

THE REPORT ON HARRY STOTTEMEIER

"It is a mistake to think that we can engage children in the educational process without engaging them in reflection about what they are doing" (Lipman, 1979, p. 128). According to Lipman, we cannot expect children to want to be actively involved in their own education unless we encourage and provide the opportunity for them to reflect on what it is that they are doing when they are doing it. Meaning is not something that can be dispensed or force-fed, children must seek it out and discover it for themselves. Analytic Teaching, by promoting inquiry through discussion, is a way by which children can become actively involved in seeking meaning and reflecting on what their education is all about.

The P4C program also has the potential to make an impact on children's contribution to society in general as well as their schooling process. If children can learn to value others' needs, views and interests as equally important as their own, and can become more sensitive to and tolerant of alternative ways of thinking and acting, their contribution to society will more likely be a positive and constructive one.

Education is not complete if it teaches only the cognitive areas of a child's growth and development. It must go beyond influencing academic achievement alone and touch a child's personal development in areas of self-confidence, emotional maturity, general self-understanding and inter-personal relationships (Lipman, 1974). The P4C program has the potential to make an impact on these areas of personal development as well as reasoning ability and creativity. Thus, Analytic Teaching could possibly effect the overall education of those students who participate.

THE STUDY

It was the purpose of this particular study to determine what effects, if any, a voluntary approach and meeting outside the confines of a regular school classroom and the regular school day would have on the effectiveness of the Philosophy for Children program and its potential for achieving its aims. The circumstances surrounding this practicum and its implementation in a classroom setting deviated somewhat from the norm. Due to the fact that at the time I was not in a full-time teaching position where the program could be implemented, a special class had to be brought together. The students had to enroll in the class on a voluntary basis, a place to meet had to be secured, and a meeting time outside the hours of the regular school day had to be decided on--either in the morning before school began or in the afternoon after school dismissed. Because of the voluntary nature of the program, some unique problems were presented regarding student selection for the program and student participation in the program.

An effort was made to reach all kinds of students with the possibilities and potential of such a program. The formation of the class was to be inclusive rather than exclusive. This was not to be an enrichment program limited to children having special abilities, but a program designed to enrich all kinds of children with the wonder of thinking and sharing in a supportive caring environment. A representative group of fourth and fifth grade students of varying achievement levels at the A. V. Cato Elementary School in Castleberry Independent School District, Fort Worth, Texas was brought together for the Philosophy for Children program.

It was also the purpose of this study to determine the program's effectiveness and the degree to which it could influence in a positive way several specific areas of development in the children who participated in the study. Although there were numerous areas that could have been dealt with as a part of this study, it was not the purpose of this study to research all the possible outcomes of the Philosophy for

Children program. The specific areas of concentration that this study attempted to research were: 1) improvement of self-esteem; 2) increased sensitivity toward others; and 3) development of thinking skills. Another proposed outcome was that as students became actively involved in the very process of inquiry, their attitudes toward school would be enhanced, and their desire to learn for the sake of learning would increase. This purpose was to be accomplished through the development of a community of inquiry--drawing the students into philosophical discussion and dialogue concerning issues that were raised in a philosophical novel written for children. In this study, that novel was Harry Stottlemeier's Discovery.

It was believed that a voluntary approach to the Philosophy for Children program would have both advantages and disadvantages. A projected outcome was related to the format of the class--its being outside a regular school classroom and the regular school day. It was believed that this might effect the teacher/student relationship. A possible advantage was liberty on the part of the teacher to withdraw any student for reasons concerning attendance or behavior in class. A possible disadvantage was a lax attitude on the part of the students concerning attendance and punctuality, which could hinder progress in the program.

There were two assumptions made in this report. The first assumption was that the teacher of the P4C program had special training in and an understanding of the techniques and aims of Analytic Teaching. The second assumption was that all respondents to the final evaluation form were honest in their responses to the questions asked.

The data of this study were of two types: primary data and secondary data. The primary data was the direct observations of the 12 participating students by the researcher during two 45-minute class sessions per week as recorded in a daily log, and the responses to the Student Evaluation Form (Nickel, 1983). Eleven out of the 12 student forms were completed. The secondary data was the responses by the parents and teachers of the 12 participating students to the Parent/Teacher Evaluation Form. Ten out of 12 parent forms were completed and five out of 12 teacher's forms were completed. Appendices A and B exhibit the responses to the Student and Parent/Teacher Evaluation Forms respectively. Data was derived through actual physical observation as well as indirect observation through the benefit of a questionnaire--in this case, the Student and Parent/Teacher Evaluation Forms.

At this point it is necessary to discuss the procedures followed for the formation of the research sample. Preparation for implementing the P4C program in the Castleberry Independent School District in Fort Worth began in the spring of 1987. Informal conversations with the superintendent and members of the school board constituted the initial steps to promoting the program within the district. These were met with a degree of curiosity and openness to the possibilities and the potential of the program.

The first official meeting was held in mid-summer with the superintendent of the district. Presented at that time for his consideration was a copy of the novel, Harry Stottlemeier's Discovery, the teacher's manual, Philosophical Inquiry, and the practicum proposal in which was set forth the plans for implementation and student selection for the program as well as the nature of the program and its possible outcomes. The most immediate concern to be dealt with was the formation of the class itself and the best or most appropriate criteria by which children should be selected to participate in the program. There were numerous possibilities. The only certainties, at this point, were that the class would consist of 12 students, fourth and fifth grades combined.

Originally, it was proposed that a brief introductory letter would be published and mailed to the parents of all fourth and fifth grade students. A detachable form would be provided for parents to fill out and mail in if interested. A decision as

to what the final selection process would involve would then be made based upon the response to the letter. The superintendent was reluctant to do such a mass mail-out, anticipating a possibly overwhelming response. His suggestion was to have some qualifications or requirements with which to begin in order to narrow the field of eligible students at the outset of the process of selection. Possible criteria that were suggested included grade point average, achievement test scores, recommendations from teachers and/or parents, and current participation in the gifted program. All of these were unacceptable, however, for the purposes of this study.

The superintendent was open, and he welcomed the opportunity to be able to offer such a new and unique program in the district. It was decided at this initial meeting that the program would be implemented in whatever way was decided on by the principal of the chosen elementary school along with the researcher.

A meeting was set up with the principal of the A. V. Cato Elementary School to discuss the program and to work out the problems of selection, scheduling and location. Again, the proposed plan of contacting all parents was met with opposition. His recommendation was that he be allowed to compile a list of 30 to 40 students who represented all achievement levels, both male and female, in grades four and five. The deciding factor would be to choose children whose families were supportive and would follow through on a commitment to the program to be regular in attendance throughout the entire 22 weeks that the program would be in session. This was an important consideration due to the voluntary nature of the program. It was not possible to require the children to attend; however, it would be difficult to accomplish the purposes of the study if attendance was sporadic or if any children dropped out, for whatever reason, and had to be replaced.

Details concerning scheduling were discussed at this meeting, and the proposed time of 45 minutes before school two days a week was confirmed. So the class meeting time was 7:30 am to 8:15 am on Mondays and Wednesdays. The school library was decided on as the location for the class.

An introductory letter was sent to the 37 students listed by the principal. On the day of school registration 10 forms were returned with a positive response. In addition, two families who had not been contacted by mail expressed an interest and enrolled their children. Thus, the class of 12 was complete. Two handouts were given to each of the enrolled families. One, a sampling of 50 possible issues and ideas to be discussed in the program; and second, excerpts from an article by Burnes in the April-May, 1983 issue of *Analytic Teaching*, entitled "Who is Harry Stottlemeier, Anyway?" The students were required to pay a supply fee of \$3.50 to help defray the cost of the books.

One family, which had not been contacted by mail, expressed an interest in the program but wanted to take a copy of the novel to read in order to determine whether or not it was something that they would be interested in. The book was later returned with a note expressing a concern regarding the program and possible negative effects that it could have on children; in particular, they worried that it might cause children to question God and religion and to challenge parental authority. Another family which had already enrolled in the program were contacted by the concerned family and were told their concerns. This family asked to read the novel, also, and subsequently withdrew their child's name from the class for reasons similar to those of the first family.

In order to prevent this problem from growing or any further problems from developing, it was deemed necessary to call a meeting with the principal, all parents of children participating in the program and Dr. Ronald Reed from Texas Wesleyan. The purpose of the meeting was to be as open and public about the program as possible and to allay any fears that may have existed concerning the program, and its methods and contents. This was done by answering questions which were raised and by

explaining in more detail the program's historical background, its geographical scope, and the nature of the philosophical discussions which characterize the programs and what the community of inquiry is all about. There was no indication at the meeting that any problems or fears existed among the group that had gathered. The meeting was productive and informative. Parents who had been positive about the program were affirmed in their decision to participate and were even more excited about its potential. All parents were invited to visit the class at anytime to see first-hand what constituted a class in P4C.

Thus, the class of 12 fourth and fifth grade students was formed and the research sample was defined. A description of identification data of the research sample are exhibited in Table I.

TABLE I
DESCRIPTION OF THE SAMPLE

GRADE	N-GIRLS	N-BOYS	TOTAL N
4	5	2	7
5	2	3	5
TOTAL	7	5	12

The selection process for choosing the children who would participate was successful as far as achieving the goal of reaching all levels of students. Table II exhibits the ranges of the students' achievement levels according to the most recent administration of the California Achievement Test.

TABLE II
RANGES OF STUDENTS' CAT GRADE EQUIVALENTS

GRADE	RANGE	Read	Lang	Math	Total	Sci	Soc Stud
4	HIGH	11.9	11.9	7.0	9.0	8.4	6.9
	LOW	3.6	3.0	3.1	3.3	0.7	4.3
5	HIGH	8.0	8.8	7.6	7.8	8.0	7.9
	LOW	6.0	5.0	4.9	5.8	5.5	5.8

The majority of the children were classified as working either on or above grade level in the areas tested. There was a small number, however, who, in either one or more of the areas tested, were found to be working below grade level.

Achievement test scores were not considered as part of the selection process. They were consulted after the completion of the practicum to determine whether or not a broad range of students had been reached and whether or not there was a relationship between achievement level and ability to perform the tasks undertaken in the P4C program. No such relationship was found to exist.

In addition to the daily log, a student evaluation was conducted at the end of 21 weeks of the practicum to help to further assess any progress achieved by the

students as a result of the program. Also, at the end of 21 weeks, parents and teachers were contacted and given an evaluation form to complete concerning their child. This parent/teacher evaluation was conducted in order to determine what effects the program had on the students in the context of their homes and other school subjects. An evaluation of this type was warranted due to the fact that the only time when careful observation or assessment of growth and progress in the areas outlined in the recent study could be made was the 90-minutes a week during which the P4C class met. It was necessary to rely on responses from individuals who were involved with the children's lives on a more consistent basis.

After 21 weeks of the practicum and following the completion of the evaluation forms by the students and their parents and teachers, all the data, including the daily log written by the researcher, were gathered with consideration being given to the areas of particular concern to the present study. Responses and records that dealt with the advantages or disadvantages of the voluntary approach, the children's self-esteem, their attitudes toward school, their attitudes and sensitivity toward others, and their thinking skills were compiled and given consideration with regard to whether or not and how they supported the projected outcomes of the study.

Responses to the evaluation forms and records in the daily log were carefully screened for any evidences of progress made in other areas as well. Also, consideration was given to the presence of any problems or digressions by any students as a result of, or at least as it related to, the program itself.

REVIEW OF THE YEAR

The P4C program began at 7:30 am, Monday, September 28, 1987. Introductory activities were initiated in order to acquaint the class members, as well as the researcher, with each other. The students were asked to give some introductory information about themselves. This was an initial attempt to get to know the students and to get an impression of how they felt about speaking in a group. There was only limited response at this point.

Another attempt at "breaking the ice" was made by playing some thinking games. This was the very beginning of the formation of our community of inquiry. In both of the games there was an "unknown," and the kids displayed evidence of becoming somewhat of a unit, working together to figure out what was unknown. This fostered the beginning of a supportive environment, for those who had been successful at figuring out the unknown wanted to encourage and help those who had not.

From the beginning and throughout the weeks that we met, the class worked together as a unit to be supportive of one another. There was seldom a problem of humiliation, embarrassment, or laughing at other members of the group. They worked to maintain a supportive atmosphere during the practicum experience. On occasion, however, it was necessary to give reminders concerning this--when a discussion was building and there was disagreement, some students had to be reminded of the rule in discussion that we never attack a person, we can only speak to his views or his reasons for those views.

During these initial classes together it became evident that the seating arrangement was a key factor in our discussion. We sat around tables, experimenting with different formations, with and without specific seat assignments. It was clear that the formation of a circle away from the tables would be most conducive to an open discussion format. The tables enabled the children to hide and to have access to materials and books that distracted them from the discussion. The standard seating arrangement after eight weeks became a semi-circle of chairs. Also, due to the size of the class, sitting as close as we were, it was difficult to keep students separated that needed to be separated. So a seating chart provided little assistance

in this area. There was a problem of friends sitting with friends and involving themselves in conversation and activity outside the efforts of the group as a whole. The responsibility was then placed on the students themselves to control problems concerning conduct during class time. This was successful for the most part. It was found that once the children became actively engaged in thinking, discussing and figuring things out, they were able to put aside the desire to distract each other.

Before the group began reading in the text, there were some foundational ideas and rules that first needed to be brought to the attention of the group. Following the introductory activities, a discussion was initiated concerning the five different types of conversation (Reed, 1983) in which people engage themselves including discovery or invention. Seeing the types of conversation, the children were instructed and encouraged to work toward making the discussion in our class of the discovery type. I felt it appropriate to inform the children as to what they were getting involved in and, basically, what was expected of them in a class of P4C. It was also necessary to set some ground rules to help enable us to have such discussions; these rules were generated by the students themselves so that a better impression of their importance would be made in the children's minds. Such rules included: respecting each other's opinions, not interrupting, not dominating conversation, not making fun of others, talking one at a time, sticking with the subject and listening. Eventually it was the last two rules which presented the greatest difficulty.

Following the discussion of the necessary ground rules, we began chapter one of Harry Stottlemeier's Discovery. For 13 discussants there were six copies of the book. Sharing presented problems only when a boy and girl had to share a book. This was avoided whenever possible.

Initially, the strategy for introducing a chapter was to read the chapter and ask the students to list any ideas of interest to them. We then proceeded to consider those ideas and discuss them until all the leading ideas had been covered. It is interesting to note at this point that for Chapter 1 the students had little or no idea what interested them or what might be important to consider. But after working through Chapter 1 and reading Chapter 2, the children were able to pick out all the leading ideas but two. The students became more adept at recognizing philosophical issues raised in the novel.

It was found that if too much time lapsed between readings--the students lost track of the story line, who the characters were, and the leading ideas which had been raised. We were continually having to re-read sections to call to mind the events and important ideas. Therefore, a different reading strategy was employed for the chapters following Chapter 1. The class read a section, then, before going further, discussed the characters and leading ideas found in that particular section. This strategy was helpful in providing continuity to the novel and the characters within the novel.

Chapter 1. Without a doubt, the favorite leading idea of Chapter 1 was "discovery and invention." The overall response of the class to this issue was very positive. Not only did the students respond with great involvement and enthusiasm, but also the exercises involved the group as a whole in the process of inquiry in a way that probably no other exercise or leading idea covered during the practicum experience was able to do. Even though this leading idea was covered at the beginning of the practicum, the discussion was prompted mainly by the children. They built upon each others' ideas and used each others' examples to defend or refute their views. We modified our answers in light of new ideas, and although we did not come to definite conclusions on some of the questions raised, we made progress in our understanding of the concepts, discovery and invention. After having been actively engaged in the process of inquiry, it was now natural to move directly into a

discussion about what it was that we had been doing. The students understood the process much more clearly after having participated in it.

Again, there was an "unknown"--even the "teacher" did not have the answer. There was not the fear of being wrong or giving a wrong answer--the only expectation was to give good reasons for an answer. In addition to the presence of an "unknown," the subject was of an objective rather than a personal nature, which seemed to make the discussion less intrusive and threatening to the students.

Another positive experience from Chapter 1 was the discussion of the idea "resentment." The results of our discussion were illustrative of what a philosophical discussion seeks to achieve. Philosophy, according to Lipman is "the exploration of alternative ways of doing and thinking" (1974, p. 8E). During the course of this discussion, the children considered alternative ways of thinking about situations that typically evoke feelings of resentment. They also considered alternative ways of acting when experiencing feelings of resentment. The students' consideration of others' feelings and alternative ways to think and act towards others indicated progress as a group in the area of sensitivity toward others.

One problem that had to be dealt with here was that of digressing into a simple sharing of opinions and "getting things off the chest." It was necessary, and the children learned from this exercise, to relate their personal experiences to the issue being discussed. They needed to learn to "compare notes, experiences or perspectives, and that the pieces begin to fit together into an objective picture of the way things might be" (Lipman, 1974, p. 8E).

Chapter 2. "Stereotyping": one form of jumping to conclusions was the leading idea from Chapter 2 which brought about a good discussion. All children find themselves, at one time or another, jumping to conclusions before having sufficient evidence. The problem had never been given a name, however, and close examination of the nature and problems of stereotyping had never been considered.

One positive aspect of the discussion of this particular idea is the effect it can have on the personal development of the children--one of the major aims of the P4C program. One purpose of this study was to determine whether or not the program could have a positive effect on the area of sensitivity towards others. Discussions such as the type resulting from this exercise demonstrate the possibilities regarding that area of interpersonal relationships.

Chapter 3. Significant ideas emerging from discussion in this chapter included "the unfair reprimand," "what is fairness?" and "teasing." These all generated a great deal of discussion. Again, the students considered what feelings others may have when treated unfairly, and after looking at reasons why people treat others unfairly at times, they began to consider alternative ways of relating and responding to unfair treatment themselves.

Again we were not able to decide conclusively on a definition, but because of our discussion, we were able to make progress in the clarification of the concept "fairness." This provided an opportunity to address problems affecting our discussions--shyness, over-talkativeness, sticking with the subject--without direct confrontation of any student in particular. It was interesting, though, that the students having the greatest problems in this area were the first to speak up about all the distractions hindering our progress.

Chapter 4. We were engaged in the reading and discussion of Chapter 4 when the evaluation was administered to the students. The concepts "interesting" and "boring" were raised on the evaluation form as they related to P4C, and they were also raised in the chapter. They brought about good discussion. The students realized that there was a degree of personal responsibility involved when labeling something as "boring" or "interesting." Becoming more clear about this issue obviously had an effect on the students' attitude toward school in general. We progressed in our

discussion from exclaiming how boring a certain thing or person was to reflecting on possible reasons why a certain thing or person may or may not be boring.

Chapter 5. Chapter 5 had several related ideas and exercises dealing with school and education and the purposes for each. These elicited good discussion and inquiry on the part of the students. Again as in Chapter 4, these exercises demonstrated potential for affecting a change in the students' attitude toward school and learning.

The response to the logic exercises was an unexpected one. Overall it was very positive. During Chapter 1, there was a hesitancy on the part of this researcher to introduce the logic. I was particularly anxious about those students who had not involved themselves at all in the community. I was fearful that the logic would turn them away. Surprisingly, however, the three students in question responded positively and with a certain amount of enthusiasm. It was believed that possibly because of the abstract, open-ended nature of the discussion, these students had been threatened and afraid to get involved. It was true, however, of all three during all five chapters that their best response was to the logic section.

There were a number of areas where we had to work continuously as a community in order to make progress in our inquiry and our discussions. Particular problem areas with which the discussion leader had to deal in this study were: 1) flexibility, 2) listening, 3) pacing, and 4) closure.

A perfect example of inflexibility as a discussion leader was the first period of discussion following the reading of Chapter 1. I had planned to begin with the leading idea "the process of inquiry." It was a good starting point for discussion, I believed, and it would help to introduce some major concepts regarding our community and what we would be trying to accomplish in our discussion together. I wanted the students to recognize the process of inquiry in which Harry had been engaged in chapter one and to relate that to our goals. Unfortunately, they did not recognize that as something to be discussed. So rather than listening carefully to their comments to decipher what it was that they had picked up on in the chapter, I worked to manipulate their thoughts to become like mine. I basically forced them into "discovering" the process of inquiry. As a result I missed some good ideas which they had perceived in the chapter. For example, one student said, "I'm like Harry, thinking about things all the time." Another student related a personal experience of day-dreaming. These were two valuable comments from which there could have developed a very meaningful dialogue relating to leading ideas within the chapter. However, I was listening only for cues of the leading idea that I had chosen, and I completely missed the opportunity to discuss what was of particular interest to the students. I had to guard against an over-dependence on the teacher's manual and prescribed discussion plans as well as prepared lesson plans of my own.

Lipman (1980) says that "the teacher's role throughout the discussion is one of a talented questioner"; and that "teachers do not need to present themselves to their students as possessing a great store of information. It is better to appear to the class as a questioner who is interested in stimulating and facilitating the discussion" (p. 103). I often had difficulty when it came to facilitating dialogue. The unpredictability of the students' comments required a sharpness and alertness not always called upon in a typical learning setting. It was difficult to determine which comments required further investigation and just how to respond. Becoming adept at questioning techniques was something that required time and a great deal of reflection, which also related to careful listening.

Another problem facing the discussion leader was that of pacing the discussions. Often during the practicum experience, exercises were carried on too long, to the point of disinterest on the part of the students. At times, as a class session approached its end, we were still in the middle of discussing an exercise. The

students' interest was at a peak and rather than leaving at that point, having made a degree of progress in our discussion, I would continue until we reached the point that I had planned to reach. This was counterproductive to our goal of making progress. Student interest dwindled, and this damaged progress. This problem arose within the class time as well. I mistakenly assumed that it was necessary to fill an entire class session with one particular topic. I found that it was better to pace the discussion and use more than one leading idea to create interest and motivate the students to think and participate in dialogue.

The problem of closure related somewhat to the problem of pacing. Rather than being satisfied with making a degree of progress and agreement among the students, and reaching a degree of clarity concerning an issue being discussed, I often attempted to reach a particular point where everything pulled together so I could "tie everything up" to some closing thought, moral, or conclusion.

In general, the majority of the problem areas with which the discussants had to deal in this study related directly to making discussions cumulative rather than linear. These included: listening carefully and reflectively, keeping comments focused on the issue being discussed, and building on each other's ideas. The students were encouraged frequently and regularly to listen carefully and to think about what had been said in order to build on each others' ideas rather than simply letting our discussions become a time of getting our opinions all out in the open. Our discussions needed to be more than just an "airing of views", but rather an effort to become more clear on a particular issue and to reach some level of agreement concerning that issue. This was the area of greatest concern and a problem which the group continually worked on improving. Often we found ourselves repeating statements due to the fact that good listening skills were not being practiced, so progress was hindered.

Another area of concern that developed, possibly as a result of the irregular circumstances surrounding this practicum, was sharing personal opinions and experiences as simply a way of getting things off the students' chest rather than relating them to the issue being discussed. At times our discussion bordered on being therapeutic due to the informal nature of the program and the unique quality of the teacher-student relationship. Because the P4C class met outside the confines of the school day and the classroom setting, the teacher was not viewed as the authority figure. The students felt free to share problems which they were facing at home and at school, knowing there was someone who would listen without there being the threat of damaging the teacher/learner relationship. This sharing was always done within the context of the discussion, but it did not always serve the purpose of becoming more clear on an issue. It was necessary for the discussion leader either to establish some relationship between the dialogue and what was shared or to handle it in such a way as to respect what had been shared and yet stick to the subject of the discussion.

Additional areas where students had to work continuously were: talking one at a time and being on time to class. At the beginning of the practicum it was a struggle to get the students to share at all, but by the end of the practicum, there was the problem of everyone wanting to share at once. Also, the students had a lax attitude concerning punctuality, which hindered progress in our discussions. Students coming in late were either left in the dark concerning our topic of discussion, or the group had to retrace its steps for the late-comers, both worked against our goal to make progress in our discussions. Attendance was never a problem; however, the program itself was sufficient motivation for being there. No reward system of any kind was necessary to encourage consistent attendance. The students were "rewarded" intrinsically when they participated in the activities of thinking for themselves and figuring things out. A note here about the class meeting time: the responses in the

student and parent/teacher evaluation forms indicate clearly that 7:30 am was not a good time to meet. Eight out of the 11 students responding and two out of the 10 parents responding stated that the time was very unfavorable.

Periodically it was found to be helpful to ask the children how they perceived our discussions were going--how well they thought we were following the guidelines that they had set--and ask them to critique themselves. This removed me from the position of authority figure and placed me in the group as a fellow discussant with an opinion that counted as one, which gave the group as a whole a chance to correct their own problems. It also enabled us to reflect on our joint experience of inquiry. It was found that our reflection on our experiences taught us more than the actual experience itself.

THREE STUDENT PROFILES

The responses from the Student and Parent/Teacher Evaluation Forms indicated progress in the students participating in the program. There were three, however, whose experience with the P4C class brought about some significant and desirable change. For purposes of this paper they will be called Karen, Misty, and Chuck.

Karen. At the beginning of the program, Karen evidenced no signs of listening or participating in the community. I never could establish any eye contact with her. She was busy trying to distract the girls around her. I moved her so that she would be away from her friends so that all could listen and get involved. Her response to this was to put her head down on her arm; it was as though she had completely tuned us out. I was worried whether or not she would give me or the program a chance.

The first sign of involvement was when the logic in Chapter 1 was introduced. Though she never became open and verbal, I sensed a willingness to participate when the logic was presented. Perhaps, as stated earlier, the concrete nature of the logic and its adherence to specific rules was what appealed to Karen. She seemed to enjoy trying to figure out "the right answer."

Other than a few times when she was called upon to speak, she never offered opinions or comments in our discussions. I learned from other teachers that she was typically a shy girl and that she came from a family where both of her parents were quiet people. In our discussion on "What is Fair to Expect of Participants in a Discussion?" we dealt with whether or not it was fair to expect everyone to speak. Initially, the class responded with a unanimous "yes." Then Karen's best friend in the group said, "Well, no because some people are just shy," and she looked at Karen. The group immediately changed its answer to "no, because there are shy people who like to think but don't like to talk." I perceived this to be an affirmation of Karen's position in the group. It was good to see sensitivity and support such as that from the students. It was considered to be progress in the area of interpersonal relationships.

Some of the responses from Karen's evaluation and her parents' evaluation indicate that real progress was made in the areas of self-confidence, attitude toward school, and thinking skills. Comments on her parent's evaluation form included: "She now questions some of our instructions asking for more specific directions and wanting to know "why." She has always liked school but has never discussed what went on during the day. This year she has talked about something every week. . . I feel that much of her enthusiasm is because of your class. She has had excellent teachers since first grade but has never talked about school with such enjoyment." Karen's response to the question of whether or not she enjoyed discussing ideas brought out of the story (question #11) was "very much," and her comment was, "I like it because there's some stuff you really never realize." She also indicated that she would be interested in reading another novel and continuing discussion next year. It was also

interesting to note, considering her problems at the beginning, that she commented twice about kids sitting by friends and not listening--that that was what she did not like about the program. It was her only suggestion.

Had I relied solely on what was directly observed in class, I would have considered Karen to be a student who had not been reached by P4C, other than her involvement in the logic. However, words like "enthusiasm" and "enjoyment", and references to her discussing and talking indicate something altogether different from what I had been able to observe during the short time that I was with her.

Misty. An even more encouraging success story is Misty's. Her response at the beginning of the program was similar to that of Karen. She showed no sign of life, whatever. Her expression was one of complete and total boredom. She even frequently asked when class would be over, and if she had to come if she didn't want to. Of course, the answer to that was "no." Her experience with the logic was similar to Karen's. She got involved and seemed to enjoy the writing of sentences.

Misty's problem did not seem to be shyness, because she had plenty of energy and plenty to say outside the context of the class discussion. The problem was perceived to be more one of self-confidence. However, by the end of the program Misty was sharing in every discussion. Her comments were not always on target, but she was thinking, so I would help her clarify her meaning then relate it to the discussion. I was very proud of her and the progress she made.

Responses on her evaluation forms indicated some improvement in thinking and even more in self-confidence. Her mother also indicated progress in the areas of communication skills and sensitivity toward others. Comments included: "she asks more about some thing or some word she does not understand and wants to know. Sometimes she had too much confidence when talking to her father, they would argue." That hardly sounded like the Misty I had observed in P4C class.

Chuck. Initially Chuck was a good participant and a valuable member of our community. He was always bright and perceptive in his comments and his involvement in our discussions. However, after a couple of weeks he became a discipline problem, constantly interjecting comments off the subject from our discussions, distracting individuals and the class as a whole from the inquiry process. When he did choose to participate in a constructive manner, his comments were right on track and evidenced good thinking and reasoning skills. He was a leader in the group and he had the power to make or break progress in our discussion. I had the power, however, because of the voluntary nature of the program to remove him from the class. I hesitated doing this because of the potential I saw in him to make progress personally, as well as his ability to be instrumental in promoting progress within the group as a whole because of the depth he added to our discussions.

I received a visit from Chuck's teacher after about six weeks of the program. She related to me some special problems that he was experiencing in his life at home. She felt that it would help in understanding him better. It certainly did. There was not much that I could do concerning his situation directly, but I knew that a program like P4C could be a positive force in his life--a place where he could be accepted and heard and made to feel valuable. I was even more determined to reach him and see what positive effects the program could have for him.

Like Karen, the discussion on what is fair to expect in discussion had special application to Chuck's problems in the group. As a matter of fact, he was the primary reason for choosing to discuss fairness in those terms. It was an effort to get him to see that his behavior was not fair to the group and that we had the right in discussion to expect that the participants stick with the subject and listen to everyone's comments. I found it interesting that he had more to say than anyone when it came to the joking and the unfair behavior. There was a marked change in Chuck after this discussion. There were occasional reminders, but he became a valuable,

contributing member of the community.

Unfortunately, his teacher's evaluation was very negative. If that was all I had to go on, I would feel that not only did we not make progress, but that there had been a severe digression. However, direct observation of Chuck in the class and his own evaluation of the class seem to indicate a progress in several areas. Some meaningful responses include:

- Question #2* "In their classes I didn't describe what I meant very often, but now I do."
Question #3 "I thought it would be real boring, but it's not. It's a fun class."
Question #4 "In philosophy you can't say fun words for an answer. You have to describe what you say."
Question #7 "I say it is a really neat class . . ."
Question #11 "There is more than one answer to a question."
Question #12 "I would be interested next year."
Question #13 "I like everything about it."
Question #14 "I like best trying to come up with a conclusion."
Question #15 "P4C is interesting, exciting."
Question #17 "It is a fun but an educational class that has taught me a lot of things."
Question #20 "I'm learning to think what I say instead of just throwing something out there."

CONCLUSIONS

The main concentration of this study was to determine the program's effectiveness and the degree to which it could influence children who participated in the study in a positive way. Several specific areas of development in the children who participated in the study included: 1) building self-esteem; 2) improving interpersonal relationships, i.e., a heightened sensitivity toward others; 3) enhancing attitude toward school and desire to learn; and 4) improving thinking skills. The data seems to support the hypothesis that these areas were effected in a positive way by the P4C program. Both responses to the evaluation forms and the direct observations of the students during the class time indicate progress in these areas.

The concentration of the effects of meeting outside the school day on the P4C program proved to be worthy of consideration. The findings seem to show a relationship between this format and the level and kind of participation of the students, due to the change brought about in the student/teacher relationship. The program itself effects change in this relationship because of the position the teacher has of being a fellow-discussant and facilitator rather than teacher or authority figure. The teacher is a part of the community where there is a shared ignorance on the part of all discussants. This aspect of the P4C program puts the teacher in a different perspective for the students, but the format of this particular practicum further added to the change in the student/teacher relationships. I related to them only on the level of fellow-discussant; never was I in the position of being an authority figure for them. They considered me their friend.

P4C boasts of its achievements in many areas effecting students related to academics and thinking skills, but it was found in this study that the P4C program has vast potential in areas outside academics. As stated earlier, education is not complete if it touches only the cognitive areas of a child's growth and development. It must go beyond influencing academic achievement alone and touch a child's personal development in areas of self-understanding and interpersonal relationships. Due to the personal and effective nature of many issues dealt with in the P4C program in

general and in this study in particular, the program borders at times on being therapeutic. It is the view of this researcher that this contributes significantly to the success and progress of the program in the lives of the students it reaches.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. It is important to be as public as possible with the P4C program, both with teachers and parents. A line of open communication, both before and during the program's implementation, with the other figures of leadership in the students' lives would help to reinforce what is trying to be accomplished in P4C. Rather than simply inviting parents and teachers, they should be encouraged regularly to visit the class to experience first-hand what their children are involved in. Possibly, a progress report of some kind sent to the parents periodically to let them know what kind of improvements their child is making and what kinds of activities and issues they have been discussing would be informative and reassuring. An open line of communication would also help the P4C teacher be more perceptive and sensitive to the needs and situations of each of the children in the program.
2. This researcher recommends some strategies for reading the text and discussing the suggested leading ideas. It may be that trying to cover every leading idea in the chapters is too much. Some of the ideas are not really prominent in the text--the ideas ought to bring themselves up rather than the leader stretching the text to elicit the ideas. Many of the ideas are related to each other and it may be better to wait until an idea is dealt with in the text in a way that sparks the interest of the children, then go back and pick up on exercises not discussed in previous chapters. Also, it may help to provide more continuity to the chapters and the characters within the chapters to select and discuss the two or three ideas of greatest interest to the children, then as necessary, look back at related ideas from previous chapters to reinforce those presently being considered.
3. A more preferable time than 7:30 am should be considered for meeting. There is a difficulty with children arriving on time and being alert and responsive so early in the morning. Meeting after school is a possibility but it could present conflicts with school activities, and it may be difficult for children to give their best after a full day at school. Sometime during the school day may be a possibility provided there is time for the core subjects.
4. At the age of the children participating in the study there are certain group dynamics at work that can change the outcome of the program and the discussions involved. In particular, there is a definite clash between boys and girls. Situations where boys and girls are placed together--either in a small group, sharing a book or sitting together--should be avoided. This clash can be used to the advantage of the program; however, there are times when it stimulates a bit of interest on the part of the student if they are grouped together as boys or girls, this generates some excitement due to the existing spirit of competition and the comraderie within the groups.
5. Due to its concrete and objective nature, it seems that the logic is able to draw some children into the community and its efforts more effectively than the more abstract philosophical issues. Logic plays by a strict set of rules, and generally there is a right and a wrong answer, unlike the open-endedness of the philosophical issues discussed. If there are children who do not respond well to the dialogue generated by such issues, it may be helpful to introduce the logic to bring them into the community of inquiry.
6. An important element of P4C is that of "shared ignorance" among all the discussants, including and especially the discussion leader. The discussion leader naturally has more training and experience, nevertheless, the purpose of the

community is to examine issues of interest to the students in order to become more clear on those issues and to be open to alternative ways of thinking and acting. If the leader has "the answer" there is no need for the community of inquiry. The students know that full well, and when the leader takes on the role of fellow-discussant and learner, they are more inclined to try to figure out whatever is being discussed.

7. The chalkboard and the overhead projector are helpful tools in the P4C program. They can provide direction and continuity to the discussions. The group is able to see where they have been--the ground already covered--and project where they are going with the discussion. The writing time they require allows thought time and reflection in order to help pace the discussions. They can also be used as motivational tools by giving children the opportunities to do the writing.

8. A final recommendation deals with a subject mentioned earlier, and that is flexibility on the part of the discussion leader. There should be no "hidden agenda" or definite lesson plan, whether from the manual or original design or the leader may well miss that which is of particular interest to the children. This is not to say that the discussion leader need not plan. On the contrary, it involves very careful planning to be sufficiently familiar with the philosophical implications of all the possible leading ideas in order to be prepared to follow the leading of the students.

Cynthia Gunter

REFERENCES

- Alvord, D. T., & Glass, L. W. (1974). Relationship between academic achievement and self-concept. Science Education, 58, 174-179.
- Buchler, J. (1954). What is a discussion?. Journal of General Education, 8, 7-17.
- Burnes, B. (1983). Who is Harry Stottlemeier anyway?. Analytic Teaching, 6, 39-40.
- Echeverria, E. (1985). Motivational aspects of philosophy for children. Analytic Teaching, 6, 19-23.
- Ennis, R. H. (1967). A concept of critical thinking: A proposed basis for research in the teaching and evaluation of critical thinking ability. In Psychological Concepts in Education, B. P. Komisar & C. J. B. MacMillan (Eds.), Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.
- Haas, H. J. (1976). Philosophical thinking in the elementary schools: An evaluation of the education program philosophy for children. Rutgers, NJ: The State University Institute for Cognitive Studies.
- Johnson, T. W. (1987). Philosophy for children and its critics--going beyond the information given. Educational Theory, 37, 61-68.
- Kyle, J. (1983). Managing philosophical discussions. Analytic Teaching, 3, 13-16.
- Lipman, M. (1974). Harry Stottlemeier's discovery. Montclair, NJ: First Mountain

Foundation for the Institute for the Advancement of Philosophy for Children.

Lipman, M. (1979). Philosophical inquiry. Upper Montclair, NJ: The Institute for the Advancement of Philosophy for Children, Montclair State College.

Lipman, M. (1974, October). Philosophy is also for the young: At least possibly. New York Times, 8E.

Lipman, M. (1985). Presuppositions of the teaching of thinking. Analytic Teaching, 6, 2-8.

Lipman, M., & Sharp, A. M. (1978). Growing up with philosophy. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University.

Matthews, G. B. (1984). Dialogues with children. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University.

Matthews, G. B. (1980). Philosophy and the young child. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University.

Morehouse, R. (1983). What is generalizable in the pedagogy of philosophy for children?. Analytic Teaching, 4, 25-27.

Nickel, C. (1983). Oklahoma meets Harry Stottlemeier. Analytic Teaching, 3, 21-27.

Reed, R. (1983). Talking With Children. Denver, CO: Arden.

Sharp, A. M. (1987). Pedagogical practice and philosophy: The case of ethical inquiry. Analytic Teaching, 7, 4-7.

Silver, R. E. (1983). Controlling the classroom clamor. Analytic Teaching, 3, 5-7.

Weinstein, M. (1986). Leading a philosophical discussion. Analytic Teaching, 6, 10-11.

Whalley, M. J. (1984). The practice of philosophy in the elementary school classroom. Thinking, 5, 40-42.

APPENDIX A

PHILOSOPHY FOR CHILDREN STUDENT EVALUATION FORM

1. I find this class:

- | | |
|--------------|---|
| A: Difficult | 1 |
| B: Average | 9 |
| C: Very easy | 1 |

Comments:

You don't make us do a lot of work.

It's not easy to do because sometimes you have to think very hard.

Well, because sometimes in here I know what the answer is and sometimes I don't.

Because some things are easy and some are hard, and when you put that together I

get average.
Because some things are hard and other things aren't.
You give us time to think and say what you want.
It's kind of hard to get up early. And we learn stuff I already know.
I think it is average because it is not easy and not hard.
It takes alot out of me.
It is easier than it would be now that we get our thoughts out in the open. So I think that it is average.
It wasn't like a school classroom because there were no tests.

2. Compared to other classes, I feel I am learning in this class:

A: Very much	8
B: Some	1
C: Little	2

Comments:

I don't understand what some of the questions mean.
Because I didn't know half of what we were doing.
Well, in this class we are learning about thinking, I feel that with the help from the class I have been able to think.
Because I never knew about standardizing sentences or some of the other things. I'm learning about the parts of a sentence, classifying sentences and finding ways to solve problems.
We can think and so I tend to listen better in here.
Some stuff I already know. But I'm learning a little.
The class helps us to use our noodle and it's helping in class.
In other classes I didn't describe what I meant very often, but now I do.

3. This class is as I expected it to be from the description I heard about it:

A: Exactly	1
B: Some	5
C: Not at all	5

Comments:

I thought it would have no homework, and I thought it would talk about things greater than "all" and "no."
Because I have not heard of the things we were doing.
Well, I thought it would be just like other classes (boring), but this is fun.
I thought we were just going to just read books the whole entire time.
Because some of the things are the way I thought it would be, like the book, but other things aren't.
I thought it would be like where we would study hidden treasures.
I thought it would be in my classroom. I knew it was going to be another teacher . . .
Exactly because it is like I thought it would be.
Well, I figured that there would be more people in the class.
I thought it would be real boring, but it's not, it's a fun class.

4. Philosophy for children is different from other classes:

A: Very	9
B: Some	2
C: Not at all	-

Comments:

Because other classes don't talk about Philosophy.
We discuss what we do and we discuss it until we understand.

Well, in other classes it is usually boring, but Philosophy is FUN!
Because in regular classes you don't learn about how to define the words "fair" and "unfair."
Philosophy is more fun and we learn in fun ways and we're not graded.
In most classes we study Math, and in here we think.
I think English is like Philosophy. It is different from Math.
For one thing the class is only 45-minutes long.
In Philosophy you can't say a few words for an answer. You have to describe what you say.
Because there are no tests.

5. The differences (if any) are:

A: Great	6
B: O.K.	5
C: Bad	-

Comments:

You can learn things in this class, but you learn greater things in other classes.
Because you are learning something new.
Normal classes are boring, this class is fun.
You learn a lot of different things.
No test or no grades, or we do fun things to learn.
I like the differences because we think and I like to think.
The differences are: one, you have to get up early; two, for 45-minutes Philosophy.
Because it is okay because so little of time in less and no papers and almost no books.
At least you sit where you want to.
You sometimes try to explain what you think is right, but its wrong.
Because there were no tests.

6. Answer "how?" to your response to question #4.

You have to discuss if you don't understand something until you understand what we are saying.
In Philosophy we don't have subjects or we don't get a grade or report card.
Well, you just don't sit in your chair for 45-minutes talking about fair and unfair in regular classrooms.
It's different because its fun and it doesn't put much stress on me.
We think more in here than I do in others classes.
Not a lot of children like Philosophy. I kind of like Philosophy.
Because all you have to do is look back at all the things we do.

I think it is more educational.
It is easier.

7. I speak to other kids in school about this class:

A: Often	2
B: Once in a while	5
C: Never	4

Comments:

Because they wonder what its about and everything.
Because it is great and I am learning something new.

I tell them it is interesting and fun!
I don't talk about it because the kids that I tell might be jealous and want to be in it too.
I ask them if they want to come learn about Philosophy, too.
Whenever I say Philosophy, they always ask me so I explain.
When I'm late I say I was in Philosophy.
Because I never have to talk about it because just me and Terry are the only ones in it. People think we brag.
None
I say, "It is a really neat class and I go there in the Monday and Wednesday mornings."

8. I speak to my family about this class:

A: Often	3
B: Once in a while	6
C: Never	2

Comments:

When it's time to go my dad asks me what I've learned.
Because I like to see if they understand what it is and ever had a class like this.
Well, my mom usually asked me how the day went and I tell her and my family about other classes and about Philosophy.
I tell them what I'm learning and tell them what the story I'm reading is about.
They asked me what we talked about and I explain it to them.
I don't think they are really interested in this class.
When my dad or mom ask me what did you do in Philosophy, I say a lot.
Only if my mom and dad bring up the subject that is the only time I talk about it.
Just barely.
Whenever I'm with my dad we go out and play tennis and other games so my mind is on other things. My mom won't listen.

9. I enjoy reading Harry Stottlemeier:

A: Very much	1
B: Some	9
C: Not at all	1

Comments:

He teaches stuff to me that I didn't know.
Because the story helps some things that we were doing and helped understand more.
I like some parts and I don't like some parts.
I like it because of the problems he has.
I think he has an interesting novel.
I like HS a little because its about a fourth grader.
I like it some because some of it is not that fun.
Well, he's a good kid, he likes school. But a briefcase?
It is not that interesting of a book.

10. Answer "why?" to your response to question #9.

He teaches stuff that I didn't know.

It would help understand more.
As I said in Question 9 I like some chapters and others I don't like that much.
I like it because he has a lot of problems.
Harry is funny and wants to learn about Philosophy.
I think it is an interesting book.
The chapters are too long.

A briefcase doesn't sound good. It sounds like he's showing off.
It is not a very interesting book.
Because it wasn't very interesting.

11. I enjoy discussing ideas which are brought out of the reading of the story about Harry:

- | | |
|---------------|---|
| A: Very much | 7 |
| B: Some | 4 |
| C: Not at all | - |

Comments:

I don't get into discussion very much.
Because I figure it out and I was thinking.
Because I learn more every time we have a discussion.
Because some of the problems are hard to decide on but I can do it.
Because some of the questions were hard to figure out but most of the time I like it.
It gives me time to think about the story, that's what I like about it.
I like it because there's some stuff you really never realize.
Because we don't get to read out loud and when we are reading a paragraph we do not ask any answer.
Some of his ideas really stink.
There is more one answer to a question.
I liked it very much.

12. I would be interested in reading another novel and continuing discussion like this next year:

- | | |
|---------------|---|
| A: Very much | 4 |
| B: Some | 4 |
| C: Not at all | 3 |

Comments:

I need more time to learn first and I don't like getting off so early.
Because I would be learning more and reviewing.
The only thing I would not like would be getting up early.
I would like to do it a little because it might help you in other classes but it can be boring at some times.
I would like to if I had a teacher like Cynthia to help me.
I liked HS so I think I would enjoy another one.
Because you have to wake up so early in the morning.
It teaches us things, it deals with our problems.
I would want to pick another novel and discuss it.
It would be boring.

13. One thing that I really do not like about this class is:

The playing when trying to have discussions.
Nothing.

When we are trying to have a discussion some people are talking about other things rather than the discussion.

I don't like the time (7:30 am).

In some of our talks people get off the subject and they play.

Waking up so early.

You have to get up too early.

What I do not like is we always read about Harry.

It's at 7:30.

I like everything about it.

Getting up so early.

14. The thing that I like best about this class is:

The reading.

We discuss and figure things out on our own.

The discussions.

The thing I like best is my teacher. (Mrs. Gunter)

I like the stories about people. It's fun. I had a good time.

Being able to think and discuss ideas.

It's a little fun.

The think I like best is my teacher.

The class is very good for me since I'm running on all four cylinders.

Trying to come up with a conclusion.

All of it.

15. Philosophy for Children class is:

A: Valuable 6

B: Interesting 9

C: Boring 1

D: A waste of time -

E: Exciting 6

F: Just O.K. -

16. I agree with Harry that "thinking about thinking" is important:

A: Strongly 5

B: Some 6

C: Not at all -

Comments:

Because you have to think about other things too.

So you think what you say and if you should say that or if it was dumb.

I do because when you think about it you learn more about.

Because you have to think about what you're going to think about before you can think about it.

Because people need to think about things like that and it's very interesting.

I think that if you think you will be doing good and you might have fun.

You never think about thinking when you're having fun.

And you do think about thinking when you're not.

Some because when you think about thinking I do not understand.

Well, I don't really understand where he's coming from but I think about thinking sometimes.

Because it is fun.

17. I would recommend this class to students for next year:

- A: Strongly 7
- B: Some 3
- C: Not at all 1

Comments:

Because they need to learn other things.
Because there probably is not a class like this in a higher grade.
Because it is very interesting, exciting, and you learn about thinking and very valuable.
Some because you could learn things for other classes (maybe).
It was fun and you learn about finding things out and thinking about interesting things.
I think it would be good for some students to think a little more.
Some may not like Philosophy.
Because you can learn lots of things in this class and in our other class.
It's a real good class.
It is a fun but educational class that has taught me a lot of things.
Because it was boring.

18. The circle seating arrangement is very important to our discussion:

- A: Agree strongly 7
- B: Agree some 2
- C: Disagree 2

Comments:

Because we do need to have a good discussion.
Because you can hear and are listening.
Because we are able to listen and hear the person's ideas so we can build on it.
You can see everybody. No one is behind you.
Because everyone can see each other and then they might listen more.
You can see everyone so you know what the others are saying.
Some boys and girls like to sit by their friends and don't listen.
Because you can see more people and listen closer.
It brings us closer together.
Well it isn't that important but I would rather be with a group.
Because I like it at the tables.

19. I think this class meeting two times per week is:

- A: Too much 2
- B: Just right 8
- C: Too little 1

Comments:

I need to get to class on time, but you don't let us out early enough.
Because we get what want to say and what we want to do.
Well, two times a week gets everything done unusually so it is just right.
Because you only have to get up early 2 times per week.
Then you can think more about what we said.
If too much then we will only have one in I like it.
I think just right because say one Monday you are in a discussion then you run out of time then the next day you can say what you want to say.
We need to meet 3 times per week.
I wouldn't want to have to wake up at 6:00 every morning.
It is too hard to get up two days a week.

20. As a result of this class, I am learning to think more carefully:

A: Very much 6
B: Some 5
C: Not at all -

Comments:

Because we can be helped in being crached (?).
Now that I took this class I feel that in other classes I have participated more.

Because I have learned to think things through.
I used to just jump out with my answers.
It helps me think before I answer.
Because I still don't understand that much.
I used to talk before I thought now I think before I talk.
I'm learning to think what I say instead of just throwing something out there.

21. When people ask me what we do in this class, I say:

I discuss with people.
How we turn sentences around and how we think.
We have very interesting discussions, and no one is hardly ever wrong.
I say we read a chapter and discuss for about 2-3 weeks.
I say we talk about sentences, problems and different subjects.
I tell them that we think.
We study Philosophy not English.
We do Philosophy and we talk.
We learn.
We learn Philosophy and have good discussions.
Not very much.

22. Additional comments, write on back, if needed:

I just wanted to say you are doing a GREAT job Mrs. Gunter.
Its good.
I take the way it is taught with the book and all the fun things.
I think this class is very good but also kind of hard.
Not to sit friends by each other.
Nothing.
We need to read more books.

APPENDIX B

PHILOSOPHY FOR CHILDREN PARENT/TEACHER EVALUATION FORM

Child's Name _____

Relationship To Child _____

Parent Teacher

1. Student speaks about the Philosophy for Children class:

A: Often	3	1
B: Once in a while	7	3
C: Never	-	1

Comments: Parents

Only when we asked about it.

He doesn't give out much information, unless he is unhappy or dislikes something. Some days she would talk about what someone said in class that day . . . talks about her other classes more.

Teachers

Spoke often about class at beginning of year. After home problems, rarely speaks anything.

Very positive, wants to share what was discussed.

2. When student speaks about the class he/she says:

Comments: Parents

He tried to explain to us what he was doing in the class.

Favorable things--expressing enjoyment of the class. She always had a desire to go to class.

It's fun. She likes the teacher. She has learned to think clearly about things.

He likes the class. He explained Philosophy as a means of learning to make good decisions after knowing the information.

She has talked about the lively discussions that were had in class. She said everyone really voiced their opinions. When I asked her if she said what she thought and believed she said yes. She then said they wouldn't listen, they just kept arguing.

Would relate what happened in class that day--told some of her answers to questions--that she liked the class and her teacher.

It is very good. He also says he enjoyed it very much.

It is fun, was a little confusing at times but then she began to understand.

I remember the first thing she said about the class, we can call her Cynthia, 'her' being the teacher.

Teachers

He was very excited about the class at the beginning of the year.

He enjoys it.

3. As a result of the class, I feel the student is learning to think more carefully:

A: Very much	4	1
B: Some	6	3
C: Not at all	-	1

Comments: Parents

She is still very impulsive and hopefully maturity will dwindle that. When she does slow down, she does think things through quite thoroughly and I am pleased.

She now questions some of our instructions asking for more specific directions and wanting to know "why"?

She has learned to figure out situations easier.

Sometimes it is surprising how she takes adult explanations for questions she

asked and puts them in her own terminology.
She is more conscientious in doing her work.
He really needed this class. I can see a big change in thinking before doing.
She asks more about some things or some word she does not understand and wants to know.

Teachers

I have noticed a digression of all of these actions. Again, I don't believe it has to do with the class, but other problems.
He has improved in all these areas.

4. I have noticed changes in this student in areas of:

A: Self-esteem (confidence)	6	2
B: Attitude toward school	5	1
C: Communication skills	3	2
D: Sensitivity toward others	5	1
E: Thinking skills	8	4
F: Other _____	2	-

Comments:

She is a follower in my eyes--always seeking to please her peers. She has gained confidence in herself and has become very sensitive to those she is with.
She has probably improved in all of these areas.
She has always been a good student, but would sometimes gripe about having to work. She started that at the first of the year, but is no longer doing that now. We no longer have to ask her if she has done her homework or remind her to do it.
He thinks more now.
Sometimes she had too much confidence when talking to her father and they would argue.
She has always liked school but has never discussed what went on during the day. This year she has talked about something every week. Part of this may have been attributed to Mrs. Hill, but I feel that much of her enthusiasm is because of your class. She has had excellent teaching since 1st grade but has never talked about school with such enjoyment.

5. Additional thoughts concerning the Philosophy for Children program, write on back please:

He did not speak much about the program. We do not know what was going on in the program. He would only answer the questions that we asked.
She enjoys reading--she is always involved with several books. I attribute this love of reading to the thinking and reasoning skills she's acquired through Philosophy. Thank you for providing this very positive opportunity for her. I believe any opportunity for improving and broadening a person's character is never wasted. I think she enjoyed this class. Thank you very much.
This class has helped her mature in her thinking and her ideas about learning. She even told me the other day that her school work was really fun to do. You might try a different time of day. Especially for him. He is not a morning person. You might give the parents progress reports to let us know how our kids are doing.
Thanks again--I think all the kids I talked with thought of you as teacher and friend.
She sometimes did not like getting up early for the class.

Her CAT scores seemed higher than last year. I'm anxious to see next year's results. I would have liked a Pre- and Post-test to see how much actual improvement in thinking skills occurred. I appreciate your time and effort and I thank you for allowing her to participate.