A Pedagogical Reconstruction of Upper Secondary School English in the Spirit of Pedagogical Philosophy

Bachelor's Thesis
Sami Vesakoivu

University of Jyväskylä
Department of Language and Communication Studies
English
May 2018

JYVÄSKYLÄN YLIOPISTO

Tiedekunta – Faculty	Laitos – Department
Humanistis-yhteiskuntatieteellinen tiedekunta	Kieli-ja viestintätieteiden laitos

Tekijä – Author
Sami Vesakoivu

Työn nimi – Title
A Pedagogical Reconstruction of Upper Secondary School English in the Spirit of Pedagogical Philosophy

Oppiaine – Subject	Työn laji – Level
Englannin kieli	Kandidaatin tutkielma

Aika – Month and year	Sivumäärä – Number of pages
Toukokuu 2018	41

Tiivistelmä - Abstract

Lukion opetussuunnitelma päivittyi 2015 dialogisempaan suuntaan niin oppilaan kuin oppiaineidenkin näkökulmasta. Oppilaan rooli on uudessa opetussuunnitelmassa aktiivisempi sekä vastuullisempi; mm. kriittisyys, oman osaamisen ja oppimisen jatkuva arviointi ja reflektointi, sekä laajojen kokonaisuuksien keskinäisriippuvuuksien sekä merkitysyhteyksien hahmottaminen kuuluvat oppilaan työnkuvaan. Ilmiöoppiminen havainnollistaa tiedon ja taidon oppiaineet lävistävää olemusta, ja saattaa näin lomittain Suomessa vankat rajat omaavia oppiaineita. Opettajan rooli on siirtynyt yhä edemmäksi kohti tiedon ja taidon harjoittamisen prosessin ohjaajaa; opettajan opetettavan aineen sisältötiedollisen osaamisen painotus siirtyy näin pedagogista osaamista kohti. Opettajan tulisi siis opettaa kysymysten kysymistä ja prosessin reflektointia vastausten vaatimisen sijaan.

Opetussuunnitelma on kuitenkin teoreettinen ideaali ja sen käytäntöön muuntaminen on vähintäänkin haasteellinen tehtävä. Yksilöllisen opetuksen toteutuminen luokkakokojen kasvaessa on alati vaikeampaa, ja ylioppilaskokeiden vaatimat laajat aihekokonaisuudet toimivat dialogisuutta sekä reflektiota vastaan, sillä ylioppilaskokeiden luonne on kirjallinen, joka heijastuu opetukseen informaatiopainotteisuutena. Täten lukion opetussuunnitelman ideologian ja luokkahuoneen todellisuuden välillä voidaan katsoa vallitsevan ristiriita. Tästä syystä tutkimusta tarvitaan mm. sellaisten opetuskäytäntöjen kartoittamiseksi, jotka pystyisivät vastaamaan lukion opetussuunnitelman asettamiin tavoitteisiin luokkahuoneen realiteettien kehyksessä. Tutkimusta tarvitaan myös lukion rakenteen tarkasteluun; sellaisenaan sen suuri potentiaali jää osin käyttämättä esim. mainittujen ylioppilaskirjoitusten vuoksi.

Tämän tutkimuksen tarkoituksena on ehdottaa yhdeksi mahdolliseksi lukion pedagogiseksi rekonstruktioksi pedagogista filosofiaa, ja selvittää, pystyykö se vastaamaan opetussuunnitelman vaatimuksiin. Selvitys tapahtuu opetussuunnitelman laadullisella sisältöanalyysillä, jonka avulla opetussuunnitelman sekä pedagogisen filosofian teoreettisia viitekehyksiä voidaan verrata keskenään. Tämä tutkimus ehdottaa myös käytäntöä, siis pedagogista rekonstruktiota pedagogisen filosofian hengessä, toteutettavaksi englannin kielen oppiaineessa, tarkoituksena konkreettisin esimerkein selittää pedagogisen filosofian

tarkoitusperiä ja kasvatuseetosta, sekä antaa opettajille käytännöllisiä työkaluja luokkahuoneeseen.

Opetussuunnitelman ja pedagogisen filosofian teoreettisten viitekehysten vertailu osoitti selkeästi, että pedagoginen filosofia pystyy vastaamaan opetussuunnitelman vaateisiin laadukkaasti ja monipuolisesti, ja lisäksi ajattelutavallaan asettamaan opetussuunnitelman sekä koulujärjestelmän itsensä kriittisen reflektion kohteeksi, näin mahdollistaen sen jatkuvan uudistamisen. Ongelma ei siis ole kansallisen koulutuskoneiston asettamissa puitteissa. Pedagogisen filosofian hypoteettinen käytäntöön asettaminen osoitti, että se on täysin mahdollista englannin kielen oppiaineessa, ja pystyy täyttämään opetussuunnitelman oppiaineeseen kohdistamat vaateet. Ongelma kohosi esille siitä tosiasiasta, että pedagogisen filosofian käytäntö asettaa opettajalle paineita laaja-alaisesta tietämyksestä ja osaamisesta, ja ennen kaikkea filosofista mielenlaatua. Ongelma on, että pedagogisen filosofian käytännöstä, eli oppilaslähtöisien ongelmien ja kysymysten avaamisesta laadukkaan keskustelun keinoin turvallisessa ja myötätuntoisessa sosiaalisessa tilanteessa itsereflektiivisin mielenlaaduin, ei ole tarpeeksi käytännöllistä tutkimustietoa, josta olisi hyötyä opettajien jokapäiväisen opetuksen toteutuksessa. Selväksi tehtiin kuitenkin, että pedagoginen rekonstruktio pedagogisen filosofian hengessä ei tarkoittaisi opetuksellista vallankumousta, vaan pikemminkin katsausta aineenopetuksen nykytilaan ja sen toteuttamista hieman toisesta näkökulmasta.

Säilytyspaikka – Depository JYX

Muita tietoja – Additional information

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1 INTRODUCTION

*"*Each era and society have to face their most significant challenges as philosophical problems and partly solve them through education.*"* This is how Tomperi (2017; 255), in deweyan spirit, touches the roles of philosophy and education in society. Yet he does more than simply touches them, he also profoundly joins them together. Tomperi states that philosophy in itself does not achieve anything, but it is the pedagogical reconstruction of it, the way it manifests in the classroom, that is the key (2017: 112). Thus, philosophy should be seen more as a mindset to approach the problems that arise in our current lives than as a distinct, institutional, academic and separate subject of study, or a field of research. Lipman agrees to this by stating that the students should not be aimed to learn philosophy but to think philosophically (1977: 30). Furthermore, philosophy is an essential part of the human condition as Gadamer (2005: 216) puts it, there is no other justification for philosophizing than the fact that it is already constantly practised.

The scientifically oriented "western mind", which Boisvert calls *mechanistic* (1998: 54), can be considered as having its roots, depending on the viewpoint, in the inquiries of the ancient Greeks and later in the specialization of science in the 18th, 19th and 20th centuries. Upper secondary school (that is henceforth abbreviated USS) education in Finland then has its roots in the school compounds which prepared their students for universities in the 19th and 20th centuries, hence the academic nature of today's USS and especially its matriculation examinations. Here an utterly important question arises. What is education, and more specifically, Finnish USS education for? The curriculum articulates objectives for Finnish USS education as follows:

Upper secondary school education has as its objectives an extensive general education which composes of values, knowledge, skills, attitudes and resolution with which the critically and independently thinking individuals are able to act responsibly, compassionately, communally and successfully. In the course of USS, the student accumulates knowledge and skills about the human condition, cultures, nature and society. The student becomes competent in understanding about the interconnections in life and the world and structuring extensive phenomena. USS education helps the student in constructing identity, human conception, worldview, ideology and one's place in the world. It also prepares the student for higher education and working life (LOPS 2015: 12).

In addition, the objectives are also linked to the Finnish tradition of civilisation (ibid.: 12,13), to democracy (ibid.: 12,13) and to sustainable lifestyle (ibid.: 13).

If education is regarded as a system which ought to provide its students mindsets and tools with which to react to the problems they will face in the future, the aims of the curriculum seem thorough and functional. The problem is, however, that the focus of USS is in the matriculation

examinations, from whose grades the students receive points for the processes of applying to higher education. This means that the subject matter of the courses in USS is defined by the nature of the questions of the matriculation examinations. This problem is also noted by Tomperi who views this as a force that is working against the dialogicality of the curriculum (2017: 245). Since the informational entities from which the questions of the matriculation examinations are formulated are enormous, the resource of time is used merely wholly on injecting the information in the students, rather than facilitating circumstances for discovering it through experience and self-reflecting upon it afterwards. Thus, there is an unconnectedness between the practice demanded by the curriculum and the structural realities of the educational system. At the moment, the role of USS education in Finland is still a preparatory one; unfortunately, the objective of that preparation is not in the immediate problems and questions of the students, nor it is in the global dilemmas of the word, but in the problem of graduating with grades that will aid the student in advancing to a subsequent level of education.

As the world grows more complex, its problems become increasingly more sophisticated and multifaceted as can be witnessed in the cultural and political dimensions of climate change and the crises for example in the Middle East. Orr (1991) argues that all education should be environmental education. This is to say that the students should become aware of the environmental crisis humanity is experiencing. This idea goes along, as mentioned above, with Dewey's idea of education being "married" to life (Boisvert 1997: 105) and thus subsequently with Tomperi's views about education and learning being a venture in the immediate experience of the present that moves among questions that are originated from the students' experience and are thus relevant to *them* (Tomperi 2017: 237-238). The curriculum introduces phenomenon-based learning as one solution for the unconnectedness defined above (2015: 14, 17). In phenomenon-based learning teaching focuses on problems which have features from different subject areas; one of the aims is to construct students' understanding about the world being not divided into separate subjects. Philosophy, on the other hand, has been justified in the Finnish curriculum throughout its history as a subject that links other subjects together (Tomperi 2017: 216, Lipman 1977: 7). The problems proposed above require most of all compassion and thinking that is critical and creative in nature; philosophy, not as an institution (Tomperi 2017: 212-213), but as a comprehensive mindset provides these attributes.

As Orr also points out (1991), the aim of education should be the understanding of self, not of the subject-matter. This has been stated also by Tomperi (2017: 238), Lipman (1988: 9), Dewey (Boisvert 1998: 107) and Robinson (1989: 4). The reasoning is rather simple; the knowledge of self is the knowledge with which all other knowledge and information is

processed with, and in the light of which they are understood. Furthermore, self-knowledge is the basis for the ideal of democracy by Dewey, who does not see democracy as a mere form of governing, but as a way of life in which societies are *cellular*, interconnected, and aim to provide the individual a frame of life in which she/he can realise herself/himself to the fullest, and where in return, an individual's operations are to the good of the society (Boisvert 1998: 53-56). Therefore, a student with self-knowledge, which is to say a student with vision about who she/he is and what is her/his place in the world, is a person who understands the importance of compassion, cooperation and creativity in the process of resolving the problems that she/he will face and has the tools with which to grow into a competent member of society (LOPS 2015: 12-13, 16).

A self-reflective frame of mind that is aware of the interconnectedness of the matters of the world, is capable of encountering any kind of dilemma and objectively examine its possible directions of solution. Therefore, as Tomperi points out that the premises of our very thinking are philosophically oriented, educating our students into a philosophical mindset seem justifiable if not necessary (2017: 238-239). In this way, education would not attempt to solve any exterior problem but teach and maintain the practice of critical self-reflective thinking (Tomperi 2017: 238) that would help the students face the questions that arise in their immediate life. As mentioned above, Tomperi indicates that philosophy in itself does not achieve anything, but the pedagogical reconstruction of it (2017: 112). For this reconstruction Tomperi suggests *pedagogical philosophy*. The aim of this study, therefore, is to research firstly, how does the USS curriculum enable the implementing of *pedagogical philosophy* into the national theoretical framework, and secondly, to design practical applications of this pedagogical reconstruction that would aid the teacher in connecting theory with the reality of the classroom.

There are problems that are universal to all alteration in national pedagogical framework, and problems that are unique to the kind of reconstruction that is suggested here. I will list some of the problems below and try to provide solutions for them as they arise along the features of the pedagogical reconstruction. The first problem is that of time; how to include to the teaching all the areas demanded by the matriculation exams and still have time for something like a philosophical conversation? How to create time and resources to train working teachers? The second problem then is related to the terminology associated with philosophy and *pedagogical philosophy*. Philosophy may have certain academic and institutional connotations (Tomperi 2017: 215), which is understandable because of its history (and current state) as a subject, but these connotations may prove disadvantageous. As the success of the

classroom practice strongly relies in the prevailing atmosphere, a negatively charged emotional reaction may complicate introducing the new practice. Therefore, the concept of philosophy and its connotations have to be defined more accurately. The same thing must be done with the concepts of the teacher and the student (Doll 1993: 141-142). The role of the teacher must change from the knowledge-authority into a facilitator (Lipman 1778: 62-67, Tomperi 2017: 243), and the student's role from a passive participant to an active member of the classroom dialogue (Lipman 1977: 25-28). Thirdly, a pedagogical reconstruction must be formed from a premise that recognises the social reality of the classroom (Tomperi 2017: 228).

2 BACKGROUND

"An education centred on occupations and carried on under such conditions would be compromised if each stage of the process were not understood as an end in itself." This is how Boisvert (1998: 104) expresses the idea of Dewey about how education should not simply to be a preparation to the students for something in the future, but rather something that draws from the students' present experiences to the subject matter as much as possible. Dewey's "end in itself″ here means that the motivation to learn should not be extrinsic but intrinsic, in the potential of every passing moment. Tomperi translates this as forming meaning from life and the experience of growth (2017: 238). Boisvert also states how Dewey saw education as something that is as well profoundly joined to growth which indicates a ceaseless reshaping of experience (1998: 104). This means that the student should not be a passive receiver but an active participant from whose experience the subject-matter consists of. In the heart of Dewey's pedagogy was also the idea of "returning subject-matter into the experience it was once separated from" (Dewey 1902: 285). This is to say that the information taught should not be merely information but an experience with information. There is an example of this in the *Exemplary class* in Table 3 (29-30).

Behind Dewey's educational vision are his ideas about democracy and how education and life should be "married" (Boisvert 1998: 105); the world of school should model the world outside school. Dewey saw the democratic society as something where an individual would supply for the community in the profession they know best. Therefore, every individual would be "irreplaceable" (Boisvert 1998: 106). Juuso (2007: 68) adds that the representatives of a community should continually aim to problematize and transform the institutions and values of that community, i.e. the citizens should be able to think critically and act accordingly. This

is the very basic mindset of philosophy; reflective thinking where everything around us becomes sources for contemplation reflected on the self, the community, and the world. In other words, the problems, and questions around us become the subject-matter of life and should thus become the subject-matter in the classroom (Tomperi 2017: 236-237).

Matthew Lipman's Philosophy For Children program (P4C) has its origins in the 1960's (Tomperi 2017: 102) and has had as its chief principle the development of students' thinking skills through *philosophizing* with the students (Lipman 1977: 8-11). Cam argues that the ideas of John Dewey form the basis of Lipman's P4C thinking as Dewey's idea of thinking navigates around the concept of "reflective thought" (2008: 161-180). By this Dewey meant "active, persistent, and careful consideration of any belief or supposed form of knowledge in the light of the grounds that support it, and the further conclusions to which it tends" (Dewey 1933: 119). Now, *philosophizing* with the students is creating, according to Lipman, "a community of inquiry" which practices conversation with reflective inspection conforming to the ideals of philosophical dialogue (Lipman 1977: 82-91, 2008: 118). Tomperi points out how Lipman refers to Ferdinand Tönnies's early separation of communal (*Gemeinshaft*) and societal (*Gesellschaft*) social relationships, and how P4C ideology positions itself towards the communal side (Tomperi 2017: 103). This means, as Lipman wrote himself, that the nature of the relationships between students become more equal (as they sit in a circle as opposed to rows) and more directly contacted with one another (Lipman 2008: 118). This, Tomperi points out, indicates one of the most profound characteristics of *philosophizing* which is that the relationships between students themselves and the teacher are not instrumentally purposeful as achieving some exterior goal, but valuable in themselves, as is the relationship of friendship (Tomperi 2017: 103). Thus, philosophy brings to the process of learning a mindset that turns the process of acquiring information to an inquiry that is not as highly interested in the answer as it is the process. In accordance, according to Juuso on Lipman, the essential purpose of education is not to pass on information, but the endeavour to perceive and understand the interrelations of the matters at hand (Juuso 2008: 103).

Tomperi's *pedagogical philosophy* draws from the same deweyan principles as Lipman's P4C and is defined by Tomperi as a social educational practice which exercises critical, individual, shared and cultural reflection and thus builds cognitive and social-emotional readiness (Tomperi 2017: 234). As Dewey and Lipman had as one of their core aims the ability to form meaning from the immediate experience of life, so does *pedagogical philosophy*: Tomperi justifies that thinking that is subjectively (personally) meaningful does not only benefit the thinking skills and the learning psychology of the individual but has also profound

existential and educational value (Tomperi 2017: 235). Therefore, the subject matter should in *pedagogical philosophy* act as a surface to subjectively reflect from and the goal of education should thus transform from exterior ends (exams, latter studying, working life) to the process itself. This is in harmony with the goal of the P4C program which Lipman also defines as the practice itself (Lipman 1977: 31-33).

Tomperi writes that the field of *philosophizing* with the students has, from P4C, diversified into proportions which cannot be defined adequately as a single theory any longer (2017: 234). However, he continues with a list of premises that are consistently present in *pedagogical philosophy* (2017: 234):

1) Conception of the human condition that respects the disposition of children that already at an early age they begin to seek and create meaning in their lives.
2) An outlook on education where the goal of teaching is not only informational and intellectual capability but a holistic growth that takes into consideration also the ethical, socio-emotional, and aesthetic dimensions.
3) Trust in the possibilities of thinking and communication as uniting human beings for which thinking and communicating are worth practising.
4) Having as the origination and basis of teaching and as the target of philosophical discussion the experiences and questions of the participants.
5) Progression that is scrutinizing and critically self-reflective, and that the teacher guides and supports with aiming for pedagogical tactfulness.
6) Operating as a group in which the administration of communal practices and meanings, and the respecting of others are essential.

These premises can all be found also in Lipman's justification for P4C (Lipman 1977: 31-39, 138-143, Lipman 2008: 107-109, 118-119). Tomperi also underlines the distinction to other programs that aim to improve thinking skills; In *pedagogical philosophy* the thinking skills are tools with which to, in a critically reflective manner, set also the goals, the tools and their justifications as the focus of inspection (2017: 234). Therefore, the justification of *pedagogical philosophy* is not in general education, learning of ethics, supporting democracy, thinking skills nor it is in any single claim, but in both creating meaning in the experience of life and growth, and in preserving and passing on the critically reflective thinking practices to the new generations (Tomperi 2017: 238). The compatibility of this justification with the criteria of the USS curriculum will be studied in greater detail in the *Analysis* of this thesis (LOPS 2015: 12-

17, 34-35). However, I believe, as well as Tomperi and Doll, that the problem is not in the criteria, but in turning theory into classroom practice (Doll 1993: 141-142, Tomperi 2017: 217, 218, 221).

The nature of *pedagogical philosophy* can be seen as organic (as opposed to mechanistic), as something that grows and reconstructs itself according to the situation that is the students, the subject and the teacher (an order of importance proposed by Dean, 2017) and also the learning environment. Therefore, a solid instruction on how to actually teach in the spirit of *pedagogical philosophy* might cripple the practice itself. Thus, the focus should be in understanding the premises of *pedagogical philosophy,* from which the practice would stem on its own. Lipman and Tomperi do propose some methods (Lipman more in detail) which I find very useful in understanding *pedagogical philosophy* itself. This thesis will explore these methods in the *Analysis and Research Findings* (15-34). Lipman and Tomperi underline the fact that *"no philosophy teacher feels prepared"* (Fisher 2013: 24, Tomperi 2017: 243) and that especially in the first years of teaching the teacher may feel to be constantly walking on thin ice. But this is exactly the point Tomperi underlines as a critical juncture; if *pedagogical philosophy* is understood as a set of methods that can be universally applied, as if "over" the students, it does not fulfill the promises it has made (Tomperi 2017: 243). Moreover, if the teacher has the ability to break the illusion of the omnipotence of the teacher and the black-and-whiteness of information *by her/his own example*, then the students have a possibility to learn something valuable.

Thus, this study tries to understand *pedagogical philosophy* and its applicability in the framework of the USS curriculum and the subject of English language. Tomperi also defines *pedagogical philosophy* as a borderline motion between a classroom teacher (grades 1-6) and a subject teacher (Tomperi 2017: 247), which implies, even though Tomperi discusses *pedagogical philosophy* within the subject of philosophy and then universally (apart or above subjects), the potential of *philosophizing* across the whole of curriculum. This study has in the *Analysis and Research Findings* section Tables 1, 2 and 3 in which an *exemplary class* is presented, and from it the methods of *pedagogical philosophy* reflected, originating from the premises as practically as possible. Tomperi also states, echoing ideas of Dewey and Gadamer, that the problems we face in our educational system are actually, in nature, philosophical, independent of the fact that are they labelled as such (Tomperi 2017: 239). This thesis finds this to be accurate and furthermore, as Tomperi himself states, the world outside of school is full of problems that are in nature philosophical (2017: 255). Therefore, the education system can either ignore the nature of the problems these generations face and treat them as incidental

matters, or it can accept their philosophical nature (and simultaneously the nature of a human being) and treat them with reflective philosophical thought (Tomperi 2017: 239). It is only the latter alternative that is satisfactory for civilised education.

3 RESEARCH AIM AND QUESTIONS

The aims of this study are firstly, to examine the upper secondary school curriculum in the light of how well it enables the use of *pedagogical philosophy* as a teaching mindset in the subject of English language, and secondly, to design forms that transform the inspected theory into classroom practice. This classroom practice must, as Tomperi suggests, take into consideration the physical reality of the education system which implies the mass-nature of the course structure (2017: 111), and derived from that the timeframe of the teachers (which includes e.g. class planning, evaluation and teacher training), the growing group sizes, and the cutting of national resources for education.

The first part of the study examines the national framework within which USS teachers are to operate. It is through this understanding of the borderlines, guidelines and the grounding structures that a new mindset can be implemented to the practice of the classroom. In other words, it is only through a thorough understanding of the theory and of the frames of reality that this theory is to operate within, that a functional practice can be formed. The second part of the study focuses around an exemplary class and reflects from it to provide and explain the practice of *pedagogical philosophy* and its possible methods. The aim is to produce from abstractions concrete tools that would benefit a teacher as much as possible.

The study aspires to explore the research questions below:

1. To what extent does the new upper secondary school curriculum enable pedagogical philosophy to be implemented into teaching regarding the subject of English?
2. How to practically implement *pedagogical philosophy* into the classroom practice of English language?

4 DATA AND METHODS

4.1 Data

This study uses the latest national USS curriculum as its data. The curriculum was completed in 2015 and came into effect in 2016. The reason for choosing a national curriculum for this study instead of a local curriculum is that even though implementing *pedagogical philosophy* into the national curriculum may result in a higher level of abstraction, it is indeed the national level where the foundations of a new pedagogical mindset must be constructed. Furthermore, local USS curricula may vary noticeably in terms of subject-emphasis, group sizes, and student orientation (based on e.g. the requirement of grade average for entrance).

The USS curriculum is structured as follows:

1. The objectives and values of USS education
2. Realisation of education
   - The concept of learning
   - The learning settings and methods
   - The maneuver culture which is to say the practical interpretation of the framework provided. This practicality is naturally still a universal codex to be made into reality by local curricula.
   - The structure of studies
3. Student counselling and support
4. Learning goals and central contents of teaching
   - Course contents
5. Evaluation

Tomperi points out that even though the Finnish USS curriculum is flexible and provides the teacher with freedom of procedure, things such as the matriculation examinations, the academical conceptions of the natures of some subjects (Tomperi uses philosophy here, but I believe it applies to many others as well), and the emphasis on information work against this independence (2017: 245). It is indeed within the frames of the practical reality of the classroom where *pedagogical philosophy* must be able to operate. Tomperi's viewpoint on the curriculum is that *pedagogical philosophy* should not be seen as revolutionary, but rather as something that inspects what has been done in the frame of subject teaching, and how could it be done a little bit differently (2017: 246). Therefore, for this study to have practical value, it must

examine not only the framework of English language in USS education, but also the underlying principles on which the whole education is constructed.

4.2 Method of analysis

This study uses qualitative content analysis (QCA) for analysing its data, the USS curriculum. Julien (2012: 2) describes QCA as a thoughtful procedure that facilitates deriving meaning from a body of text, and inspecting interrelations between found thematic categories. This thesis needed to study the curriculum meticulously and discover thematics relating to the essential thematics of *pedagogical philosophy* and therefore, QCA was a natural choice for the method of analysis. Because of the fact that not much prior research has been conducted, the approach in this study is inductive, as proposed by Elo and Kyngäs (2008: 109). This is to say that the study intends to move from the specific information into a comprehensive direction.

Elo and Kyngäs suggest that QCA is a three-phased process. These phases are *preparation*, *organizing* and *reporting* (2008: 109). *Preparation* includes selecting the data and closely familiarizing with it. It is only after having acquainted with the data that the second phase of *organizing* can happen (2008: 109-110). *Organizing* includes, according to Elo and Kyngäs, mainly categorising the data with the objective to generalise (2008: 111). Therefore, both of the first two phases are recursive and are conducted partly simultaneously. The categorising process should thus provide a hierarchy; sub-categories join each other to create general categories and further, main categories (2008: 111). This hierarchy aim to create *abstraction*, i.e. generalisation. *Reporting* then is the final written-out form of the analysis, and it may consist of text, tables, figures etc. (2008: 110).

In this thesis, the USS curriculum was firstly closely examined in the light of the core principles of *pedagogical philosophy*. Julien (2012: 3) suggests caution with the cohesion of language between the original text and the analysis, so that the meaning would change as little as possible. Therefore, the thematics of the analysis of the USS curriculum were labelled so that the terminology of the curriculum and the phrasing of *pedagogical philosophy* shared as much meaning as possible. The analysis thus formed a bridge between the two. Julien also points out that QCA is often a repetitive process (2012: 3) as do Elo and Kyngäs. This thesis repeated both of the phases throughout the study likewise. The *organizing* phase then was to examine the analysis and the interrelations between the found categories. The hierarchy mentioned above rose naturally as the categories grew more specific and could be placed under more general categories. QCA has the ability to identify ″both conscious and unconscious messages communicated by the text″ (Julien 2012: 3). It was through these analysed

interrelations between categories that formed the basis for the answer to the first research question of how does the USS curriculum enable implementing *pedagogical philosophy* as an educational practice and mindset for USS. The essential thematics of this framework are discussed in section 5.

Since QSA is not standardized nor procedurically restricted, the process of thought should be meticulously explained when analysing results (Julien 2012: 2. Elo and Kyngäs 2008: 112-114). The quality of demonstrating the thought process can be regarded as linking directly into the trustworthiness of the study (Elo and Kyngäs 2008: 112-113). A clear disclosure of the development of thought and ideas also reduces the level of abstraction which in answering research question two is crucial. Therefore, as Elo and Kyngäs argue (2008: 112), the connection between the data and the results should always be apparent. This idea was particularly emphasised in section 5.

We can state that QSA is the connection between the data and the results. Therefore, QSA itself presented the answer to research question 1, whereas it constructed the grounds for the hypothetical suggestions that covered research question 2. Naturally, as the thesis focuses merely on the subject of English language, the suggestions may seem inapplicable to other subjects, at least outside languages. Therefore, the analysis attempts to illustrate the ideas behind the practice of the suggestions and accomplish some level of subjectal universality alongside the single-subject practice.

5 ANALYSIS OF THE NATIONAL CORE CURRICULUM

"The curricular basics of USS philosophy have proceeded into a direction that is, from the standpoint of pedagogical philosophy, intelligent." (Tomperi 2017: 245). Tomperi explores *pedagogical philosophy* subject-wise mainly from two angles: 1) from the standpoint of the subject of philosophy and 2) from a standpoint that is detached from the subject structure of USS and that examines *pedagogical philosophy* in the framework of the whole Finnish curriculum. Tomperi continues that even though the curriculum is flexible in terms of educational and subject thematics and method, as well as student centeredness and dialogicality, many factors work against this theoretical freedom (2017: 245). As these factors Tomperi mentions academic premises of the sciences and their institutional basis (what should be taught does not originate from students but from the institution of the subject, and what should be taught is presumably already known (2017: 242)), as well as the approaches to

grading and testing (2017: 245). Thus, the problem is not in the framework but in the components of practice which are reflected in attitudes, preconceptions, and tradition. The strongpoint of *pedagogical philosophy* is its ability to turn the unconscious into conscious and to critically revisit such premises with the students themselves, and thus renew the system itself, much like a snake sheds its skin.

As Tomperi points out, the national USS curriculum considering the subject of philosophy shares theoretical ground with *pedagogical philosophy.* The qualitative content analysis showed that this is equally true with the aims of USS education and with the subject of English language. In the first part of this section the thesis aims to explain in detail, how the features of *pedagogical philosophy* fit into the framework of the curriculum. This is realised through four general themes that were derived with the QCA. The second part of this section presents an exemplary class of English as a narration including an exemplary preparation, and then discusses the ideas presented in the narration in the light of the theories of the curriculum and of *pedagogical philosophy.* The first part has thus a theoretical emphasis, and the latter part a practical one; yet it is to be remembered that the two rise mutually.

5.1 The curriculum and pedagogical philosophy

The four general themes mentioned above are the result of the *organizing phase* proposed by Elo and Kyngäs (2008: 109-111) These themes are therefore combinations of smaller cluster of thematics and are for that reason rather broad and overlapping. The intention of this division is to maintain a balance between generality and specificity, and between comprehensibility and complexity. The curriculum is a broad set of data and in order to make sense of it through a small-scale thesis such as this the analysis must produce general guidelines which are then explained and conditioned with specific examples. Subsequently, this thesis attempts to appreciate the complexity of the matter of education but is due to the scale of the study forced to simplify certain matters. These matters will be discussed in the conclusion where further areas of research are suggested. In this thesis common ground between the USS curriculum and *pedagogical philosophy* is thus explored through the following themes: *Student centeredness, The concept of learning, The operative culture of the school and collaboration,* and *The subject of English language*.

5.1.1 Student centeredness

As the basis for the solutions of upper secondary school's learning environments and learning methods are the concept of learning and the aims for teaching set in the curriculum. As the basis of choosing and developing learning environments and learning methods are also the students' prerequisites, points of interest, insights and individual needs (LOPS 2015: 14).

The concept of learning, as discussed below, is defined in the USS curriculum as consequence of engaged, goal-oriented and autonomous student activity (LOPS 2015: 14). Therefore, as Dean theorizes, the fact that the student is more significant than the subject, and that the subject is more important than the teacher (2017), must be defined further. It is only through characterizing the roles of a student and a teacher that student centeredness can be thoroughly understood.

Orr argues that one of the core objectives of education is, along the lines of the Greek *paideia,* the thorough knowledge of the self, a process in which he sees subject matter as a mere medium (Orr 1991). The curriculum states that USS has a scholarly and an educational purpose, the first of which meaning the subject matter, and the latter one meaning establishing concepts of humanity, identity, ideology and worldview (LOPS 2015: 12). The Greek *paideia,* which is a concept for Western civilisation (Kahn 2007: 2), has to it the concept of the *golden mean.* The idea is articulated also by Robinson as the attempt for balance between the inner and the outer world of a child (1989: 10-12, 18-19, 25), and by the curriculum as engrossing students into both the worlds of art and of science (LOPS 2015: 12). Therefore, student centeredness should be seen as a concept that recognises the student as an active participant in the process of learning in way where subject matter produces a surface to reflect upon with the intention to attach an individual experience into the information presented.

Tomperi claims that the foundation of teaching and the purpose of the subject are to be reconstructed from the student's point of view, whatever the subject may be (2017: 217). This means in a broad sense that the teacher should be able to reconstruct the topic at hand to the class and its students personally for *every class.* Therefore, as Tomperi points out as well, the reconstruction of subject matter is also a pedagogical responsibility and happens recursively all the time (2017: 217). In the core of *pedagogical philosophy* is thus reconstructing the subject matter before class and during the class into questions that through self-reflection, conversation and exploration are transformed into a part of the students' view of the world and themselves in it. Furthermore, it should be remembered that *pedagogical philosophy* aims not to teach

quality thinking and conversation skills (these are just mediums) but practice them for themselves, for the joy of exploring and creating individual meaning of the world (Tomperi 2017: 225-239).

It can be stated that the ideals of the USS curriculum and of *pedagogical philosophy* meet in a profound way which is only natural because Tomperi has researched his theory within the frame of the USS education system. *Pedagogical philosophy* can thus be seen as a bridge between Robinson's outer world and the inner world, as a practice for exercising the theory suggested by the curriculum. In this dualistic process of learning the teacher and the student both share a responsibility which is individual and social in nature (Orr 1991, LOPS 2015: i.a. 12-14, 16, 19, Tomperi 2017: 249). Understanding this responsibility, the active *role* of the student, will help in the classroom practice. Student centeredness can therefore be also recognised as reconstructing the process of learning so that the students become *aware,* through conversation, of its individual and social dimensions, and discover the roles themselves.

5.1.2 The concept of learning

As mentioned above, the curriculum defines learning as a consequence of an engaged, goal-oriented and autonomous student activity that is self-reflective, recursive and social in nature (LOPS 2015: 14). More importantly, the curriculum emphasises the perpetuity of learning as one of the essential aims of teaching should be the understanding of lifelong learning (LOPS 2015: 12, 19, 34). This concept goes together with Dewey's idea about education as profoundly connected to growth as "a constant reorganizing and reconstructing of experience*"* (Boisvert 1997: 104), as well as *pedagogical philosophy's* view of philosophy and learning as something constantly present in the context of school (Tomperi 2017: 239). The idea of lifelong learning also sets the process free of any ulterior motivation since the learning will not cease after graduation and can be thus aimed to the present moment alone.

Another essential point raised by the curriculum is the recursiveness of learning (LOPS 2015: 14-15). Tomperi discusses this as relating critically to immediate existing structures, such as educational traditions, classroom action and evaluation (2017: 226, 238-239), and Lipman as inquiries that have no resolved answers and which demand "continual rephrasing and reformulation*"* (Lipman 1977: 9). Recursiveness can be also seen as unlearning (Watts 1957: 2), as the curriculum emphasises a cumulative nature of building new knowledge on top of prior knowledge, learning often requires a critical revision of the presumptions. Therefore, recursiveness can be considered as a ceaseless reconstruction of knowledge; a mindset that does not assume and regards truth as subjective and indeterminate. This mindset supports the

idea of the importance of the process as compared to a solution. The curriculum also emphasises self-evaluation and peer feedback as methods for realising the recursiveness of learning (LOPS 2015: 20, 41). This form of examination should be taught to be practised as an essential part of the conversation in the classroom in a compassionate and well-argued manner (Lipman 1977: 11-12, 116-117, Tomperi 2017: 219, 223, 226, 234-235).

Where the USS curriculum regards the role of the student as an active inquirer, it states that the teacher should act as a guide with pedagogical tact (LOPS 2015: 20). Lipman writes that the role of the teacher in a conversation is that of "a talented questioner" (1977: 84), and through these questions the teacher should be able to support the students' exploration of the topic at hand as well as the conventions of conversation, and furthermore, represent the fact that questions (the process) are more important than the outcome (1977: 70, 75). Tomperi concurs by stating that the teacher should facilitate conversation and that the emphasis is on the teacher's pedagogical knowledge rather than only in the subjectal information (2016: 87-90, 2017: 219, 243). An essential task in facilitating conversation in the classroom is the creating a beneficial atmosphere (Robinson 2015, Lipman 1977: 20, Tomperi 2017: 250). Lipman underlines the students' natural curiosity as the fuel for all inquiry (1977: 14), and it is the responsibility of the teacher not to extinguish this boundless asset. Children indicate curiosity by questions that they may utter or leave unuttered. Lipman encourages the teacher not to ignore these worded questions or non-verbal expressions of puzzlement but to grab them and turn them into conversation (1977: 29, 37, 78-79). Tomperi suggests the same in planning a class and emphasises the importance of working around thematics that inspire the teacher her/himself as an antidote against uncertainty that naturally rises from teaching without a strict plan (2017: 243-245).

The relationship between the teacher and the students can thus be seen as being aimed to proceed from teacher-student interaction towards student-student interaction (Lipman 1977: 29). One of the aims of the USS curriculum is the student's growth towards autonomy (LOPS 2015: 12,18), and Tomperi explains how *pedagogical philosophy* achieves this, not by stating autonomy as an educational goal, but through placing the autonomy of an individual under a conversational microscope and letting the goal rise from within the process (Tomperi 2017: 238, Doll 1993: 170-171). That is to exemplify the explorational nature of learning; the students should be encouraged to discover the structures of their immediate surroundings and to critically view them as rather potentials than immutable establishments. Along the words of Dewey, "democracy is an ongoing experiment" (Boisvert 1997: 105), can be stated that learning and thus education is an unending process which must be discovered anew for every

individual. Therefore, can be stated that *pedagogical philosophy* offers a natural and highly relevant method to realise this profound idea of the concept of learning.

5.1.3 The operative culture of the school and collaboration

The operative culture is a practical interpretation of the educational objective of the USS (LOPS 2015: 15). The operative culture in the USS curriculum is divided into four sections that are *Learning community, Participation and collaboration, Welfare and sustainable future,* and *Cultural diversity and language awareness.* The operational culture is defined and formed by the context, i.e. the physical reality of the schools, and therefore the national description remains noticeably abstract. There are important themes, however, that need to be scrutinized, because the operational culture is the framework within which educational practice is realised.

The *Learning community* and the *Participation and collaboration* sections emphasize the social nature of learning (LOPS 2015: 15). This has been partly discussed in the sections above on behalf of the classroom, but here the collaboration between the school and the physical reality outside the school is also accentuated (2015: 16). Dewey also strongly suggests that education should resemble life outside the school building (Boisvert 1997: 105-107). Lipman underlines the unifying capabilities of philosophy as an answer to a child's demand for a comprehensive view of the world (1977: 6-12), as does Tomperi in stating that *pedagogical philosophy* has an ability to transform the individual, the community and the culture it is practised in (2017: 242, 255). Therefore, can be stated that it is essential to create such an operative culture where the atmosphere encourages the students to explore and recognise the connections of the subject matter into larger entities in the outside world. This is also one of the educational aims of the USS curriculum (LOPS 2015: 12).

The *Welfare and sustainable future* section discusses the welfare of the student which involves mental, physical and social health as well as the health of the environment (LOPS 2015: 16). Orr argues that in the modern age "all education is environmental education" (Orr 1991). As Tomperi interprets Dewey's perspective on philosophy as a mindset to solve the global dilemmas (2017: 255), Orr's remark fits the modern framework thoroughly. This is an excellent example of how *pedagogical philosophy* turns problems into meaningful questions and then engages students in thinking processes.

The *Cultural diversity and language awareness* proposes two essential aspects. Firstly, USS education should prepare students with unprejudiced openness towards one's own and other cultures, and that the learning community facilitates all resources considering cultural diversity (LOPS 2015: 16-17). The ideas are in the heart of *pedagogical philosophy,* as the openness is

one of the key features in forming an understanding about other views than one's own, and that the questions rise from the immediate environment of the students (Tomperi 2017: 234-235, 237-238). The teacher has an important role firstly as facilitating such conversation and moreover to help the students connect the knowledge to a wider entity.

Secondly, the curriculum introduces an idea that every teacher is the language teacher of her/his subject, hence *language awareness* (LOPS 2015: 16-17). Tomperi arguments that one of the reasons for which *pedagogical philosophy* is a competent practice for the modern age, is that modern psychology has demonstrated the interconnectedness of thinking and language (2017: 248-249). Complementary results have been shown through Lipman's *philosophizing,* where Lipman states that practicing philosophical thinking has significantly improved students' reading skills (1977: 6). Gadamer states that social life is profoundly based on communication (2005: 216). Communication is the medium of growth; communication with oneself (wording responses to experiences), with the community and communicating globally all require lingual capability and quality thinking. It is clear that *pedagogical philosophy* answers to this need of knowledge and ability through its potential to unify subject areas in a practice of compassionate and critical conversation (Tomperi 2017: 239).

5.1.4 The subject of English language

This thesis studies the practical possibilities of implementing *pedagogical philosophy* into USS in Finland through the subject of English language. The subject of English language was established into the Finnish education system in the 1910's and has gone through the turbulence of teaching methodologies in languages as Korhonen presents (2014: 7-14). Korhonen also states that today both innovative and more conventional methods are used, according to the needs of the students (2014: 14). The USS curriculum recognises the role of English as *lingua franca* and emphasises the importance of understanding the global nature of English language (LOPS 2015: 109-111).

The five theme entities that create the educational basis for all subjects in USS and are thus reflected in the English language course descriptions are *Active citizenship, entrepreneurship and working life*, *Welfare and safety*, *Sustainable lifestyle and global responsibility*, *Cultural knowledge and internationality*, *Multiliteracies and mediae*, and *Technology and society*. (LOPS 2015: 35-39). As stated by Tomperi the Finnish curriculum is merely a set of thematics and is thus flexible and provides teachers with pedagogical freedom. The freedom considering subject matter is naturally more extensive in the subject of English language compared for example to the sciences where the need to cover vast topical entities is prescribed by the

matriculation examinations (2017: 245). Therefore, as the course topics of English language are also broad (LOPS 2015: 109-111), there is space for pedagogical reconstruction in the spirit of *pedagogical philosophy,* since the general thematics presented above and the particular thematics of English language enable philosophically oriented conversation to occur.

The English language matriculation examinations base on the USS curriculum and can be taken as *extensive* (European language level B2.1) or as *short* (B1.1). The examination consists of listening and reading comprehension as well as of written production and vocabulary and grammar exercises (Ylioppilaslautakunta 2017: 6-9). Korhonen found that the literal nature of the matriculation examinations confine lesson planning and affect the examination procedures of the teachers (2014: 77) The curriculum does not define the grammatical items to be taught (LOPS 2015: 109-111); they are presented by the textbooks. Therefore, I believe that by practising meaningful conversation within the topical areas of the curriculum and by implementing grammatical items in such a way that students discover the rules by themselves, and partake in lesson planning as well, the demands of the matriculation examinations can be answered to with *pedagogical philosophy.* Through having profoundly reflected upon philosophical matters originated from the students such as presented by Tomperi (2017: 236), and not having studied in an institution-originated manner that is solely individually evaluated (not dialogical) as the matriculation examinations as little as an aim as possible (2017: 245), an intrinsic, personal capability for English language can be achieved.

Therefore, can be stated that the curricular demands of the English language allow *pedagogical philosophy* to be practiced, perhaps better than in the sciences due to a more flexible and abstract curricular thematics. This is logical because of the essential connection of language and thinking and conversation, as discussed above. Implementing *pedagogical philosophy* into English language then demands courage from the teacher to leave the safe textbook aside and embrace the uncertain, but as it has been proven, *pedagogical philosophy* has an educative value that is difficult to be ignored (Tomperi 2017: 238-239).

6 PRACTICAL DESIGNS IN THE SPIRIT OF PEDAGOGICAL PHILOSOPHY

In this section I will present a narration of an exemplary class of 90 minutes that includes an exemplary preparation as well. The narration is in three parts, and there are two reflections of the ideas presented in the narration against the theoretical framework of the USS curriculum and of *pedagogical philosophy,* one after the "*Preparation"* and one after the two "*Exemplary classes".* The aim of these narrations and their reflections is to be of practical use for a teacher, but as mentioned above, it is the nature of *pedagogical philosophy* that it reconstructs itself according to the classroom conditions that are the students, the subject, the environment and the teacher (Tomperi 2017: 237). Therefore, I can only provide practical examples of the concepts of *pedagogical philosophy*, yet the final methodology is left for the individual teacher to decide upon.

As this thesis has shown, *pedagogical philosophy* shares a significant amount of common ground with the USS curriculum and has potential to answer to the demands of national education in a way that benefits the individual as a member of the human condition, and thus cumulatively the nation and the whole world. Korhonen pointed out that a communicative methodology is already used more in the teaching of English than the traditional methodologies (2014: 74), and along the lines of Tomperi, *pedagogical philosophy* does not attempt to revolutionise education but in the already existing practical framework to do something little differently (2017: 246). Furthermore, I believe in many classrooms, hidden from the academic inquiry, features similar to *pedagogical philosophy* are already practised, but the topic requires, as Tomperi mentions as well, more pedagogical speculation and theoretic and empirical research (2017: 246).

6.1 An Exemplary class – Preparation

6.1.1 Table 1: Preparation

Class: 25 USS first-graders, the 1st lesson of the ENA1
Class length: 90 minutes
Languages used: English and Finnish (and all others that are required)
Themes: Identity (45min), relativity (45min)
- Getting to know each other

- o Names, where do our surnames come from, how would we define ourselves if we were not to use our names? (Small groups?)
- o Stories, tell a story about yourself that no other in this room knows, a memory game after the stories
- o Dreams, hopes for the future, how have/do our dreams define(d) us, the course of our lives? (Small groups?)
  - ▪ "The only place where life looks planned is the CV." (Robinson)

- Relativity
  - o Candles in the dark, what is motion, what are dimensions (room booking)
  - o What else is relative? Good - bad, luck - unluck, beauty - ugliness, popularity - unpopularity, and therefore evaluation of *any kind,* relativity as how we think
  - o Level of magnification, if we look into our bodies we see organisms fighting yet harmony from the mirror, when we zoom out we see people fighting but harmony on the whole → the importance of perspective!
    - ▪ The picture about *truth* (Truth)

- Classroom arrangement
  - o Tables into a circle or a square so that everybody is able to see everybody
  - o Perhaps low volume background music

6.1.2 An Exemplary class - Preparation, analysis

Firstly, the fact that Tomperi points out that the teacher should in her/his work emphasise personal points of interest, therefore move among topics that are of genuine interest to her/him (2017: 243), should not be taken lightly and moreover, should be applied to everything the teacher does. The teacher should plan the lessons as closely as she/he feels necessary; plan Bs never go in vain. Also, the details from small to large should rise naturally from the teacher. Examples of this are the background music, and moving towards larger details, the arrangement of the room, and the choice of the languages used in the classroom. It should be remembered that too strict planning may prevent natural proceedings of the class (see the word 'perhaps' in the note about music), as the purpose is to eventually engage the students in reflective thinking and conversation and draw the subject matter from there (Lipman 1977: 14, 29, Tomperi 2017: 237, 240). Lipman also recognises the genuine belief and passion of the teacher in what she/he does in the classroom by arguing that the teacher is through her/his actions, verbal and non-verbal, a model for the students (1977: 62). Lipman also states that *philosophizing* is difficult, and like any art form, it requires rehearsing (1977: 59).

The target group is a class of 25 students, all of which are first-graders of upper secondary school. The average group size in the national junior high school was 20 students in 2014 (Ministry of Education and Culture 2017), thus 25 is a safe estimate for an average USS class in 2018. The only difference that an age group may result in is that on average the older students have a deeper understanding about the dimension of conversational practices. Therefore, as the characteristics of quality dialogue (i.a. compassion, trust, and criticality) are in the heart *pedagogical philosophy* (Tomperi 2017: 234-235), the most difficult part of the process of explorative classroom in the spirit of *pedagogical philosophy* is the beginning. However, uncertainty is something that the teacher must adapt to in practicing philosophically oriented discussion (Tomperi 2017: 242, 243, Fisher 2013: 24).

The identity discussion about the surnames in the beginning of the class can be done in a free manner; whoever knows about the origins of their surname and wants to share it, may do so. Lipman point out that philosophy should not be imposed on the students (1977: 25), but it should rather be introduced to them. Moreover, the teacher should trust in the curiosity of the students. Then the question of "*How would we define ourselves if we were not to use our names?*". This inquiry broadens the concept of identity into a level that some of the students may not have thought about at all. Therefore, small group discussion may be a safe and perhaps more productive approach to this particular question. The group sizes and division, and the seating order altogether should be decided upon the class in question. I would most likely personally perform in both ways regarding the seating order; sometimes I would let them sit where they wanted and sometimes assign the seatings in order to get them to discuss with different people.

The stories about oneself do not need to be longer than one sentence, however they certainly can be. The point is to familiarise with the students and to attain a more personal connection, and furthermore a nickname can be produced from a story to remember their names better. This should also be a lot of fun. Continuing from the conversation about identity, the question "*How do dreams define us?*" should touch all of the students on a personal level which is essential in order for reflection to transpire, according to Tomperi (2017: 237). Again, the students can begin the conversation in small groups and participate as much as they want. The teacher may provide supporting questions such as "*What dreams did you have as toddlers?*" and "*Do you think you are guided by some sort of a dream at the moment*?". The teacher should in these kinds of situations practice pedagogical tactfulness (Tomperi 2017: 243) to make sure that the students are not left with insufficient instructions. This contributes to the feelings of safety and confidence (LOPS 2015: 15).

The theme of relativity is closely connected to that of identity, and very present in the students' everyday life. Firstly, the teacher and the students move to a room which can be easily made dark. The reason for using a different room is that it consciously and subconsciously communicates the students about relating critically to the tradition of conducting teaching always in the same classroom (Tomperi 2017: 226). Lipman also discusses the teacher's possibilities to influence the atmosphere of the class by manipulating the physical surroundings (1977: 60). The idea of the class is to help the students mutually discover through hypothesising and conversation the concept of relativity. The teacher can first explain what will happen: The room is darkened (it should be made sure that everyone is comfortable with the situation) and with alight candles the class is going to study relativity. The concept and its meaning can be discussed to an extent the teacher feels necessary before the "experiment" itself; the sense of mystery is important, however, because life *actually is* full of mystery and school should be able to teach it, and furthermore, the school should imitate the world outside (Boisvert 1997: 105-107). The room is then darkened and the first candle lit. The teacher proposes a question: "*Does the candle move?*" The scheme is to lead the conversation into the disclosure that if we take everything away but the candle, no motion can be appointed to the candle because there is nothing to *compare to*. The answer should not be as fundamental as the process of inquiry (Tomperi 2017: 235), and the process is conducted in an exploring manner, operating as a group (Tomperi 2017: 234-235). More candles are lit to, in a similar manner, explore the birth of dimension as two candles create the first etc (and in the end all the students should light their candles and the class should enjoy the aesthetic experience). The point is, however, as a teacher to guide the process into student-originated, mutual discovery, and then to have a discussion about it along the lines of Alexander, quoted by Tomperi (2017: 250). The discussion should demonstrate to the students that they live in a relative world, and that in the end their feelings of e.g. uncertainty can be seen only as relations to something parallel, and therefore perhaps understood in a way that will promote growth. I believe, in this exercise the students get close to the ideal of Dewey that all information should be restored in the experience that it was originally separated from (1902: 285), an idea which is in the heart of *pedagogical philosophy* likewise (Tomperi 216-217).

As a general rule to planning a lesson, Tomperi suggests beginning with philosophical problems that touch the students' experience and are, as mentioned, of interest to the teacher (2017: 236, 244-245). The teacher should also be aware of the language she/he uses. For example, the word *problem* proposes an interesting dilemma of having negative connotations. This could be transformed into subject matter and discussion about the meaning of the word

problem, and perhaps its Finnish equivalent *ongelma,* and compare the connotations. Moreover, the concept of connotation could be discussed, and perhaps even the art of translation and how meaning is altered through converting a word or a phrase into another language. This a good example of the mindset of *pedagogical philosophy;* an everyday question is asked, and the teacher guides the students to move it from the specific and shallow to the comprehensive and complex in terms of meaning and interconnections (Lipman 1977: 51-51, 60, 107, Tomperi 2017: 242-243). This also fulfils the demands of the USS curriculum (LOPS 2015: 12-17).

6.2 An Exemplary class - Execution

6.2.1 Table 2: The first 45 minutes, narration

Remote jazz is playing from the speakers of the classroom, the shades let in a cloudy autumn morning. The teacher is sitting at her/his desk as the students come in.

   "*Good morning ladies and gentlemen, come in, come in!"* greets the teacher and rises to shake hands with every student. "*Welcome, nice to meet you, yes, you may sit wherever you please, the chair at the teacher's desk is taken tho', nice to meet you."*
The teacher greets everyone personally and sits wherever there is free space in the circle constructed by the chairs and tables.
"*Now, is it a good morning?"* the teacher asks with laughter because the phrase reminds him of the movie The Hobbit and asks if the students have seen the scene with Bilbo and Gandalf. They watch the clip from Youtube and the teacher continues: "*Now, let us take a round of mornings, good or bad! I can go first. My name is ***** and my morning was good; I slept decently well, had time for a nice breakfast of coffee and rye bread with my family and came to work with almost no rush at all! Okay your turn, what is your name? And if you do not remember the English word, you can use Finnish."*
And they go around telling about their mornings and night sleeps, and the teacher asks questions here and there. She/he does not ask the students to ask question of one another and yet one brave soul does just that in the end-part of the morning round. The teacher nods in support.
"*Now, back to names. Let us take a round of surnames. Do you know what a surname is?"*
The teacher rises to write the word on the board, glancing to the class. A girl raises her hand.
"*Yes, go ahead. Anna was it?"* the teacher says, smiling.
"*Mmm, Anne."*
"*Ahh, yes, apologies, I shall remember the next time."* the teacher says still smiling. "*So, a surname?"*
"*Is it the last name?"*
"*Yes, that is so, thank you. Now, let us take a round of surnames."*
Everyone tells their surname and the teacher listens carefully.

"Thank you. Now, does anyone of you know where your surnames come from, the origins of your family name?" The class falls silent at the question. *"Anything, anything at all?* The teacher waits for a while and says, *"Mine is from Germany, that's all I know, hahah."*
A boy raises his hand.
"Yes, please."
"Mine is from Germany too, or… so my grandfather tell me."
"Oh, so he told? Cool! Is it from your mother's side or your father's?"
"Father's," the boy answers
"So is mine. Anyone else?"
Two more say a word or two about the origins of their last names and the teacher asks both a question after which she/he continues.
"Now, did you know...by the way if do not understand what I'm saying, please ask, yes? Good, so did you know..." the teacher rises up and walks next to a world map. *"that languages have families as well?"*
Then she/he shows from the map how English has "evolved" from Germanic languages with for example influences from Latin and the Scandinavia. She/he gives examples as she/he explains like the word "English" is formed from the word Angles, the people who conquered the isle in the 5th century, and how "axe" was brought to English by vikings etc.
"Do you know where Finnish is developed from?"
"Sweden?"
"Not quite from Swedish, even though we have a lot of loan words from Swedish."
And then the teacher shortly explains the origins of Finnish. And then she/he has an idea.
"In small groups, try figure out why is it important to study etymology, the origin of words? Why do that? In Finnish or English."
The teacher then goes around the groups asking questions, and finally a group discussion is held. After the historical aspect has been discussed the teacher asks:
"Now, we may learn about history, about ancient cultures and their languages and thus their habits but what of it? Where does it take us? The class remains silent. *"Now, if I asked you, do you know what the word connotation, konnotaatio, means, if I say the word 'problem' has a negative connotation? Sanalla ongelma on negatiivinen konnotaatio?"*
A girl raises her hand.
"Yes, please?"
"Is it like...tarkoitus?"
"Yes, indeed it is, well done! Connotation is like meaning. Now, it is something else as well. Something else… What connotations does the colour black have? Mitä konnotaatioita värillä musta on?"
"Heavy metal," says a girl.
"Nice Katariina, what else?"
And the students come up with death and sorrow and things like that.
"Now, what is connotation apart from meaning? Mitä on konnotaatio tarkoituksen tai merkityksen lisäksi?" asks the teacher.
The students come up with the word "connection".

"Yes, very good! Now, why is etymology (the teacher writes it on the board) so important? Because it defines the meanings and connotations of the words we use! And the more we understand the meanings and connotations of the words we use, the better we become at what?

"At communication?" asks a boy.

"Yes, indeed Jesse. And why do we need to be good at conversation?"

"Because we need know how to communicate in work?" asks a girl.

"*What do you think?"* asks the teacher.

And they have a conversation about why it is good to be skilful in conversation. They come up with matters such as the working life, the school, this class, chatting with friends and family, and in the end that conversation is actually everywhere, even when one writes in a diary. And the teacher concludes: "*And it is a whole lot of fun, what do you think? A whole lotta fun..."*

There is only 5 minutes left of the class.

"*Thank you very much for the conversation, I think we found out pretty cool stuff. A ten-minute break here, okay? I'll meet you down at the storeroom, you know where it is?*

The students say they do and they are off through the door.

✳

6.2.2 Table 3: The latter 45 minutes, narration

The students arrive at the storeroom in clusters.

"*Hello, hello! Tatu, eikö niin? Ja Eemeli ja Eveliina. Ja siun nimi alkoi n:llä, eikö niin? Eipä nyt tule mieleen."*

"*Niilo."*

"*No, niinpä olikin, enköhän mie nyt sen muista. Onks teillä minkälaiset nimimuistit? Onko tarvinnut koskaan käyttää?"*

The teacher and the students chat until everyone has arrived. They enter the storeroom, a large space with a white ceiling and walls covered with shelves full of school supplies. The teacher has brought pillows to sit on and they form a circle in the centre of the room.

"*We are going to do an experiment. An experiment, in Finnish? Yes, Maisa?"*

"*Koe, niinkun kemiassa."*

"*Yep, that is correct. Just like in chemistry, or physics for that matter. Now Jesse, could you take the candles from the shelf and deal them around, one candle each, thank you. You know what these are called in English?"* No one seems to know. "*Tealights, spelled together, tealights. Cheers Jesse."* The teacher has an idea. "*Do you know what word associations are? Sana-assosiaatiot? Sirpa?"*

"Niitä on välillä talk showssa, missä pitää sanoa ensimmäinen sana mikä tulee mieleen jostakin toisesta sanasta."

"Juuri näin! Now, let's take a round. I say a word to my left, and then you.. Valtteri? Yes, Valtteri Keränen it was! Valtteri will tell the next word to Sanni and so on. Let us do this in Finnish."

So, they do the round and laugh a bit. The round comes back, and the teacher says,

"Hahhah mahtavaa. Tulee kaksi sanaa vielä, Tatu, Albert Einstein."

Tatu is silent for a moment and answers. The teacher nods with a smile.

"Krista, avaruus."

Krista answers. The teacher nods with consent.

"Jouko, suhteellisuus."

Jouko smiles and answers. The teacher smiles and asks Sanni.

"Ja vielä, Sanni, ulottuvuus."

Sanni utters a laughter and answers.

"Hahhah, oikein hyvä. Now, about relativity, what comes to mind of the word relativity, suhteellisuus?

And they talk for a short while about Einstein and the concept of relativity, the teacher mostly asking questions, sometimes providing them with facts and anecdotes. Then the teacher says,

"Now, let us try to discover relativity ourselves. Let us light one candle. Who will go first?"

Mona steps forward.

"Here are matches, here you go. Now if it is okay with everyone, could we turn the lights of? Onko kaikille ok, jos laitetaan valot pois? Me voidaan jättää tuo ovi raolleen, jos tarvitsee."

Everyone seems alright with the darkness.

"Okay now, Mona come in the centre here, if you will, and sway the candle, heiluta tai keinuta kynttilää. Now the question is, does the candle move?"

"Yes," an answer is called.

"That is right," nods the teacher in the candlelight. *"But what about if Mona was not here? And the rest of us were not here. And this room was not here. Imagine that candle alone in the whole universe."* The teacher looks around. *"Kuvitelkaa, että ainoastaan tuo kynttilä olisi olemassa, onnistuuko? Liikkuisko se sitten? "Would the candle be moving if it was alone in the emptiness universe?"*

"No?" answers a voice to the right of the teacher.

"Mh-hmm, why not?" asks the teacher.

"Koska ei olisi kukaan kattomassa sen liikettä?" answers Eveliina.

"Loistavaa, eli tarkoitatko, että, jotta jokin liikkuu, jonkin pitää nähdä sen liikkuvan?"

"En vaan...niinku...että se ei liiku koska se ei kukaan..tai..mikään ei niinku liiku sen kanssa, niinkun lähemmäksi tai kauemmaksi tai emmätiiä.."

"Mitäs sanotte, what do you say?" the teacher asks the rest of the group nodding at Eveliina's answer.

"Joo, ei se kyllä liiku, kun ei ole mihinkään mihin liikkua."

And they build the idea together for a while. The teacher reacting to every answer verbally or nonverbally, but actively listening. And they discover that motion is actually relative. They talk about shooting cannonballs from a moving truck and jumping off a boat to the direction

it was coming from. Then the teacher asks for a second candle to be lit. Through a similar process they discover that the first, second and third dimensions are actually born when more candles are lit. They wonder about why cannot our senses actually sense more than three spatial dimensions and what is time, and how is time actually relative too. They light all the candles at once and talk while enjoying the warm candle light in a dark storeroom.

In the end of class, the teacher asks, "*What else then is actually relative than motion and time?"*

The students draw from the previous conversation and from their attuned imaginations, and come up with the concepts of size, length, width, weight and even texture. Someone asks if colours can be relative, and they ponder it over. They discover that evaluation is relative, such as the concepts of beauty and ugliness, good and bad. The clock rings and they need to go.

"*Hey, thank you so much for the lesson, it was a blast! I will send your homework in Wilma, be sure to check it. Does everyone have Wilma operating? Toimiihan kaikilla Wilma? Hyvä, ensi kertaan, until next time!"*

The students leave, and the teacher goes to her/his room and writes the homework message for the students. As homework, the students need to think about at least one of the two questions; they will be discussed next time.

1. How would you tell a stranger who you are without using your name?
2. Why do you think it is good to understand relativity?

6.2.3 An Exemplary class – Execution analysis

The importance of the first meeting with a class is underlined by Showalter (2003: 46-48) as the first impressions of the teacher are formed. Showalter specifies that this impression is constructed by the students' perception of the teacher's clothing, posture, facial expressions and the way the teacher speaks (tone, vocabulary, volume). This is only natural, but the teacher should be aware of this and reflect it against the operative culture and the value demands of the curriculum (LOPS 2015: 12-17). With the curricular framework the teacher should consider what attributes would she/he wish to teach the students; as Lipman pointed out, the teacher acts as a model of the operational culture of her/his classroom and should thus act accordingly (1977: 62). The students are likely to sense any inauthentic behaviour which may result in confusion and uncertainty. Therefore, the teacher should act naturally and professionally (Tomperi 2017: 243). A friendly, talkative and curious approach is most likely universally functional. If the teacher seems comfortable and confident, the students are most likely to feel welcome and safe.

6.2.3.1 Conversation practice

As the core medium of *pedagogical philosophy* is conversation. The architect of this medium is a pedagogically capable teacher who by questions and inquiries stimulates thought processes in the students (Tomperi 2017: 235, 240, Wegerif 2011, as quoted by Tomperi 2017: 252). The purpose of this practice is to move the subject matter into the experiential reality of the student and guide the student to critically reflect on the experience in order to create personal meaning (Tomperi 2017: 239). Meaning is therefore a key concept when resolving the pedagogical reconstruction in the spirit of *pedagogical philosophy.*

As Gadamer points out, social interaction is communication (2005: 216). Therefore, conversation can be seen as a continual process which is also recursive in nature; the same patterns reoccur renewing thought. As the *Exemplary class* begins, the conversation arises mutually (Table 2: 26-27). The teacher must show an example of genuine, personal interest towards the students (Lipman 1977: 62), because she/he is the leading composer of the atmosphere in the classroom. The teacher begins further conversation with a simple question of "*Is it a good morning?"* which immediately implies the nature of both Lipman's *philosophizing* and Tomperi's *pedagogical philosophy* in a way that the inquiry demands argumentation, further thinking (Lipman 1977: 60, Tomperi 2017: 235). The teacher follows Lipman's idea of modelling (1977: 62) when she/he demonstrates an exemplary answer her/himself, and thus encourages freshly met students to take part (Table 2: 27). Lipman's *organic* idea of starting from the shallow and then advancing into deeper waters of meaning and connotation (1977: 59-60) performs a soft start for a new class; however, even with simple, "trivial" question the teacher can introduce the practice of further inquiry that will be exercised in the future. Furthermore, these further inquiries are a good example of Tomperi's idea of the essence of personal particularity of the questions presented (2017: 237); as the first question is the same for everyone, the following question is student specific.

This is the basic pattern of conversation in the spirit of *pedagogical philosophy.* The teacher proposes a question to the students that should be of relevance to them, and they answer. Then the given answer implies further discussion and questions. Gradually, the students begin to understand the interconnectedness of the world and the philosophical nature of a human being. The students should move towards the discovery that due to the interconnectedness of reality meaning is ever present, and that growth and learning are actually simply self-reflective experience (Dewey 1902: 285).

This basic pattern is demonstrated in Table 3 as beginning from a question "*What is relativity?"* leading to a discussion about Einstein, and then through an experiment and

experience (Lipman 1977: 61) and recursively back to "*What is relativity?"* (Table 3: 29-30)*.* As Tomperi states, *pedagogical philosophy* must recognise the social reality of the classroom (2017: 234, Lipman 1988: 139) which means the knowledge must be constructed together (Lipman 1977: 29). The students take the conversation (with the help of the teacher) away from the discussed concept of motion into their own lives and discover the relativity of concepts in their own experiencial realities.

The teacher may well take part in the conversation but as pedagogically active and philosophically passive (Lipman 2014: 12). This is to say that the teacher should not impose her/his own philosophical truths on the students and thus take away the possibility to personal discovery. Also, the teacher should use her/his pedagogical capability to adjust a balance between the two according to the groups of students in question. As Lipman suggests, the most important contribution to the discussion from the teacher are relevant questions (1977: 78, 84). An example of a question like this is "*Now, what is connotation apart from meaning?"* (Table 2: 28). This kind of question implies a new direction for thought by referring to a concept that has already been discussed. The teacher should in this way utilize the recursive nature of conversation. Other important and simple inquiries are "*Why so?"* and "*Why not?"* as well as "*What do you say?"*. These questions demand further argumentation and demand the student to engage in thought in a more intricate level.

6.2.3.2 Conversational virtues

As life can be seen as extracting meaning from the immediate experience, conversation can then be regarded as the medium to transfer that meaning (Lipman 1977: 7). This could also be closely linked to a broader definition of teaching; a teacher is someone who can help the student to extract meaning from the immediate experience and consequently help her/him to communicate it to her/himself and to others. As communication is present in every social encounter, our students should learn how to communicate suitably. Therefore, *conversational virtues* are raised next to the pattern of conversation in the spirit of *pedagogical philosophy,* because there is far more to conversation than the verbal acts of inquiry and answer.

Alexander summarises features of quality dialogic teaching (2008, as quoted by Tomperi 2017: 250): collectiveness and reciprocity, support of the other (safety and respect), cumulative (ideas are mutually constructed), meaningfulness (the pedagogical capability of the teacher). This thesis uses these features as a theoretical basis for conducting these *conversational virtues* that are necessary in practicing *pedagogical philosophy,* and moreover, any human interaction.

One of the most essential features of conversation is trust. Trust can be seen as the bedrock on which all productive interaction takes place. It can be also closely linked to Alexander's feeling of safety. The fact that the teacher invites the students to sit where they want, expresses trust which is one of the preconditions of communication also according to Tomperi (2017: 234, Table 2: 26). In a student-teacher relationship, the teacher has the first responsibility as an authority to create a relationship of trust. In the *Exemplary class* the teacher continues to do just that as she/he asks a question and answers it first personally (Table 2: 27). Another display of trust is in *Table 3,* when the teacher asks a student to deal the tealights around (29). Offering responsibility is a good way of building the trust in a student-teacher relationship. Likewise, the students trust shown to the teacher should be recognized and appreciated by the teacher. Such instance arises when the teacher asks, if she/he can switch off the lights (Table 3: 29). The mutual nature of trust emanates from the decision to trust the other to trust yourself. Lipman's modelling works here very well (1977: 62).

Tomperi discusses responsibility in conversation as three-fold (2017: 249): 1) The responsibility towards the conversational community. 2) The responsibility towards knowledge. 3) The responsibility towards the criteria of reasoning. The first includes the desire to construct a meaningful conversation, listening to and respecting others, and considering and reacting to the thoughts of others. The responsibility towards knowledge means being aware of the sources of the present information, and criticality. Responsibility towards the criteria of reasoning then includes the using of logic and coherence of thought, argumenting the basics, and readiness to adjust own views may they prove faulty. Tomperi continues that all these dimensions of responsibility are interconnected, and their full realisation is difficult, yet however the key to the growth of the group's thinking (2017: 249). It is through understanding the social nature of the classroom, of constructing knowledge together (Lipman 1977: 29), that the ideas of responsibility arise naturally. If there is no individual effort but towards the common good (Boisvert 1997: 106), responsibility of others, of knowledge and of reasoning should not be elusive for the classroom dialogue.

Other *conversational virtues* can be stated to rise from trust and responsibility. These other virtues are i.a. a student reacting to student response in a form of further thought or a question, expressions of empathy in conversation, and any expression of authentic curiosity. Whenever a student independently practices *conversational virtues*, should the teacher point it out verbally or nonverbally; this is the *organic* way of learning proposed by Lipman and the curriculum as well (LOPS 2015: 14); learning through positive experience. An example of this

is the autonomous question by a student at another student in the end of the morning round, and the nonverbal feedback of the teacher (Table 2: 27).

6.2.3.3 Pedagogical tactfulness

Even though general guidance has been stated about the role of the teacher in a classroom conversation, there is a lot of ground undiscussed. This section is an attempt to provide more practical information and guidance considering the details of the teacher-student relationship, and the ideas behind those details. *Pedagogical tactfulness* could be defined as a skill to pedagogically handle the students in a professional, yet friendly manner.

As the students come to class, there is music playing and the teacher rises from her/his chair to greet the students personally (Table 2: 26). This alongside the attempt to learn the students' names communicates vital messages of dedication and personal interest (Lipman 1977: 83-84). It may be the teacher's sense of responsibility that originates this communication, but it is the teacher's *pedagogical tactfulness* that physically generates the actions. As *pedagogical tactfulness* operates around traits such as empathy, caring, charisma and professionality, the teacher should be as natural as possible.

Another aspect which requires *pedagogical tactfulness* is the students' mistakes. The balance to be considered as a teacher, is the balance between when to regard the mistake and when to disregard it. In the *Exemplary class,* the teacher makes a mistake with Anne's name (Table 2: 27) and regards the mistake with laughter and lightness of tone. Whereas in the next conversation about the origins of the students' surnames, the teacher disregards the student's mistake by only correcting it through repetition (Table 2: 27). One aspect in Alexander's features (as quoted by Tomperi 2017: 250) is the one of safety. If the teacher by her/his example can create an atmosphere into the classroom where mistakes are natural and even beneficial, the feature of safety is attained. Furthermore, if the students understand the significance of the process as opposed to striving for the right answer, the fear of making mistakes is yet further reduced (Lipman 1977: 31-33, Doll 1993: 170-171).

This kind of reacting to mistakes requires listening skills from the teacher. Lipman ponders about "selective inattention*",* a term used in psychology, to demonstrate a possible pitfall for a teacher (1977: 78). This term means that if one is not interested in something, or is not mentally orientated towards it, one may disregard the matter completely. The teacher should be aware of this, and consciously bear an open mind towards everything the students have to say, because if a student takes part in conversation, the utterance most likely has some meaning to her/him (Table 2: 27-28). Lipman describes a frame of mind that might be helpful to avoid this trap of

selective inattention; he calls it *a philosophical view on knowledge* (1977: 65). This is to say that the teacher should be open to interpretations and not regard her/himself ready, as arrived at the truth, because the teacher has thus nothing more to find, nothing that the students may teach her/him. This frame of mind also recognises the fact that how meaning is created, is indeed in a conversational, dialogical situation (1977: 65)

A teacher of English language should also pay attention to the language(s) she/he uses in the classroom. In Korhonen's thesis 86.2% of the student respondents stated that it is valuable that the teacher inspires the students to use English in the classroom and in their free time (2014: 56). However, the complexity of the spoken English should always be determined by the students' level of English in the particular class. The teacher in the *Exemplary class* uses both English and Finnish, though Finnish mainly in ensuring that the meaning of the phrase or question was understood by the students (Table 2: 28, Table 3: 29-30).

This is also a balance to be considered by every language teacher. The teacher in the *exemplary class* has also chosen to talk Finnish with the students outside the classroom, or rather outside a direct educational situation. This probably brings the students and the teacher closer to each other, since the students do not need to think about communicating in English every time they socialise with this particular teacher. Other lingual aspects that should be stated are the accent, the tempo of speech, the tone of voice and repetition. The accent of the teacher should be intelligible, and a comparison basis of some extent with other accents would most likely be very useful in teaching pronunciation. The tempo of the speech should be kept at a moderate level so that the students could focus on other things than simply trying to separate the words from one another. A dynamicity is recommendable in pace and rhythm as well as in the tone of voice; pauses, and ascents and decents in pitch as well as different intonations and emphasises result in a more interesting audio. Repetition, as mentioned, is a simple and effective tool for learning and the teacher uses it also in the *Exemplary class* with the word 'Swedish' and 'Connotation' (Table 2: 27, 28.) An example of the dynamics of spoken expression happens during the conversation in the dark room, where the teacher should add a touch of mysticism, and slow the pace because of complex concepts (Table 3: 29-30).

7 CONCLUSION

This thesis explored the compatibility of *pedagogical philosophy* as an educational practice to the upper secondary school curriculum and found not only that it corresponds to the demands

of the curriculum, but also that it has properties that cannot be disregarded in realising national education. It recognises the philosophical nature of human thought and places the institutions and their structures as objects of critical reflection and has for that reason an ability to renew the system from the inside out (LOPS 2015: 12). Furthermore, *pedagogical philosophy* has a capability to turn the immediate experience of the student into personal meaning that contributes to the student's personal growth (Tomperi 2017: 237-239). This thesis also attempted to design a practical realisation of *pedagogical philosophy* within the framework of USS English language, i.e. a pedagogical reconstruction within the framework of the theory, and found that the curricular requirements of English language can be realised through that reconstruction. Therefore, *pedagogical philosophy* can and should be implemented into the educational practice of the Finnish USS English language in the spirit stated by Tomperi (2017: 246): The most practical way of implementation is not a pedagogical revolution but a slight paradigm shift within the practical frameworks of what is being done in schools at the moment. It should also be stated that some forms and components of *pedagogical philosophy* are already practised in Finnish schools, conscious or unconscious of the theoretical framework, which underlines the course of change; *pedagogical philosophy* appreciates the natural curiosity of a human being and one's attempt to make sense of the world (Lipman 1977: 14).

However, there are problems regarding the process of implementing *pedagogical philosophy* into school reality, and these problems must be taken as a point of beginning. This thesis presents three major dilemmas as the most acute and proposes possible solutional directions. Firstly, along the words of Doll and Lipman (1993: 141-142, Fisher 2013: 24), transforming this kind of theory into practice requires changing the concept of both the student and the teacher. It thus requires reshaping the traditional setting of the teacher as the active participant and the student as the passive, which in turn means altering the very educational culture of Finland. However, as Korhonen points out and was mentioned above, innovative ways of teaching English language are already *more common* than traditional ones, and that there is already a great deal of conversation practised in the classrooms (2014: 76). By innovative ways of teaching Korhonen means the communicative approach which recognises language as social action (Roberts 2004: 2). Furthermore, as the new curriculum and *pedagogical philosophy* recognise the student as an active participant and the teacher as a guide or a facilitator (LOPS 2015: 12, 14-16. Lipman 1977: 84, 93, Tomperi 2017: 243), enough evidence is produced to be stated that the tradition of the teacher as the active and the student as the passive is being transformed.

The second problem is how to train teachers for the philosophical frame of mind, i.e. as to practice as little as possible the "selective inattention" (Lipman 1977: 65, 78). One of the problems of training teachers for the mindset of *pedagogical philosophy* is that it is a practice whose definitive methods and tools arise from the action of teaching itself (Doll 1993: 170-171). Therefore, a universal methodology would appear very abstract. The teachers should be also familiarised with the concept of continual uncertainty considering the course of the class (Tomperi 2017: 243). As Lipman states, this pedagogical role of the teacher is like an art form; one only gets better with practice (1977: 59). Things will go wrong, but that is alright. One of the fundamental aspects of *pedagogical philosophy* is as mentioned above, its capability to transform mistakes and uncertainty itself into subject matter and into thematics of conversation (Tomperi 2017: 239). Therefore, what teachers can be taught, is the art of communication. Teacher training should thus emphasise basic parameters of conversation with attention to the role of the teacher as a facilitator of the conversation as pedagogically active yet philosophically passive (Lipman 2014: 12). Furthermore, Lipman proposes active, open listening as a remedy for the "selective inattention" (1977: 78-79). As the origins of conversation should be the students (Lipman 1977: 29), openly listening to their wonder and bewilderment, verbal and nonverbal, helps the teacher to facilitate discussion that touches the experiences of the students. Returning to the modelling of Lipman (1977: 62), if the teacher shows authentic interest in the students by listening and asking question, and also no fear towards the uncertainty of free conversation, the students will sense the safety of atmosphere and open up to participation.

Thirdly, a problem rises from the nature of assessing the "skills" acquired through *pedagogical philosophy*. This problem may be regarded as two-fold; the problematicness of assessing manifests as problematicness to show results to bureaucratic engine, and vice versa. Even though Lipman presented *measurable* improvements in the students' reading skills after partaking in his P4C program (1977: 6), the concrete learning income may be difficult to present. In the subject of English language, as the criticality and reflective skills do enhance reading and production skills (Dean 2017), this problem is not perhaps as substantial as in other subjects, such as the sciences. This has been the very reason philosophy as an independent (institutional) subject has been under conversation and debate, whether it is *useful* or not, since it does not supply a direct material benefit (Tomperi 2017: 211-215). Nevertheless, implementing *pedagogical philosophy* into the curricular practice will, because of the nature of the mindset, transform the assessment; the focus of what is being assessed changes from information to communicating experience. Through critical self-reflection, the students are

encouraged to practice peer- and self-assessment alongside the assessment of the teacher. The need for this is also stated in the USS curriculum (2015: 20, 41). Here should also be remember that *pedagogical philosophy* should not be seen as something revolutionary, but rather as a new perspective that inspects what has been done in the frame of subject teaching, and how it could be done a bit differently (2017: 246).

Future studies should then be conducted on implementing *pedagogical philosophy* into Finnish elementary school and secondary school curricula, as well as into the other subjects of upper secondary school. The possibilities of transforming information into experience that would contribute to the student's mastery of the self (Orr 1991) should be explored in all subject areas. The emphasis should be on practice, i.e. how to turn the ideals of theory into practice that takes into consideration the social and physical realities of the education system (Tomperi 2017: 234). Furthermore, as discussed by Tomperi (2017: 221-225) and Watts (1957: 2), learning should involve the concept of unlearning which requires critical reflection of the grounds on which learning is taking place. For this reason, it would be essential to introduce the philosophical mindset to the classroom teachers (or even to kindergarten teachers) that have the influence to shape the new generations' attitudes about the traditions of education in Finland. Studies should also examine the possibilities to train working teachers, and to design practices for doing that. It is also crucial that teacher training in Finland would prepare the future teachers for the art of conversation, and therefore research should be conducted also on prospects of developing teacher training in Finland.

In accordance with Korhonen, Robinson and Tomperi the pedagogical reconstruction is not a revolution because change is unceasing; it is gradually happening all the time (2014: 73-77, 2010, 2017: 246). Therefore, *pedagogical philosophy* can be seen as a new perspective on this spectrum of change, and as an attempt to unify the direction of the transformation of education in the light of the knowledge at hand. The practice of empathic critical self-reflection with the immediate, social experience of life is the medium which will result in resolving the philosophical problems that these generations are confronted with (2017: 235-238, 255). *Pedagogical philosophy* can therefore fulfil the demand made by Orr (1991) about education's requisite of being "the mastery of the self" by recognising the fact that the experience of learning is the experience of growth and has no other motivation or end than it in itself (Boisvert 1997: 104-105, Tomperi 2017: 234-238).

Bibliography

Alexander, R. (2008). *Towards dialogical teaching. Rethinking classroom talk.* Lontoo: Routledge.

Boisvert, R. D. (1998). *John Dewey: Rethinking our time.* Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York Press

Cam, P. (2008). Dewey, Lipman, and the tradition of reflective education. In the work M. Taylor, H. Schreier & P. Ghirardelli (ed.), *Pragmatism, education, and children.* 163-181. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Dean, P. (2017). Episode #4. Will Orr-Ewing interviews Paul Dean. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wGiiASHeerg&t=3s. (20 May, 2018).

Dewey, J. (1902). *The child and the curriculum.* The collected works of John Dewey. The Middle Works Volume 2. Edited by J. A. Boydston. Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press, 1978.

Dewey, J. (1933). *How we think.* Revised edition (originally 1910) The Collected Works of John Dewey. The Later Works Volume 8. Edited by J. A. Boydston. Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press, 1986.

Doll, W. (1993). *A post-modern perspective on curriculum.* New York: Teacher's College Press.

Elo, S. and Kyngäs, H. (2008). The qualitative content analysis process. *Journal of Advanced Nursing* [online] 62(1), 107–115.

Fisher, R. (2013). *Teaching thinking. Philosophical enquiry in the classroom.* Lontoo: Bloomsbury.

Gadamer, H-G. (2005). *Vastauksia kritiikkeihin.* (1971). Translated by J.S. Tuusvuori. In a book by J. Tontti (ed.), *Tulkinnasta toiseen. Esseitä hermeneutiikasta.* Tampere: Vastapaino.

Julien, H. (2012). *The SAGE Encyclopedia of Qualitative Research Methods.* Content analysis, 121-122. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Juuso, H. (2007). *Child, philosophy and education. Discussing intellectual sources of philosophy for children.* Acta Universitatis Ouluensis. E Scientiae Rerum Socialum 91. Oulu: Oulu University Press.

Juuso, H. (2008). Ajatteleva koulu. Matthew Lipman ja P4C. In the work by T. Tomperi, H. Juuso (ed.), *Sokrates koulussa. Itsenäisen ja yhteisöllisen ajattelun edistäminen opetuksessa.* Tampere: Eurooppalaisen filosofian seura, 97-117.

Kahn, R. (2007). Toward a critique of paideia and humanitas: (Mis)Education and the global ecological crisis. In the work *Education in the Era of Globalization* 209-230.

Korhonen, K. (2014). *English teaching in Finnish upper secondary schools: Students' and teachers' perceptions.* Department of Languages, University of Jyväskylä.

Lipman, M. (1977). *Philosophy in the classroom.* Montclair: The Institute For The Advancement Of Philosophy For Children.

Lipman, M. (2008). *A life teaching thinking.* Montclair: Institute for the Advancement of Philosophy for Children, Montclair State University.

Lipman, M. (2014). The educational role of philosophy. *Journal of Philosophy in Schools,* 1(1), 5-14.

Lukion opetussuunnitelman perusteet (2015). Finnish National Board of Education [online]. http://www.oph.fi/download/172124_lukion_opetussuunnitelman_perusteet_2015.pdf (20 May, 2018).

Ministry of Education and Culture, (2017). OECD: Suomi tilastokärjessä koulutuksen rahoituksessa, jäljessä varhaiskasvatuksessa ja koulutustasossa [online]. http://minedu.fi/artikkeli/-/asset_publisher/oecd-suomi-tilastokarjessa-koulutuksen-rahoituksessa-jaljessa-varhaiskasvatuksessa-ja-koulutustasossa. (20 May, 2018).

Orr, D. (1991). What Is Education For? Six myths about the foundations of modern education, and six new principles to replace them. *The Learning Revolution* [online]. 27(52), n, pag. https://www.eeob.iastate.edu/classes/EEOB-590A/marshcourse/V.5/V.5a%20What%20Is%20Education%20For.htm (20 May, 2018).

Roberts, J. T. (2004). The Communicative Approach to Language Teaching: The King is dead! Long live the King!'. *International Journal of English Studies [online]* 4(1), 1-37.

Robinson, K. (1989). *The arts in schools.* London: BPCC Oyez Press Ltd.

Robinson, K. (2010). Bring on the learning revolution! Sir Ken Robinson. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=r9LelXa3U_I&t=3s. (20 May, 2018).

Robinson, K. (2015). How to build a culture of innovation: Sir Ken Robinson. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zABwof_oYrw. (20 May, 2018).

Showalter, E. (2003). *Teaching literature.* Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Tomperi, T. (2017). *Filosofianopetus ja pedagoginen filosofia.* Tampere: Eurooppalaisen filosofian seura ry.

Watts, A. (1957). *The way of zen.* New York: Random House.

Wegerif, R. (2011). Towards a dialogic theory of how children learn to think. *Thinking Skills and Creativity.* 6(3), 179-195.

Ylioppilaslautakunta, (2017). Toisen kotimaisen kielen ja vieraiden kielten digitaalisten kokeiden määräykset [online]. https://www.ylioppilastutkinto.fi/images/sivuston_tiedostot/Ohjeet/Koekohtaiset/sahkoiset_kielikokeet_maaraykset_30.11.2017_fi.pdf. (20 May, 2018)