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Introduction

Education is challenged by the demands of educating future citizens who are capable of responding to multiple societal demands. Analysis of global societal trends reveals consequences for Europe with outcomes such as rising inequality, more vulnerable groups, and uneven opportunities for individual empowerment (Hoorens et al, 2013). Results of an International Civic and Citizenship Education Study (ICCS) indicate how countries are devoted to enhance young peoples’ civic and citizenship education, which prepare them to meet the demands facing societies in the 21st century (Schultz et al, 2010). When defining 21st century skills for professionals in the labour market, the capacities of sharing, teamwork and innovation are crucial (Binkley et al, 2012).

Most of the 38 ICCS-countries emphasize participation and engagement in civic and civil society as well as communicating through discussion and debate. By contrast, fewer countries emphasize opportunities for student involvement in decision-making and reflecting on change processes in school. Comparisons between England and Finland suggest that the English school system better supports positive attitudes toward being active, participating citizens (Schultz et al, 2010), whilst Finnish youngsters’ civic knowledge and performance e.g. in mathematics, science and reading is at a higher level (OECD, 2014).

Teacher education is responsible for educating teachers capable of making changes and encouraging student/adult respect and democracy in society. Although democratic practices are developed teacher education is burdened with hierarchical traditions such as unequal teacher-learner relationships and emphasis on school subjects instead of building a collaborative culture. This chapter analyses changes made in one Finnish teacher education programme at the University of Jyväskylä through one case study. In the Department of Teacher Education, emphasis has been placed on developing teaching courses focused on interpersonal competence (Klemola, 2009; Klemola et al, 2013; Rasku-Puttonen et al, 2011). The research-based evidence from these courses shows that such studies generate 21st century skills including collaboration, problem-solving as well as motivating learning. Due to these findings, we wanted to emphasise developing ‘impressive’ education (as described by students – see method) based on democratic philosophies (Freire, 1996; hooks, 1994). An intervention course-module PedArt was implemented where changes were consciously made at constructional and ideological levels.
In theorising democracy and dialogue this paper describes the PedArt intervention, considers the implications for teacher education, whilst also reflecting on the findings in light of the student teacher populations in Finland and England.

**Dialogue as a basis for democracy and change**

The space of dialogue and the emphasis on interaction must be present to enhance democracy and democratic practices in education. ‘Democracy calls for citizens to think for themselves about the lives they want to lead and so democratic education must bring about citizens who can do this’ (Blacker, 2007:146-147). According to Dewey, democratic education requires individuals to be personally involved in the decisions they make and to experience ‘individual growth’ (Blacker, 2007:42). In order to achieve this in the context of multiethnic societies such as the UK, the United States and to a lesser extent Finland, two things need to be understood. First that ‘democratic education has largely committed itself to the enterprise of expanding its ideas and assumptions about culture from … a relatively narrow middle-class Anglo ideal to a more encompassing “multicultural” approach that “celebrates” or at least acknowledges diversity’ (Blacker, 2007:43, emphasis in original). There are questions regarding the precise nature of this multicultural commitment in these countries. Second, critical thinking is required by the individual if s/he is to ‘examine for oneself the assumptions about the world that one has been accepting’ (Blacker, 2007:141). To do this, Descartes maintained, individuals should:

…reject all their beliefs together in one go, as if they were uncertain and false. They can then go over each belief in turn and re-adopt only those which they recognise as true and indubitable’ (Cottingham et al, 1985:481).

Blacker observes that many will question whether it is possible to reject all their beliefs and replace them only with correct beliefs. Moreover, how does one know which are the correct beliefs to have? This could be the role of the teacher and teacher educator. However, it is recognised that understanding whether students or indeed teachers are ready to have their taken-for-granted-beliefs challenged can be daunting for both teachers and teacher educators. Notwithstanding, Freire suggests that education should be concerned to make students:

more fully human’ i.e. ‘conscious beings’, subjects and creators of knowledge. A subject is someone who has the capacity to adapt oneself to reality plus the critical capacity to make choices and transform that reality’ (Freire, 2008:4).

Freire views teachers and other professionals as determined by a culture of (middle class) domination and ultimately being miseducated, and it is this miseducation which is addressed through dialogue, and transformative pedagogy. However, true teacher-student dialogue cannot exist if teachers/teacher educators do not understand their own backgrounds, the world they live in and the backgrounds of those they teach and they continue to regard students as ‘ignorant’ (Freire, 2008:71) and close their minds to the knowledge that students bring to the classroom. Similarly hooks (1994:202) argues that ‘…without the capacity to think critically
about ourselves and our lives, none of us would be able to move forward, to change, to grow’ (hooks, 1994:202). In other words ‘…dialogue creates a critical attitude…’ and ‘…only dialogue truly communicates…’ (Freire, 2010:40). Being aware of and considering these challenging issues related to democratic education is difficult but not impossible. The aim of the PedArt intervention was to find the voices of students as well as teachers, which in turn could enable critical thinking concerning the predominant structures and flaws in school with regard to democratic education and citizenship.

In the classroom, if dialogue is to communicate there has to be understanding of the issues being raised and this comes through teacher-student and student-student discussion/negotiation of shared meanings. Further, to develop critical consciousness amongst students it is important that educators understand the role of education and that of the teacher. According to Freire (2010, p.111):

‘If education is dialogical, it is clear that the role of the teacher is important, whatever the situation. As s/he dialogues with the [students], s/he must draw their attention to points that are unclear or naïve, always looking at them problematically. Why? How? Is it so?

Put simply, educators are required to move from the banking approach where students are filled with knowledge to problem-posing whereby ‘…education affirms men and women as beings in the process of becoming (ibid.:65), capable of building democratic futures through critical questioning/dialogue. The expectation is that engaging in dialogue about real ‘…concrete situations’ (ibid.) should lead to the transformation of both student and educator and their ability to transform the world.

Freire’s philosophy encourages teachers to be self-reflective and at the same time seek to transform their practice. To do this, and to create possibilities for dialogue and educational change, hooks (1994:207) contends that teachers should ‘…teach in a manner that respects and cares for the souls of [their] students’ if [they] are to provide the necessary conditions where learning can most deeply and intimately begin’ (hooks, 1994:13). hooks (1994:84) also called for teachers to ‘…bring to the classroom pedagogical strategies that affirm [student] presence [and] their right to speak, in multiple ways on diverse topics’. These notions were cherished in the PedArt intervention discussed below and provided opportunities for teacher educators and student teachers to engage in dialogue, enhance voice and teacher-student transformation through a new pedagogical strategy.

Method

Case description - PedArt-project in one Finnish teacher education programme

A research-based intervention course entitled PedArt was implemented at the University of Jyväskylä. In the spirit of critical pedagogy, the underlining ideas of PedArt were to change
the school and conventional teaching and learning practices, and to combine pedagogy and art.

Experiences and views of teacher educators and students undergoing the intervention course-module were examined. The participants were a group of class teachers and subject student teachers (majoring in biology, Finnish language, foreign languages, health education, philosophy, and psychology) together with 6th graders and two teacher educators. Every subject student teacher and a second year class student teacher had an opportunity to join PedArt; 13 out of 350 used this opportunity. The course took seven months and attracted 7 credits. The aim of the project was to generate possibilities for dialogues between students, and between students and teacher educators. Replacing the banking by the problem solving approach (Freire, 2008) meant that, from the beginning, the project’s principles relied on pedagogical strategies of non-hierarchy between teacher educators and students, giving possibilities ‘…for all to grow’ (Freire, 2008). Changes were made in the following epistemological ways:

- teaching orientation to research orientation;
- customary teaching and learning methods to more creative methods and art;
- static to dynamic;
- structured to open;
- fragmentary to holistic;
- formal to informal;
- knowing to being;
- working alone to working together;
- monologue to dialogue.

PedArt was implemented by emphasizing an open basis-approach, the role of arts, co-teaching and linking theory and practice. The open basis-approach means that the ‘teacher-students’ and ‘students-teachers’ plan and construct the project together. The teachers offered only curriculum-defined loose frameworks, e.g. credits, university course aims and the context, school class. The role of arts was apparent in the learning assignments and teaching methods in various ways throughout the project. The PedArt project started with an art-adventure which ended up in a home garden. Two teacher educators intensively worked together modelling the idea of co-teaching, implemented by combining separate teacher education programmes of class and subject teachers, and collaboration between students as well as students and teachers. Emphasizing the link between theory and practice was enhanced by studying theory in real environments and facing real problems.

Research questions, data and data analysis

This study sought to answer the following questions:
What do student teachers find impressive during interventions emphasizing democratic philosophies?

What issues do they raise in their writings?

The data consisted of students’ (n=13) written essays in the form of letters (n=26) in the middle and at the end of the intervention. The form of letter was chosen because of its informal nature. In the letter, the students were asked to write about their thoughts and feelings about the PedArt project and what was meaningful to them.

Qualitative content analysis was used to reveal the significance of the student teachers’ experiences. The data was analysed step-by-step, consisting of three interactive sub processes (see Table 1); creating initial codes; searching and revealing themes; defining and naming themes (Braun & Clark, 2006; Miles & Huberman, 1994). In the first phase, the data was analysed according to those qualitatively different expressions that students described as being impressive, either during or as a result of the intervention. The first analysis phase revealed nine sub-code categories. The second phase consisted of the cross-analysis between the nine sub-categories and resulted in six themes which were experienced as impressive. Further, in the third analysis phase three meta-themes on democratic philosophies were identified namely: (1) the sense of community, (2) equality and authenticity and (3) faith in change.

The students’ own voice is significant when presenting the results. Therefore citations from their letters have a notable place in the text. For the purposes of this chapter the data presented has been translated from Finnish into English.

Results

Sense of community

According to the analysis, the sense of community comprised a central theme identifying the impressiveness of the intervention based on democratic philosophies. The characterizing dimensions in this theme were: meaning of the group, collaboration, and empowerment.

Meaning of the group and collaboration

The group was exceptionally important for the students. The group was required because a lengthy, challenging project was not a mission that could be accomplished alone. The project, including the resistance of some 6th graders, required joint effort, brainstorming, support and social interaction competence among the students. The group was experienced both as being supportive and as being the source of inspiration.
“Concerning this [difficulties with the class] next spring is still like a television screen showing only a static blur – unclear. But nothing is impossible for our group!” (S9)

“This group we have feels oddly intimate, a little bit like a family. It's empowering to be involved with people who have similar dreams for the future as you do! It's empowering to be involved with people who are so creative and enthusiastic!” (S7)

The orientation to one another was characteristic of students’ expressions. Getting interested in one another was supported by various teaching and learning methods. Using art as an integral role in assignments provided routes in mutual understanding. In a lengthy project it was possible for the participants to become acquainted with each other; which was seen as a precondition for mutual trust. Also teachers’ situational sensitivity to the group and regular support proved to be important.

“It was interesting to notice how many different ways there can be for interpreting the word 'art'. Even though we are all different and we think differently about different subjects, we are all still similar in some ways. I'm not sure, maybe it's the art that makes us tolerant and interested in the viewpoints and opinions of other people as well.” (S11)

“I feel it's great that I can trust every member, because we are committed. I can be honest and open when saying things to them and I am accepted.” (S8)

“At times the stress levels began to rise but this group has offered so much peer support. Your [teachers’] advice has been really supportive as well.”(S3)

Empowerment

The intervention can be interpreted as empowering students in various ways, giving them breathing space and increased well-being. Further, the project was experienced as offering perspectives to see other studies and one’s everyday matters and self in a new way. Understanding their own role as being special in changing the school was considered especially empowering.

“On the other hand, PedArt has given us the means to also rest and relax, because our meetings have genuinely been like a comfy couch for rest in the middle of packed schedules and overall anxiety. I began finding the sides of myself that have been dormant under the surface. I especially found a way to being a better and more tolerant person. Less envious.” (S9)

“I thought that maybe the structures of the elementary school system are too stifling after all and my motivation to study to be a teacher was down in the dumps. The project has instilled me with belief, hope, and new ideas as well as dreams.” (S12)
“Our group contains everyone who wanted to be on this course. A small portion of a humongous crowd that makes this even more important. Are we really the only ones who want to change the school world?”(S9)

While recognizing the importance of being a teacher, some students nevertheless found it a strain to question their career choice, once accepted on a teacher education programme. The intervention also enabled those uncertain and lacking knowledge about teaching to explore these issues.

“One of my teacher’s has said that there are teachers who should not concern themselves with anything remotely close to teaching. I know myself well enough to state, that I will very carefully measure whether or not being a teacher is my thing. Right now, that particular gate is not showing a green light. PedArt gives me the opportunity to think of issues such as this.”(S10)

Equality and authenticity

Equality and authenticity appeared to be other important dimensions necessary to enhance democratic values (democracy, the rule of law, individual liberty, fairness/equality, respect and tolerance) in education. The features characterizing these dimensions were allowing diversity and various emotions as well as experiences of appreciation, trust and gratitude.

Allowing diversity and various emotions

The analysis raised the issue that even in a group of thirteen white female students, the experience of being different and valued as such was important. They felt they were individually allowed to experience and express authentic emotions in their full variety from disappointments to joy and success. The students appreciated the possibility of being ‘…more fully human…’ (Freire, 2008:4), in a permissive and safe atmosphere.

“PedArt is not just a course. It allows us to be just how we are. Every personality is given sufficient space. I don't have to fear anything, not even giving constructive criticism to somebody. Thank you for giving our personalities space. It's wonderful that we don't have to be afraid of ourselves.”(S9)

Appreciation, trust and gratitude

The students appreciated that the ideas based on democratic values and ‘to move beyond boundaries, to transgress’ (hooks, 1994:207) did not “…remain only as lovely thoughts but became concrete and apparent in the operational culture of the intervention”(S5). Further, students had a great sense of being valued and experience of being important and trusted.
“This project has made me feel that we students are important. That I'm important.” (S7)

“I'm impressed by the fact that in the beginning, we had a completely open opportunity to do something really new and different. We were able to work on tolerance through art. I am forever grateful for the trust that we were shown in letting us plan this thing through.” (S8)

The role of the teacher seemed to be very important. In their letters, the students were candid when describing the meaning of the teachers involved in the intervention. The teachers in turn were concerned that they did not appear to be “above” the students and owning the ‘right’ answer. In general, the students expressed a gratitude towards the project and the teachers.

“I think there is an exceptionally good team spirit, trust and emotional bond within this group of students that we have. But what is even more unusual is how close a relationship we have had with you too. You have dared to let us get close to you. You have been more to us than what teachers usually are for students – you have been present and open for us as human beings. I think there is no greater gift that you could be giving.” (S7)

“During this course, I learned to thank people.” (S2)

 Faith in change

The features in the data attached to faith in change were informality in learning spaces and the desire and courage to do things differently. Analysis indicated that faith in change supported the idea of democratic values in education.

Informality in learning spaces

Students described the more informal and unexpected situations and surroundings as important. These situations tended to give a certain nuance throughout the intervention.

“The highlights of this autumn have been the first meeting in Ulla's wonderful garden, the princess games and the meeting at the Gardner's house.” (S3)

“I think it [team spirit] was affected by the unifying bicycle trek we did early on. Right away, it clearly knit us together into a group. Simply dressing up in red was so surprising and nice. I never thought that something like that would happen in a UNIVERSITY! But being invited into a teacher's home and the wonderful sense of hospitality that the teacher gave us [...] it totally took us off guard.” (S8)

Desire and courage to do things differently
The students attending the intervention were motivated to change the school towards being more democratic and holistic even with “…trying something quite radical that would really give children something to think about” (S13). Some of them had been frustrated in the current ‘banking’ school system and desired change.

"I loved the thought of an opportunity to go and teach in a new and different manner. During my student years, I wondered where my creativity had gone. When school came into my life, I was suddenly given a set of rules and orders that were telling me where to be, how to behave and what had to appear on paper as the tip of my pencil was moving on it.”(S8)

Desire for change remained, even strengthened, within the project. In students’ letters there were strong words of faith, taking steps towards Freire’s (2008) idea of dialogue.

“In a simple rhyme, you could say that PedArt gives you strength, faith and courage to strive towards a more humane, innovative school. And that counts for a lot. Thanks to PedArt, I believe that a school can operate communally, by giving space and a voice to everyone. I believe that a teacher should be an idealist.”(S5)

“The best way to wake people up to think, question and notice things is to spring into action for your own visions and believe in them. It is the only way to improvement.”(S13)

**Discussion**

In the spirit of bell hooks and Paulo Freire we discuss the findings using dialogue to consider the role of art, teachers and possible interventions to enhance democracy. We also compare the results with Finnish and English student populations.

**What is the role of art and the teacher in enhancing democracy?**

Uvanney: Emma and Ulla, when you started this intervention, what did you have in mind the role of art and finding one’s voice would be?

Emma and Ulla: One idea was that teacher education would be more holistic, not only a question of brains and thinking but would affect the whole human being through their heart and emotions (that you face or cannot face), and help students to find the strength and interests that they have concerning art. Even though the teaching of art and skills subjects rests in a solid basis in Finnish basic education there is an ongoing debate concerning the need for increasing them (Ministry of Education and Culture, 2010). Our students, other than art student teacher, saw the need and wanted to strengthen the role of art in school. Art raises more questions than traditional teaching methods, and the questions are very important as they raise critical thinking and encourage seeing things differently, more freely. Uvanney, what is the role of art in English schools and it’s relationship towards education for democracy?
Uvanney: Art is part of art and design within the national curriculum in England. Emphasis is placed on creativity, students thinking critically and developing a ‘more rigorous understanding of art and design’ (DfE, 2013a). There is no specific role for art in promoting democracy in the National Curriculum that falls within the remit of citizenship education (DfE, 2013b). However, art has been used in the UK to engage young people, particularly those described as disengaged from school and to explore issues of culture, citizenship and democracy (Finney et al, 2005; Meade & Shaw, 2011). It is also increasingly being used to explore migrant communities (and subsequent generations) experiences of integration and multiculturalism in Europe and the USA (DiMaggio & Fernandez-Kelly, 2010; Martiniello, 2014; 2015). The medium of art could be used to help teachers develop students ‘democratic imagination’ and foster an understanding of democracy as ‘an active social, political and cultural process through which change occurs in different contexts and spaces by means of subversion, opposition and resistance as much as by participation and consent’ (Meade & Shaw, 2011:65). Such understanding is particularly important for teachers and teacher educators in multiethnic societies where a lack of knowledge about minority ethnic communities (including their beliefs and values) has contributed to minority ethnic cultures, particularly in Europe, being blamed for them being perceived as not sharing a state’s democratic values (Cameron, 2011; Lesińska, 2014).

For these reasons I think your project of using art as a vehicle to create dialogue is very helpful in working across different class/ethnic/gender/faith groups because it allows those opportunities for dialogue and new understandings to emerge. Important, you found art also provides a means for student teachers specializing in subjects other than art to develop democratic understandings and apply these in their teaching. But you said it is not art alone that gives the voice, so what else gives voice then?

Emma and Ulla: In this intervention we put effort into us and the students getting to know each other personally, to enhance mutual respect. When we got to know each other it was easier to express and share all kinds of emotions. We think that one of the main points is that if you care and dare to open your innermost feelings, and the others in the group accept you, we may notice that my voice is equal to yours. This increased the trust between us all.

Uvanney: What do you think the role of the teacher is?

Emma and Ulla: Listening and aiming for dialogue are teachers’ key skills for equality. Our bond with the students after a couple of years is still very strong; for example, one sent us an email concerning her current work for human rights. We think one reason for this was that we put effort into listening to our students and we were quite sensitive towards their needs and their emotions. Still, when we read their letters, it is a little bit embarrassing when they say such beautiful words about us. How can we report such results without praising ourselves?

The teacher being a member of the group was important. Actually, it might have been a cultural shock to our students that instead of saying ‘you have to do this and that’ we said ‘we
will create the project together’. So for some of our students it was hard to bear this uncertainty. But then when reflecting on hooks’ and Freire’s ideas, we became uncertain: are we as middle class university teachers able to ask the right questions to enhance democracy?

*How did the intervention reach for the roots of democracy?*

Uvanney: You talked about being able to question yourselves and what you were doing. This suggests you [sought to] understand your own background as part of the process and used that to help you teach, which is what Freire and hooks say teachers should do. Did the students have the same class background as yourselves?

Emma and Ulla: If we look at the big picture they were all white, young, Finnish ladies. Yet in their letters many of them wrote about how this is a group of various different types of persons and still they felt they were accepted as their own unique person. Actually, the background didn’t appear to be an issue in the project. What was an issue were students’ feelings of inequality. For example, students felt that sharing the work in the project was uneven.

Uvanney: This inequality would suggest that even if you and the group you are teaching share the same background, it doesn’t necessarily mean you will be able to communicate and have that shared dialogue. You have to find ways of creating that dialogue and shared understanding, which is what you did. It seems to me that you are also saying as part of that process that time is essential, to understand your students, for your students to understand you where you are coming from and what you are expecting as part of the learning process. In addition, another key point that comes out of your work, is that teachers need to see students as individuals.

Emma and Ulla: Exactly! According to the data this project managed to do it. The students felt they were accepted as individuals and they saw their own specialties, strengths, weaknesses and skills. Uvanney, would it be possible to organize similar projects like PedArt in English teacher education? Can the results with Finnish and English student populations be compared?

Uvanney: The school populations in Finland and England are clearly different. Yet there are some similarities with the teaching population in that the majority of teachers are predominantly white (DfE, 2015a). In some schools classrooms are ethnically diverse whereas within others it’s predominantly white. So having a predominance of white majority students in some English classrooms would not be dissimilar to those in Finland, where there are few minority ethnic students. While England is more ethnically diverse (ONS, 2012) than Finland, nevertheless I think the same issues as found in your PedArt project would apply, in that teachers would need to have an understanding of the backgrounds of their students and be sensitive to and respectful of those experiences when exploring democratic issues. So for example, in England you will have White British students but their everyday experiences are very different (e.g. because of geographical location, class, gender, disability), so they are
coming to the classroom from different perspectives. Because their experiences are different, their understandings are different, and they bring those differences to the learning process. The same would apply to minority ethnic students. Applying this to the teacher education context where the majority of student teachers are from White backgrounds (DfE, 2015b) means teacher educators cannot make assumptions about what knowledge students have (hooks, 1994) or the type of experiences or perspectives they might bring into teacher training. Do you want to discuss those interesting issues that you said the students did not mention in their letters?

Emma and Ulla: Yes, it was interesting that after this project they didn’t raise those issues we normally get with university course feedback like ‘I already knew this and didn’t want to study it again’. With the PedArt project they said ‘at last this is what we want’.

Uvanney: Any idea why they didn’t do that?

Emma and Ulla: Because everything we did was so real, we used proper questions and we had real problems with the children for the students to solve. When there was a conflict with the pupils, we discussed it and practiced social and emotional skills which could be helpful in such situations. So theory and practice went hand in hand.

Uvanney: So that would be similar to Freire’s problem-posing which he says is important in the creation of dialogue.

Emma and Ulla: The other part of this project was that we as teachers strengthened our own voice. It allowed us to dare to believe in these democratic values and continue our work towards dialogue and listening to students’ voices and their ideas. And maybe that is the reason why every now and then tears come to our eyes when we talk about this project because it is something that we deeply believe in.

**Implications**

In the PedArt project, changes towards democratic education were made in various ways. The project partly confirmed the students’ desire to do things differently and change their teaching. Although a Finnish project, it has relevance for democratic education globally as it supports seeing “…education as the practice of freedom…”, school as “…a location of possibility…” and helped students “…to move beyond boundaries, to transgress…” (hooks, 1994:207). The intervention empowered these student teachers to share, discuss and debate issues previously not explored. Possibly, through the positive experiences they highlighted, they will implement elements of democratic philosophies and practices in their future schools. Acts for childrens’ empowerment would enhance democracy in school more widely, which is not obvious in Finnish schools (Rautiainen & Räihä, 2012).

Even though the experiences of the democratic intervention were highly positive, the question of equality remains under continuous negotiation. Work for equality and democracy
demands commitment and sensibility of students and teachers. We believe that if teacher educators create a space for dialogue in teacher education, then teachers will be able to promote democracy and democratic values in their practice. It is important to recognize, however, that the shift towards democratic education is demanding. If the physical space (e.g. formal seminar room) and intellectual space (e.g. collegial pressure to be moderate) forces teachers to proceed using customary practices, s/he cannot strike against what is conventional. Instead it becomes tempting to remain in one’s ‘comfort zone’. If the surroundings regulate teachers’ work rather than foster an intellectual future-oriented dialogic community, democratic education will not be achieved. In democratic education, individuals are personally involved in the decisions they make (Blacker, 2007:42). Therefore, democratic projects are worth doing and supporting in teacher education.
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Table 1. The phases of the data analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 1</th>
<th>Phase 2</th>
<th>Phase 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creating initial codes</td>
<td>Searching and revealing themes</td>
<td>Defining and naming themes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressions of support given by the group</td>
<td>Meaning of the group and collaboration</td>
<td>The sense of community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenging task combines the group</td>
<td>Empowerment</td>
<td>Equality and authenticity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness creates collaboration</td>
<td>Allowing diversity</td>
<td>Faith in change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well-being</td>
<td>Appreciation, trust and gratitude</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual respect</td>
<td>Informality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressions of emotions</td>
<td>Desire and courage to do things differently</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facing various difficulties and disappointments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unconventional learning spaces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dreams and vision concerning future school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>