13/3 |      | 11/0 | 12/1 | 10/1 | 11/1 |      | 11/1 | 11/1 | 11/1    |      |      | 21/16 |
| Trausti      |      |      | 11/1 |      |      |      | 11/2 |      | 12/1 | 11/0 | 12/0 | 11/2 | 11/0 | 12/2 | 11/0 |      |      | 11/3 | 11/1 | 12/2    | 11/0 |      | 19/14 |
| Torfi        | 12/1 | 12/1 | 12/3 |      | 11/1 | 11/1 | 12/1 | 11/1 | 12/0 | 11/2 | 12/2 | 2/2  | 10/1 | 11/1 | 12/1 | 10/1 |      | 10/1 | 13/3 | 12/2    | 3/2  | 11/1 | 30/28 |

\*\*

TABLE X: LINDA'S STUDENTS PERFORMANCE WITHIN SKILL AREAS ON THE NEW JERSEY TEST OF REASONING SKILLS

| Areas on New Jersey Test of Reasoning Skills |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |       |       |
|----------------------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|-------|
| Areas*                                       | 1   | 2   | 3   | 4   | 5   | 6   | 7   | 8   | 9   | 10  | 11  | 12  | 13  | 14  | 15  | 16  | 17  | 18  | 19  | 20  | 21  | 22  | TOTAL |       |
| Full house                                   | 2   | 3   | 4   | 1   | 1   | 1   | 3   | 1   | 2   | 3   | 3   | 4   | 2   | 3   | 2   | 2   | 1   | 1   | 3   | 3   | 3   | 3   | 50    |       |
| Before/after                                 | B/A | B/A | B/A | B/A | B/A | B/A | B/A | B/A | B/A | B/A | B/A | B/A | B/A | B/A | B/A | B/A | B/A | B/A | B/A | B/A | B/A | B/A | B/A   |       |
| Student                                      |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |       |       |
| CHIEFS                                       |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |       |       |
| Freyja                                       |     |     | 2/1 |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | 3/0 |     |     | 1/0 |     |     |     |     | 1/1 | 1/1 | 1/1 | 1/1 | 10/5  |       |
| Frigg                                        |     | 1/0 | 2/0 |     |     |     | 1/0 | 1/0 | 1/0 |     | 2/0 | 1/1 |     | 2/2 | 1/0 |     |     |     | 2/3 | 1/1 | 2/1 |     | 17/8  |       |
| Saga                                         |     |     | 2/2 | 1/0 | 1/0 | 1/1 | 3/0 | 0/1 |     | 3/1 | 3/2 | 2/3 |     | 2/2 |     | 1/0 |     |     | 3/1 | 2/0 | 2/0 | 1/1 | 27/14 |       |
| Hlin                                         | 1/1 | 1/1 | 1/0 | 1/1 |     |     | 1/0 |     | 2/0 | 1/0 | 3/2 | 2/0 |     | 0/1 | 1/0 |     |     |     | 2/0 | 3/2 | 1/1 | 1/1 | 21/10 |       |
| PRIVATES                                     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |       |       |
| Snotra                                       |     | 0/1 | 2/1 | 1/1 | 1/0 | 0/1 | 1/2 | 1/0 |     | 3/2 | 2/2 | 1/0 | 3/2 | 1/0 |     |     |     |     | 1/3 | 1/0 | 2/0 | 1/1 | 20/17 |       |
| Var                                          |     |     |     |     | 1/1 |     | 1/1 |     | 1/1 | 1/1 | 3/2 | 1/2 |     | 0/1 |     |     |     |     | 1/0 | 1/0 |     |     | 10/9  |       |
| Sjofn                                        | 0/1 |     | 2/3 | 1/0 | 0/1 | 1/0 | 2/1 |     | 1/1 | 1/1 | 1/2 | 1/0 |     | 2/1 | 1/2 | 1/0 |     |     | 3/1 | 1/2 | 1/1 |     | 19/17 |       |
| Fulla                                        | 1/1 |     | 2/1 | 1/1 | 1/0 | 1/0 | 3/2 |     | 2/1 | 2/1 | 3/2 | 0/1 |     | 2/3 |     | 1/0 |     |     | 3/2 | 2/0 | 2/0 | 2/1 | 28/16 |       |
| Gna                                          | 1/1 |     | 3/1 | 1/0 | 0/1 | 1/1 | 1/1 | 1/0 | 1/1 | 3/3 | 2/2 | 1/2 |     | 0/2 | 1/1 |     | 1/0 |     | 2/2 | 1/1 | 2/2 | 2/1 | 24/22 |       |
| VALKYRIES                                    |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |       |       |
| Hrist                                        |     | 3/0 | 1/2 | 1/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 3/3 | 1/0 | 1/0 | 1/1 | 3/3 | 2/2 | 0/1 | 3/1 | 2/0 |     |     | 1/0 | 2/1 |     |     |     | 1/0   | 25/17 |
| Hrund                                        |     | 1/0 | 2/1 | 1/0 | 1/0 |     | 2/2 | 1/0 | 1/1 |     | 2/1 | 2/3 |     | 2/2 | 1/1 |     |     |     | 1/3 | 1/0 |     | 1/1 | 19/15 |       |
| Hildur                                       | 1/0 | 1/0 | 1/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 1/1 | 3/3 | 1/0 | 1/1 |     | 1/0 | 2/3 |     | 2/1 | 2/1 | 0/1 |     |     | 2/1 |     |     |     | 1/0   | 21/16 |
| CHILDREN                                     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |       |       |
| Gefn                                         |     | 1/0 | 1/1 | 1/1 | 1/1 |     |     | 1/1 | 1/0 |     | 2/2 | 1/3 |     | 2/2 |     |     |     | 1/0 | 1/0 | 1/1 | 1/1 | 0/1 | 1/1   | 17/15 |
| Syr                                          | 0/1 | 2/2 | 3/1 | 1/0 |     | 0/1 | 2/3 |     | 1/0 | 2/2 | 2/1 | 2/3 |     | 2/2 | 2/1 | 1/1 | 1/0 |     | 3/3 | 1/0 | 1/0 | 0/1 | 26/22 |       |
| LOWERS                                       |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |       |       |
| Horn                                         | 1/1 | 1/0 | 4/1 | 1/1 | 1/0 | 1/0 | 3/2 | 1/1 | 1/0 | 3/2 | 3/2 | 1/1 | 2/1 | 3/3 | 2/1 | 2/1 | 0/1 | 1/1 | 3/2 | 1/2 | 2/2 |     | 37/25 |       |
| Vidarr                                       | 1/1 | 2/2 | 2/2 | 1/1 | 1/1 | 1/1 | 1/3 | 1/1 | 1/1 |     | 1/3 | 1/2 |     | 1/3 |     |     |     | 1/1 | 1/2 | 1/2 | 1/3 | 1/1 | 1/30  |       |
| BOY LEADERS                                  |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |       |       |
| Odinn                                        |     | 1/0 |     |     |     | 1/1 | 2/1 | 0/1 |     |     | 3/0 | 1/2 |     | 3/3 |     |     |     |     | 3/2 |     | 1/0 |     | 15/10 |       |
| Loki                                         | 1/1 |     | 2/1 |     |     | 1/1 | 1/1 |     | 1/1 |     | 2/1 | 1/1 | 1/1 |     |     |     |     |     | 3/1 | 1/1 | 1/1 | 1/1 | 22/1  |       |
| BOY FOLLOWERS                                |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |       |       |
| Hodur                                        |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |       |       |
| Thor                                         | 1/2 | 1/1 | 1/1 | 1/0 | 0/1 | 1/0 | 3/1 | 0/1 | 1/1 | 1/1 | 2/2 | 3/3 | 0/1 | 3/2 | 2/1 | 1/1 | 0/1 | 1/1 | 1/2 | 0/1 | 3/2 | 1/2 | 27/28 |       |

## REFERENCES

- Arango Vila-Belda, Faulkes and Robinson (1987). Education Committee: Review of Educational Policy in Iceland. Examiners' Report and Questions. Reykjavík: Menntamálaráðuneytið (Ministry of Education).
- Bellah, R. (1982). Social Science as practical reason. Hastings Center Report, 12(10), 32-39.
- ✓ Benjamin M. and Echeverria E. (in press). Knowledge and the Classroom. Michigan State University.
- Bernstein, R.J. (1967). John Dewey. The Encyclopedia of Philosophy, (Vol. II, pp. 380-385). New York: Macmillan.
- ✓ Bernstein, R.J. (1983). Beyond Objectivism and Relativism. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Brownie, M.W. (1986). Quantum Theory: Disturbing Questions Remain Unresolved. The New York Times. February 11, 1986.
- Burnes, B. (1981). Harry Stottlemeier's Discovery - the Minnesota experience. Thinking, 3(1), (pp. 8-11).
- Cinquino, D. (1981). An evaluation of a philosophy program with 5th- and 6th-grade academically talented students. Thinking, 3(3 & 4), (pp. 79-83).
- Clifford W.K. (1877). Ethics of Belief. Contemporary Review. Also in: Lectures and Essays. London 1879.
- Collingwood, R. G. (1933). An Essay on Philosophical Method. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cummings, N. (1980). Improving the logical skills of fifth graders. Thinking, 2(1), (pp. 90-92).
- Curtis, B. (1985). Wittgenstein and Philosophy for Children. Thinking, 5(4), (pp. 10-19).
- Cusic P. (1983) The American High School and the Egalitarian Ideal. New York: Longman.
- Dewey, J. (1916). Democracy and Education. New York: Macmillan.
- Dewey, J. (1929). The Quest for Certainty: A Study of the Relation of Knowledge and Action. New York: Minton, Balch & Company.
- Dewey, J. (1965/1904). The Relation of Theory to Practice in Education. In M.L. Borrowman (Ed.), Teacher Education in America: A Documentary History. New York: Teachers College Press.
- ✓ Erickson, F. (1979). Mere Ethnography: Some problems in its use in Educational Practice. MI: East Lansing, Institute for Research on Teaching.
- ✓ Erickson, F. (1986). Qualitative Research on Teaching. In

Handbook of Research on Teaching. Third Edition. M. Wittrock, (Ed.) New York: MacMillan.

✓ Erickson, F. and Schultz, J. (1981). When is a Context? Some Issues and Methods in the Analysis of Social Competence. In Ethnography and Language in Educational Settings. J. Green and C. Wallat, (Eds.), pp. 147-60. Norwood, NJ: ABLEX Publishing Corporation.

Growing up With Philosophy (1978). (Eds. Lipman, M. and Sharp, A.M.) Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Higa, W.R. (1980). Evaluation of the Hawaii Philosophy for Children program. Thinking, 2(1), (pp. 90-92).

Jóseppsson, B. (1985). The Modern Icelandic School System in Historic Perspective. Reykjavík: The National Center for Educational Materials.

Karras, R.W. (1980). Final evaluation of the pilot program in philosophical reasoning in Lexington Elementary Schools 1978-79. Thinking, 2(1), (pp. 26-32).

Kuhn, T.S. (1962/1970). The Structure of Scientific Revolutions. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Leithauser, B. (1987). A Nonesuch People. The Atlantic (September, pp. 32-41).

Lipman, M. (1974/1982) Harry Stottlemeier's Discovery. New Jersey: First Mountain Foundation.

Lipman, M. (1976/1985). Lisa. New Jersey: Institute for the Advancement of Philosophy for Children, 1976, 1st ed., and 2nd edition copublished by The First Mountain Foundation and University Press of America, 1985.

Lipman, M. (1976) Philosophy for Children. Metaphilosophy, 7(1).

Lipman, M. (1978). Suki. New Jersey: Institute for the Advancement of Philosophy for Children.

Lipman, M. (1980). Mark. New Jersey: Institute for the Advancement of Philosophy for Children.

Lipman, M. (1981). Pixie. New Jersey: First Mountain Foundation.

Lipman, M. (1982). Kio and Gus. New Jersey: First Mountain Foundation.

Lipman, M. (1984a). On Children's Philosophical Style. Metaphilosophy, 15(3&4), (pp. 318-30), 1984. (Originally published in German in Zeitschrift f r Didaktik der Philosophie, January 1984.)

Lipman, M. (1984b). The Cultivation of Reasoning Through Philosophy. Educational Leadership, 42(1), (pp. 51-6). A complete version in: Thinking, 5(4), (pp. 33-41).

- Lipman, M. (1985a). Philosophical Practice and Educational Reform. Journal of Thought, 20(4), (pp. 20-36).
- Lipman, M. (1985b). Philosophy for Children and Critical Thinking. The Phi Kappa Phi Journal, Winter 1985, (pp.18-23).
- Lipman, M. (1985c). Thinking Skills Fostered by Philosophy for Children. In Thinking and Learning Skills, vol. 1: Relating Instruction to Research, (pp. 83-108). (Eds. Segal, J.W., Chipman, S.F. and Glaser, R. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Lipman, M. and Gazzard, A. (1986) Philosophy for Children: Where We are now. Thinking 6(4). (Special Center Supplement.)
- Lipman, M. with assistance of Sharp, A.M. (1980a). Social Inquiry. New Jersey: Institute for the Advancement of Philosophy for Children.
- Lipman, M. with Sharp, A.M. (1980b). Writing: How and Why. New Jersey: Institute for the Advancement of Philosophy for Children.
- Lipman, M. and Sharp, A.M. (1982). Looking for Meaning. New Jersey: The First Mountain Foundation.
- Lipman, M. and Sharp, A.M. (1986). Wondering at the World. New Jersey: The First Mountain Foundation & University Press of America.
- Lipman, M., Sharp, A.M., and Oscanyan, F. (1977, 1985). Ethical Inquiry. New Jersey: Institute for the Advancement of Philosophy for Children, 1977, 1st ed.; 2nd edited by Lipman and Sharp. Copublished by First Mountain Foundation and University Press of America, 1985.
- Lipman, M., Sharp, A.M., and Oscanyan, F. (1975/1979). Philosophical Inquiry. First Mountain Foundation and 2nd ed. with University Press of America 1984.
- Lipman, M., Sharp, A.M., and Oscanyan, F. (1980). Philosophy in the Classroom. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1980.
- Lortie, D. (1975). Schoolteacher. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Matthews, G.B. (1984). Dialogues with Children. Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Matthews, G.B. (1980). Philosophy and the Young Child. Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- McDermott, R.P., Gospodinoff, K., and Aron, J. (1978). Criteria for Ethnographically Adequate Description of Concerted Activities and Their Contexts. Semiotica, 24(3,4), pp. 245-275.
- McPeck, J. (1981). Critical Thinking and Education. New York: St Martin's Press.

- Mead, G.H. (1979/1910) Language as Thinking. Thinking, 1(2), (pp. 23-26). (Originally published in Science, 31, pp. 688-693.)
- Mead, G. H. (1934). Mind Self and Society. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Morante, E.A and Ulesky, A. (1984). Assessment of Reasoning Abilities. Educational Leadership, 42(1), (pp. 71-74).
- Passmore, J. (1972). On teaching to be critical. In Education and the Development of Reason, (Eds. Dearden, Hirst, and Peters, London. Also in Passmore, J. (1980). The Philosophy of Teaching. London: Duckworth.
- Pálsson H. (1986a). Heimspeki með börnum. (Philosophy with Children.) Reykjavík: Rannsóknastofnun Uppeldismála.
- Pálsson, H. (1986c). Metacognition and Philosophical Discussions. Analytic Teaching, 6(2), (pp. 43-49).
- Pálsson, H. (in press). Gunni. Reykjavík: National Center for Educational Materials.
- Peirce, C.S. (1878). "How to Make Our Ideas Clear" and (1877) "The Fixation of Belief" in Philosophical Writings of Peirce, (Ed. J. Buchler). New York: Dover, 1955.
- Pritchard, M.S. (1985). Philosophical Adventures with Children. University Press of America.
- Reed, R. & Henderson, A. (1981). Analytic thinking for children in Fort Worth elementary schools: Initial evaluation report. Analytic Teaching, 2(1), (pp. 5-12).
- Rogoff, B. (1982). Integrating Context and Cognitive Development. Advances in Developmental Psychology. (M.E. Lamb & A.L. Brown, (Eds.)), pp. 125-170).
- Rorty, R. (1979). Philosophy and the Mirror of Nature. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Rorty, R. (1982). Method, social science and social hope. In Consequences of Pragmatism (pp. 191-210). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Ryle, G. (1968). A Puzzling Element in the Notion of Thinking. In Studies in the Philosophy of Thought and Action, (p. 23). P.F. Strawson (Ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ryle, G. (1969). Thinking and Self-teaching. In Kolenda, K. (Ed.) On Thinking (pp. 65-78). New Jersey: Bowman and Littlefield.
- Sharp, A.M. (1986). What is a Community of Inquiry? Journal of Moral Education.
- Shipman, V.C. (1978). An experiment with philosophy for children in Newark and Pompton Lakes, N.J. Unpublished manuscript.

- Shipman, V.C. (1982). Evaluation of the Philosophy for Children program in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania. Thinking, 4(1), (pp. 37-40).
- Simon, C. (1979). Philosophy for Students with Learning Disabilities. Thinking, 1, pp. (21-33).
- Skúlason, P. (1985). Er hægt að kenna gagnrýna hugsun? (Is it possible to Teach Critical Thinking? Reykjavík: Fjölrit.
- Snook, I.A. (1974). Teaching Pupils to Think. Studies in Philosophy and Education, 8(3), (pp. 146-62).
- Sternberg, R.J. (1984). How Can We Teach Intelligence. Educational Leadership, 42(1), (pp. 38-50).
- Taylor, C. (1979). Interpretation and Sciences of Man. In P. Rainbow & M. Sullivan (Eds.) Interpretive Social Science: A Reader. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Wade, C. (1982). The Pocket Encyclopedia of Baby Names. California: Globe Communications Corp.
- Weinstein, M.L. & Martin, J.F. (1982). Philosophy for children and the improvement of thinking skills in Queens, New York. Thinking, 4(2), (p. 36).
- Wittgenstein, L.J.J. (1958/1953). Philosophical Investigations. London: Basil Blackwell.
- Yeazell, M.I. (1981). A report on the first year of the Upshur Country, West Virginia Philosophy for Children project. Thinking, 3(1), (pp. 12-14).